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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.
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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.
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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 aforementioned 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—estimatively 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. 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. Internal evidence in his epitomized work indicates that Jason was a Jew whose primary or only language was Greek. 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. His precise knowledge of the Seleucid administration, institutions, prosopography, and chancery terminology makes this supposition likely. On the other hand, commentators have noted that he does not seem to have been well acquainted with the geography and topography of Judaea.

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. 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. 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), with the author of a work on Jewish history going down to 158/7 BCE, 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

---

4 See Barclay 1996, 232.
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.
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). 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.

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, although the epitomator, in his prologue (2:19–23), gives a sketchy outline of its contents. Scholars have oscillated between the

---


14 See Bickermann [sic], “Makkabäerbücher,” PW 14, col. 793 (“um das J. 100 v. Chr.”) and id. 2007, 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.”).


17 See Doran 2012, 11.
opinion that the epitomator was a "beschränkter Kopf" who, aside from abbreviating and ornameting 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. 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.

With regard to the place of composition of the epitome, scholars waver between Judea (Jerusalem) and the Diaspora (Alexandria or Antioch). 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.”
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.
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.
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, 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). The insertion of these documents (which originally may have been preserved in the archives of Jerusalem) into chapter 11 can be assigned to either Jason of Cyrene 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.

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]. 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 exorted their brethren in Egypt to celebrate the rededication feast, which had been instituted by Judas Maccabeus twenty years earlier, in 164 BCE. The letter may originally have been elaborated by a different author. See Habicht 1976, 12; id. 1979, 179; Schwartz 2008, 42; Doran 2012, 227.


31 See Pfeiffer 1949, 509; Goldstein 1983, 407.


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.

written in Hebrew or Aramaic and then officially translated into a Semitizing Greek. 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, 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. On the whole, Bickerman’s analysis, combined with insights provided by recent scholarship, 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, 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

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.
the version of the death of Antiochus IV that disagrees with the one in the body of the epitome (1:13–16)\textsuperscript{40} and the long digression explaining the origin of the Temple’s sacred fire (1:18b–2:15)\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 ὑγιαίινι, 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 ἔρρωσθαι (or ὑγιαίινι)”), 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 ἔρρωσθαι but none of χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίινι, which becomes current from the 60s BCE onwards. The epigraphical corpus (PHI) records two instances of the formula χαίρειν καὶ ἔρρωσθαι, 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 ὑγιαίινι. The single instance of χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίινι in a fourth-century BCE private letter written on lead from Attica,\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{40} See Schwartz 2008, 133, 147.
\textsuperscript{41} Momigliano and Bunge cited in Habicht 1979, 199.
\textsuperscript{42} See Habicht 1979, 199–201; Goldstein 1983, 157–58.
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 χαίίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίίνειν 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 χαίίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίίνειν 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 χαίίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίίνειν, may have sought to render the extended Aramaic Shalom-formula “peace and health,” which is attested in a fifth-century BCE ostrakon 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 BC. 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, 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, 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.

1.2.5 Language and vocabulary of the epitome

Since St. Jerome, there has been no doubt that the epitome of 2 Maccabees (and presumably Jason’s history before it) was originally composed in Greek. 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. 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*, as well as with the epigraphical documents of the period, especially those bearing decrees of the public assembly and

---

54 Niese 1900, 292; Abel 1949, xliii; Momigliano 1994, 39; Schürer 1986, 3.1:532; van Henten 1997, 53.
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.
royal letters. 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” and the paucity of Hebraisms and, on the other hand, identified the “influence of Attic literary models” and detected echoes of Classical Greek writers such as Plato, Euripides, and Aeschines. 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, homoioiteleuton, tricolon, parison, litotes, alliteration, paronomasia, gradation, variation, hyperbaton, hypallage, personification, hyperbole, irony, periphrastic and abstract expressions, metaphors, and occasional prose rhythm. The ornate rhetorical style and the use of emotional language aiming at arousing pathos has led scholars to categorize 2 Maccabees into such genres as ‘Asianic’ writing and ‘pathetic’ or ‘tragic’ historiography.

The epitomator achieves the concision that he aims at (see 2:31) through an excessive use of participles (1,026), passive verbs, and several asyndeta. His prologue, by contrast, consists of a series of long periods, displaying rare words, verbal adjectives in -τέεος, and homoioteleuton, 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.
63 Doran 1981, 27.
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.
72 See Mugler 1931, 422; Bar-Kochva 1989, 178; Schwartz 2008, 73–74.
counting proper nouns).\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{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/7,737 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.

\textsuperscript{78} Cf. the graph showing the distribution of the Septuagint hapax legomena in Wagner 1999, 5.


\textsuperscript{80} See Hanhart 1961, 59–60 [481–82].

\textsuperscript{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, words that denote fear and related emotions, and verbs that denote ‘to die’ and ‘to kill.’ 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.

Another characteristic of the book’s vocabulary, noted by most commentators, 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 and 16 words rarely attested anywhere else than in 2 Maccabees, as well as a small number of poetic words. 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, 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. 
85 See Shaw 2016, 410. 
87 A few of these words are not really hapax legomena, although LSJ cites only their instances in 2 Maccabees, e.g. ἀπασταθώμαι (also in Memn. FHG 3:42.5), προσεξηγόμαι (also in Ph. Legat. 197), προσδηγός (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. 
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 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, 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)\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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. 29a–e and
42:17a–e in the Septuagint of Job (see Gray 1920), which have no equivalent in the Masoretic Text.
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. 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. 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. 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 Sprachschatz 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 א. 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 aforementioned 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)

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)

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. (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 GEKS, 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. 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 aduce to illustrate this last point is the word προσήήλυτος, 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 Fa'iyum mummy cartonnage, which mentions a commotion caused by some newcomers (προσήήλυτοι) 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) 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.

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. Our knowledge of the Greek language of that period is so fragmentary, the amount of perish 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, ἀναθεατίζειν, ὅλοκαύτω, ἁπαξλεγόμενος, 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).


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 κυνόμως (κυνάρχω) or χιοργυρύλλιος. One could see some sense where some specific Jewish motivation could be discerned, as in θεοσπάσατον perhaps, but hardly in ἡλίκος, 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.

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.” 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

---


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. 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. 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.” 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, we lack analogous data with regard to the neologisms. 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, 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 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. 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.
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.\textsuperscript{115} Most of these words are Septuagint neologisms, many of which remained unrecorded in LSJ’s Revised Supplement of 1996.\textsuperscript{116}

To identify the words that fall under the above-mentioned description, Rehkopf relied on LSJ,\textsuperscript{117} a dictionary that has often been criticized for its inadequate treatment of the Septuagint lexical material.\textsuperscript{118} As a result, his list of asterisked words is neither exhaustive nor free from error. To give just a few examples, μονοφάαγος (4 Macc 2:7) is attested as early as the Attic Old Comedy (Ar. *V.* 923; Amips. fr. 24 Kock), as LSJ informs us; ἄποσκυθίζω, 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”; γνωριστήής, in 4 Kgdms 23:24, is previously attested in Antipho (5.94), albeit in a different sense; σκηνοπηγίία, a cultic term in the Septuagint (9x), shows up first in Aristotle, who uses it of a swallow’s nest-building (*HA* 612\textsuperscript{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

---

\textsuperscript{115} However, a few of these words (e.g. ἀναπηδύύω, ἀνδρογύύναιος, διαµαχίίζοαι, πάάρινος) had already been added in the 1968 Supplement. \textsuperscript{116} E.g. ἐκάλωμα (Exod 36:13), κοσµοφορέεω (4 Macc 15:31), προσερυθρίααω (Tob\textsuperscript{GII} 2:14), πυρόόπνους (3 Macc 6:34), ἅγια (Amos 6:11), ἔποικαλύφτω (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 Rahlfis but relegated to the critical apparatus in the Göttingen Septuagint. E.g. ἔπανικτές Rahlfis/ἔπανικτες Göttingen (Ezek 26:17), φρουρέω Rahlfis/φρουρέω Göttingen (Jdt 3:6).

\textsuperscript{117} See LEH, vii–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.” or “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. Although LEH does not claim to be exhaustive in its tracking down of the Septuagint neologisms, the number of the latter that it gives is impressive: 1,280 words are marked as “neol.” and 398 as “neol.?”.

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); 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), the Pentateuch and the bulk of the other canonical books of the Hebrew Bible had probably already been translated into Greek; 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.

119 LEH, xiv.
120 LEH, xxiv.
121 The ca. 190 Greek transliterations of Semitic words recorded in LEH are not treated as neologisms.
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 ἁμάς, 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: μεταγήνωμαι (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); διαδοχία (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 προγήνω (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 ἀπαρασήναντος (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 ἡναπερεῖδομαι (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 διαρρυθίζω (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); δυσπέτη, 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.?,” ἄκατάγνωστος, 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 ἄναγγεια (2 Macc 4:13) and ἄνενωθος 126 LEH, xvi. 127 See Waltz 1931, 183.
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, 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”) includes only new words. 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: διονυσία (E. fr. 156.3 Austin); ἐνομαί (A. Th. 733 and elsewhere); ἀπεριστήμως (Men. Sam. 683); ἂφενία (Ioc. 5.7 and elsewhere); διάμαζος (Hdt. 4.11.12 and elsewhere); διάκόμως (Ph. 1.47.5); ἔγχονῳ (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); καταβλέεπω (Call. Del. 303); κατανάω (Hdt. 4.86 and elsewhere); κατατυπώμεω (X. HG 2.4.16); κατατυπώμεω (D. 18.178); κατάφοβος (Philipid. fr. 36 Kock); μεγαλόπετος (Men. fr. 1035 Kock); ἀκάλληλος (Hp. Epel. 7.1.4.7 [Epidemics 7 is dated to ca. 375–350 BCE. See EANS, 409 and Craik 2015, 91]); μακρινία (D. 25.84); ὀνύστοσα (Call. Aet. 178 Pfeiffer); πατράάδελφος (Is. 4.23); πολλόθρυνος (A. Ag. 711 and elsewhere); προσαναφέερω (Chr.Wilck. 250.10 [225 BCE]); υπερτιτρώω (S. Ant. 284); φιλόπροσωπος (Antiph. fr. 220 Kock); ψιθυρίστας (Men. Mis. 140); ὄμορφος and πολύφως, 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; ἑπταβάρδια and πανηγυρισμοίς 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 contemporaries with the author of the sapiential book. For all these words (but διονυσία, μεγαλόπετος, and ὄμορφος), 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), xiin19.

133 E.g. ἀλλοφυλισός, ἡμερολόγια, διαμόρφον, διεξέχομαι, ἐπιστόλαμα, κυψελός, παραδείγματικά, προσαναφέρω, σπαταλάω, τρίμαζο, γωνιαῖος, ἀφρόνως (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); ἄγγελω (Eup. fr. 99 Kock); ἐκθελάζω (Arist. HA 587e27; Hr. Mul. 1.73); ἐπισάγγειν and διάκοπτον (S. Ph. 755); ἔμπνευσις (Lindos II 58.1 [311 BCE]); καταδάσσειν (Th. 7.81.5); μονοφάγος (Ar. V. 923; Amips. fr. 24 Kock); ἔξετε (Democr. fr. 246 D.-K.); πρόνωσις (Hr. Art. 41.48); προήγορος (Epheusos 572.1 [ca. 340–320 BCE]); προσκήνιον (IG XI,2 153.14 [297–297 BCE]); πυρτανίον (Eup. fr. 77 Kock; used figuratively in 1 Kgdms 21.14); πυρφόρον (S., Hdt., X., Pl.); χειρόγραφον (Hr. Hum. 9.10); ψύχλος (Arist. HA 537e6); ψυχοί (X. Oec. 7.43).

135 A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets), 1993.
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).<sup>136</sup> 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 *Koinē* 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.”<sup>137</sup> 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.”<sup>138</sup> 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).<sup>139</sup> 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.”<sup>140</sup> 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,<sup>141</sup> 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, and in the Hippocratic corpus. We also find a number of words which, outside the Septuagint, are not attested in “later texts” but in pre-Common Era literary, epigraphical, and papyrological texts (TLG, PHI, PN), we can track down even more words, which are attested prior to the Septuagint or prior to the Common Era. We can also see that, despite the lexicographer’s wish to exclude words that

142 E.g. ἄτροπαλλέτζω (Diph. fr. 74–75 Kock); μοντρέει (Alex. fr. 172 Kock); εὐπάρφος (Nicostr.Com. fr. 9 Kock); σωμοκτός (title of a tragedy by Sophocles, fr. 482–486 Radt); δοροφόρος occurs in a lyric aikadynamon quoted by Dioscorides of Halicarnassus (Comp. 17.38).

143 E.g. ἄρχωμα (Epicur. fr. 34.29 Arrigletti) and ἐπισφέρω (Thphr. HP 2.6.5; Theophrastus’ botanical treatments were written around the turn of the third century BCE [see Amigues 1988, xii, xviii–xx]).

144 E.g. ἐκπαρώνα (Mul. 133.21); in a different sense than in the Septuagint; ἐξήρθος (Art. 10.6; in a different sense than in the Septuagint); περιχειροσύνη (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 approximate 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 treatments in which the aforesaid words occur range from the mid-fifth to the mid-fourth centuries BCE. See Craik 2015, 111, 206, 217.

145 E.g. ἄθραχος (Posidipp.Epigr. 133.8 Austin-Bastianini [αAP 9,359]); ἄνηφος (Antip. Sid. AP 7,748); δυσπαρμία (Scymn. GGM 1:684); καταβλέπω (Call. Del. 303); παραθάξῃ (Arat. 1,993); περιπεποθή (Mel. AP 12,95); σκεπτικός (Scymn. GGM 1:336); νυφόγαμος (Herod. 5.25).

146 E.g. ἀθλονύμεα (E. fr. 156 Austin); ἀπελέκητος (Thphr. HP 3.8.7); δορθιός (Gomni II 112.2 [late 3rd c. BCE]); ἀνακλής (Thphr. CP 4.4.9); κιόργας (SEG 18:726.48 [4th c. BCE]); μακρός (P-Arist. Phgr. 8,1378); P-Aristotle’s Physiognomics is dated to 320–280 BCE [see EANS, 149]; μελανάμα (Hp. Epid. 7.1.47); πρόφυρος (Ερημος 572.1 [4th c. BCE]); ἀκιδώτος (IG II 1627.345 [330/329 BCE]); τεττυλάκης (title of a comedy by Epictocrates, fr. tit. 7–8 Kock); τεττυλάκης (SEG 18,36, fse B.col.III.344 [ca. 330–310 BCE]).

147 E.g. ἱππιδαίμον (ID 1421; frg.col-II.18 [ca. 156/155 BCE]); ἀναφέρομαι (BGU 8,1846.9 [50/49 BCE]); ἀναφέρομαι (P.Kosm. 6,275.14 [104–105 BCE]); ἀπεικόνισις (P.Cair.-Zen. 2,59152.18 [256 BCE]); ἄφτωπα (P.Tebt. 3,1704.21 [232 BCE]); ἀφθαργήθη (Vho 62.17 [36–24 BCE]; see Aitken 2014, 71–72); ἄτεκτος (IG XI,2 199 A.105 [273 BCE]); ἀθολοχία (Priene 51,XII.167 [ca. 120 BCE]; partially reconstructed reading); ἀθολοχία (ISM I 54.34 [ca. mid 1st c. BCE]); δικαιονυματίζω (IK Kyme 41.19 [1st c. BCE]; see Aitken 2014, 49–50); διακόσια (P.Oxy. 3,5691.11 [252 BCE]); διάφορος (S.B 6,9556.3.10 [245 BCE]); διαστάσεις (IK Kinos 1,31,Kn, [C] V.42, 43 [100 BCE]); ἐνεχύρασ (P.Mil. 2,27.24 [158 BCE]); ἐνελπίωμα (BGU 8,1848.7 [ca. 47 BCE]); ἐπικαλέσιον (IK Kinos 1,154,21 [239/190 BCE]); ἐπικαλέσιον (P.Yale 1,32.3 [ca. 257 BCE]); ἐργασία (BGU 4,1159.9, 21 [30 BCE–14 CE]); ἐργασία (P.Col. 4,81.19 [246–240 BCE]); ἐργάτης (BGU 10,2006.8 [150–100 BCE]); in a different sense than in the LXX); κάλλινθον (BGU 4,1120.17 [5 BCE]); καταβλέπω (P.Hels. 1,118 [194–180 BCE]); καταδεσφικος (Ephgr. 626.5 [late 3rd–early 2nd c. BCE]; in a different sense than in the LXX); καταδεσφικος (SB 20,14183.11 [198 BCE]); κακέμα (Ph.Mech. Bel. 75,29, 31); λέγειν (P.Cair.-Zen. 4,5970.7 [263–229 BCE]; λεγών (P.Ryl. 4,667, fr.24 [125–100 BCE]); μεσοποφόρος (partially reconstructed reading in ID 1473.7–8 [after 166 BCE]); περίστερα (P.Koeln. 8,347.20 [193 BCE]); στυλάτης (OGIS 56,A.4 [238 BCE]); στυλάτης (P.Lond. 7,2188.65 [148 BCE]); σύνιμος (Tam V,1 775,13–4 [46/45 BCE]); τύφαις (Ph.Mech. Bel. 60,39); τροφεύω (P.Tebt. 3,1815, fr.9,2,18 [228–221 BCE]); χαρετίζω (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. 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.

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.” 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. 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 ἐβδομηχηστάς” (p. xix) do not hold true. The numeral is in fact attested in Aristotle (Mete. 362b24), 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,

114. [The dates assigned to the following authors and works are according to LSJ (“Authors and Works,” pp. xvi–xxxviii) and Revised Supplement 1996: άνατροφή (SEG 35.216.18 [iii CE]); άπολεπίζω (Gr. 10.58 [x CE]); δευτέρωσις (Just. Nov. 146.1.2 [vi CE]); ενδελεχέω (Steph. in Hs. 1.136 D [vii CE]); ήθολογεύω (Longin. 9.15 [iii CE]); κακοφροσύνη (Opp. [=Oppianus Anazarbemnis] H. 3.363 [ii/iii CE]); κατατρυφά (Luc. JTr 53 [ii CE]; μακροτήρεσις (SEG 34.1515 [i CE]); ονοματογραφία (S.E. M. 11.67 [ii CE]); παρακάπνισις (Eun. VS p. 476 B [iv/v CE]); παρακαθέω (Ael. VH 1.13 [i/iii CE]); τερατοποίω (Proc. Par.Piol. 225 [v CE]); υπερήφανος (M. Ant. 8.26 [ii CE]; ψιλοκλάδιος (Sm. Ec. 7.98) [i/iii CE]); φωταγωγεύω (Lamb. Mchn. 3.14 [iv CE]). For the ἄπειραγάθως and χωνούμαι, LSJ does not cite any other occurrences than the ones in the Septuagint (it only cites D.S. 15.40 for the adverb ἄπειραγάθως).
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 LSJ157 and the DGE158 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.
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 “*aging 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, v–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, 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, 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. 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. 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), 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. 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. The rest recur,

---

163 Cf. Deissmann’s (1908, 45n5) comment apropos of the term *hapax legomena*: “Es sind ἅπαξ εὑρηκένα, nicht ἅπαξ εὑρηκένα.”

164 See BDAG, ix and xii.

165 The rest recur,

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, Zelso (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 Aristides and in Philo, 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; the secular instances of some of these words definitely predate the Septuagintal ones. 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*, for example, which, according to the TLG, occurs only in 3 Mac 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. ἀντάσφας (Ps. 118:112; Let. Aris. 259); κραταύτης (Ps 45:4; Ph. Leg. 3.115.9); προσεξηγόμε (2 Mac 15:11); Ph. Legat. 197.5); καβύτσια (Sir 43:18; Ph. Ios. 93).

168 E.g. ἄφωνος (P.Köln. 5.222.11 [145 BCE]); ἄφωνος (Phld. Elect. 16.2); δεκακερόμα (P.Hels. 1.31.11 [160 BCE]); διαπερά (Phld. Mor. 954E); δωροδέκτης (Men.Rh. 416.15 Russell and Wilson); ἐθδοτή (possibly in P.Mich. inv.920.24 [2nd–3rd CE]; see ZPE 56 [1984], pp. 5 and 7n24); ἔντριτος (SEG 55:723.8 [2nd–1st CE]; cf. I. Aitken 2013, 326); ἐνυποτάσσω (possibly in Phld. Min. 4.90.33 Delattre); ἐξερεύνησις (Poll. 9.117); ἐπισυνέχεω (IGLSyr. 3.2 992.9 [189 BCE];) εὐκοσίω (Phld. Ps. 24, 185 Janko; Str. 15.1.53.3); ἐφημερίως (Hep. 189.18 Pingree); καθίπτα (Luc. Dind. 5.20); καταγογγύζω (Polyaen. 47.1); καταγγάλων (Harp. 392.9 Pingree); κάταρα (Phld. Ps. 151.10 Janko); κατασκευάζω (Hero Dioptr. 6.116); κοσμοζωοchrono (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 Mac 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. ἀκολούθησα 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; ἢμποδοκαρτίω 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 ἐπισυνέχεω in a Syrian inscription (see previous footnote) dated to 189 BCE and of ἤμοσια in Philodemus’ On Poems (151.10 Janko) are anterior to those in 1 Esd 9:17 and 4 Mac 13:25, respectively; the same goes for ἄρφων, 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 ἐλέοντος and τιμοφρενία, whose first attestations (Hermopolis 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.

90
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 ‘\textit{hapax legomena}’ (p. xvi) of the 230 words contained in list III.B, which, as explained earlier, occur more than once in the Septuagint but nowhere else (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 lexicicon: “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.”

Indeed, for some twenty of the words contained in the list, LSJ and its Revised Supplement cite at least one extra-Septuagintal instance. 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 \textit{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.” 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. 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 \textit{πρωτογέένη µα}, for instance, Chamberlain (p. xvin37) states that “LSJ can cite only Philo—commenting precisely on the texts in question—beyond the LXX itself.” The truth is that \textit{πρωτογέένη µα} 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 \textit{πρωτογέένη µα} are verbatim quotations of Septuagint verses. Lastly, some fifteen words also occur in secular Greek texts contemporary with or slightly posterior

\footnote{A few of these words have actually a single occurrence in the Septuagint and should have been included in list III.A instead: \text{ἀγαυριάάο µαι, δεκαπλασιάζω, ἐξακονάάω, ἐξιχνιασ µός, κληδονισ µός, σύβλησ, χλεύασ µα}.}

\footnote{GS, xvii–xvin37.}

\footnote{\text{ἀμνάς, ἀναφορεύς, ἀπαντή, ἀποκαθαρίζω, ἀπονέθεσια, ἀποκόμια, ἀργόρη, ἀργύριον, γαβρεύω, ἑπικαταράαι, ἑταρίς, καρπωτός, καταδυναστεία, καταπάατησις, λαξεύω, στηλογραφία, στιπ(π)ύνος, σύβλησ, σύβλησις, ὑπεράνωθεν, χήρεις. In their secular attestations, some of these words (e.g. ἀναφορεύς, ἀπονέθεσια, σύβλησις) have a different meaning than the one they have in the Septuagint.}

\footnote{In their secular attestations, some of these words (e.g. δεινάάζω, κολλυρίζω, µακρύµα) recur only in lexicographical works.}

\footnote{E.g. ἀλλοφυλισµός, ἀρχιπατριώτης, ἀναφαλάάντω, ἀποκιδαρόόω, ἐµφραγ µός, καρπωτός, καρυόκος, κατακάαρπωσις, παρόργισ, περισπόόριον, etc.}
to the Septuagint; \(\tilde{h} \varepsilon \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\iota\gamma\), “handbreadth,” is even attested prior to the Septuagint, as early as Xenophon (Cyn. 2.7, 9.13).  

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. The discrepancy

---

175 E.g. ἀπάνωθεν (BGU 16.2603.28 [21 BCE–5 CE]); ἀπωσκοπεύΰω (Ariston. Il. 16.361); ἀσυνθετέέω (Chryissipp.Stoic. SVF 2:197; PSI 4.418.23 [263–229 BCE]); ἔχοιντις (Theano Ep. p. 196.34 Thesleff); μάδος (P.Oxy. 41.2982.9 [150–299 CE]); ἕκλιψις (P.Mil.Congr. xviii.pg6.16 [143/142 BCE]); ἓκακοκοκος (Psal. Alm. 1.1:197.5); ἥξεμάζω (D.L. 9.113.5 Long); βολητόός (Epict. 4.1.101); κατάβρω (P.Lips. 2.129.15, 34 [8 CE]); κατάβρωσις (P.Athen. 14.19 [22 CE]); καταθλάάω (Ctes. FGrH 3C, 688, ir. 45sq.48); κολλύύριον (P.Hib. 2.271.6 [230 BCE]); κωφεύύω (Moschiotrag. TrGF 1:6); κωφεύύω (Polyaen. 15.4.4, 29.1.5); πυγάλωμα (Demetr. Eloc. 100); χωνευτήήριον (Antig. Mir. 84a.2 Giannini).


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 different words contained in the Septuagint.\(^\text{178}\) 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.\(^\text{180}\)

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

---

\(^{178}\) 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).
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.  

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/undatable 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.

---

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 firstattestation 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, 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 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. Semantic and other types of neologisms 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. 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.

See 1.2.4.

Cf. the definition of proton legomenon in 1.3.2.

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 Sapientia precederà di quasi un secolo Filone e di due secoli il IV dei Macsebei? 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.  

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 (ἡ 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

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 δεκαμερινιαῖος (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: ἐμελετήμα (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. σπλαγχνοφάνης (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.
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, ὁ, and ἀπέέρχομαι and their replacement by ποτίζω, βρέέχω, and ἀποτρέέχω, 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” (ὁράάω/βλέέπω) and “donkey” (ὄνος/ὑποζύύγιον). In the third-century BCE papyri, ὁράάω is still the standard word for the meaning “to see,” but, around the middle of the second century BCE, βλέέπω begins to compete with it as a synonym; in the first century BCE, βλέέπω becomes the standard word for “to see,” and by the mid-first century CE it has almost totally ousted ὁράάω. In the Greek Pentateuch, ὁράάω 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 ὑποζύύγιον, 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 ὑποζύύγιον 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 ὑποζύύγιον 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).

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 *kaîge* 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, runs the risk of being a petitio principii, as he himself is aware. Subsequent studies on the Greek Psalter have actually challenged this early dating. Schaper (1995, 42, 45, 150; 2014, 174) saw in LXX Ps 59:9c and 107:9c Ἰουδας 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. 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. 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. 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

---


192 See p. 156.

193 Williams (2001, 262–63) downplays the significance of the phrase Ἰουδας βασιλεύς μου as a clue to the date of translation of the Psalms, arguing that Judas Maccabees 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 fulfilled: 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 ἐμπαιγμός (“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 observing that in both 1QM 12.9 and Jer 4:13 (but not in 4Q381 46.4), the word ἐμπαιγμός 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.
(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”) from Ezek 38:9 (וְאֶֽרֶץ הַגֶּ复查ֶר הַנֵּ复查ֶר, “like a cloud covering the land” NRSV), in which he embedded two words from Isa 18:4 (וְאֶ复查ֶר הַגֶּ复查ֶר, “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复查ֶר复查ֶר复查ֶר复查ֶר 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) 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). 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).
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). 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 ἀνοια µαταιότης. καὶ µνήσθητι τοῦ κτίσαντός σε ἐν ήμέραις 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. 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.\(^2\) 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),

\(^2\) 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. 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*, *πρόόπτωσις*) reappear in subsequent literature in a different sense. Of the neologisms that are not (absolute or non-absolute) *hapax legomena*, twenty-two recur from the first century BCE onwards, eleven from the first century CE onwards, and fourteen do not recur earlier than the second century CE; only two have instances so early as the last quarter of the second century BCE. 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, and that a couple of other adjectives recorded in the list (*αὐλαῖος*, *μοιῳδής*) are variants of words which are attested much earlier than 2 Maccabees.

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 ἑννενήκονταετής, πρόπτωσις, ύποπλαβέεο, ύπονοθεύύω.
3 ἀγύτης, ἀκατάάγνωστος, βαρβάρως, χρυσοθήκην, μετάφρασις, ἕπαλλογέα, παντεπόόπτης, προσεξηγέεο, ύπογράµµός, χορτώώδης, ψυχικῶς.
4 ἀναβίίωσις, δεξιάάζω, δευτερολογέεω, δυσπέέτη µα, ἔλευστέέον, ἐποξύύνω, εὐθίίκτως, θωρακισ µόός, Μαρδοχαϊκόός, προοδηγόός, συσσύύρω, τιµωρήτης.
5 δᾳδουχίία, περισκυθίίζω (?).
6 βάάρβαρος (Alcm. fr. 10a.42 Page); εὔθικτως (Arist. HA 616b22); ψυχικόός (Arist. GA 726b22, passim).
7 αύλειος is attested as early as Homer (*Od. 1.104*) and ἡμώνυμος 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). None of the neologisms listed in this Appendix occur in the prefixed or the embedded letters. Two neologisms (μετάφρασις, υπογραμμικά) occur in the epitomator’s prologue, one (εὐθικτως) in the epitomator’s epilogue, and four (δυσπέέτης, ἐλευστέον, προενέέχω, 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,’ ‘military activities,’ ‘violence, harm, destroy, kill,’ ‘religious beliefs and activities,’ ‘attitudes and emotions,’ and ‘divine attributes.’

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. ἐνενηκοναστής) or words that have previously been discussed at some length in lexic, commentaries, or other studies. 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,
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 πολίν Ἑλλήσιν ὀικήτηριον ποιήσει, τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν ἀργυρολόγητον καθὼς τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τεμένη, πρατήν δὲ κατ’ ἐτος τὴν ἀργυροσύνην ποιήσειν

Second Maccabees uses fifty-five verbal adjectives in -τος. Sixteen of these are not found in other books of the Septuagint; 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 ὀινονόβρωτος 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 the 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 νῆς) to the north and west coasts of the Aegean and the Euxine in the winters of 430/29, 428/27, 425/24, 422 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, ἀπαρασῆμονς, ἀπενεύοντος, ἀργυρολόγητος, ἀφόρητος, ἀφυπαρόχροτος, δυσπρόσιτος, ἐπικτητος, εὐαπάντητος, ἑφικτῶς, θεοκτιστῶς, κατάρρυτος, περικατάλημπτος, πρατός, ὅποιον.
19 ἀγωνιστος, ἀδήμος, ἀμάκας, ἀνήκος, ἀνήκης, ἀπήμονος, ἀπάκης, ἀστώς, ἀναζώσως, ἀκατάκλεις, ἀπατητῶς, ἀπάτητος, ἀτάρτος, ἀνίκητος, ἀνήκος.
20 2.69.1 ἔτερας δὲ ἐς [sc. νεῶν ἀργυρολόγων] ἐπὶ Καρίας καὶ Λυκίας . . . ὁπως ταύτα τε ἀργυρολογώσι.
21 1.19.1–2 ἔζερεμμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔξωμάκους ἀργυρολόγους νεῶν δῶδεκα . . . ὅπως [sc. Λυσικλῆς] ἄλλα τε ἀργυρολόγου καὶ περιπάλι.
22 4.50.1 Ἀριστείδης δὲ Ἀρχίππου, εἰς τῶν ἀργυρολόγων νεῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός, αἱ ἐξεπιαφθήσειν πρὸς τοὺς ἔξωμάκους.
23 4.75.1 καὶ 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 τα τε τῶν ἔξωμάκων ἀργυρολόγησεν ζε τοιατούς).
to address the emergencies of the Archidamian war. 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. Modern historians have no hesitation in describing these operations as “a sort of legalized plundering,” “piratical undertakings,” and “a kind of state piracy, officially authorized and organized plundering raids.” 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, of Thrasybulus and Theramenes in Macedonia and Thasos in 410 BCE, of Thrasybulus, again, in Pamphylia, and of Iphicrates in the Hellespont in 389 BCE. 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.

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 νοστοιοί, 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, were charged with collecting the funds (consisting of donations and contributions from the member states) required for the reconstruction of the temple. 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 νοστοιοί appointed late in 357 as ἀργυρολογέοντες were actually “money-levying officials” assigned to negotiate with the Lacedaemonians.

---

25 For a discussion on whether the ἀργυρολογός νῆς 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 Ἐνδημίδης 1071 νείς ἔκσταθ’ ἐς / αἰτεῖ ταχείας ἀργυρολόγους οὔτοσιν.


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.


30 Τοῦ τετταράκοντα ἀργυρολογίαν ἐπ᾽ ἤλλῳ ἑαυτῷ ἀργυρολογίαν ἔξω τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου. Τοῦ τετταράκοντα ἀργυρολογίαν ἐπ᾽ ἤλλῳ ἑαυτῷ ἀργυρολογίαν ἔξω τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου.

31 1.11.12 ἀπὸ Θοραμῆνης . . . ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, ἀπὸ δὲ καὶ Ῥακαύρουλους . . . ἐκ Θάσου, ἀμφότεροι ἀργυρολογότες.


33 3.159 τριήρθρο τριπλανάδον ἰματίαν, καὶ τοὺς Ἐλλήνας ἀργυρολογόθης.


uses it in the same sense as Thucydides and Xenophon.

unrelated to money seem to have been a class of magistrates peculiar to Samothrace and ἀργυρολόόγοι.

θεωροί πρυτανεῖον in the offered to two Iasian, who in this case are to pay from the allocated funds the ἀργυρολόόγοι the same period of wheat that they sold. Another decree from Samothrace found in Iasos and dated to the ἄρχοντες assumes that they were the σιτοθέέται had

.lines, Tréheux (1986, 421) calls them the “receveurs généraux de la cité,” and assumes that they were the ἄρχοντες to whom the σιτοθέέται 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 also mentions the ἄργυρολόόγοι, who in this case are to pay from the allocated funds the cost of the dinner in the πρυτανείον offered to two Iasian θεωροι. Whatever their exact functions, these ἄργυρολόόγοι 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 ἄργυρολόόγεω is attested in Polybius, who uses it in the same sense as Thucydides and Xenophon. In its three instances in the


does 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 ἄργυρολοόγεω in the Delphic context is “to exact” and not “to receive” the monies owed to Apollo. This interpretation has been questioned by Rouset (REG 117:620–23), who points out that the establishment of the office of the ἄργυρολοόγεόντες 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 ἄργυρολόόγος have been preserved. The first is found in an inscription from Samothrace containing a decree regulating the city’s grain-purchase. The decree, dated to the second half of the third century BCE, or somewhat later, specifies that, in the event of a deficiency, the ἄργυρολόόγοι are to provide the σιτοθέέται with the necessary funds from the general revenue of the city for the purchase of grain. Both ἄργυρολόόγος and σιτοθέέτης as titles of officials are nowhere else attested. Fraser (1960, 27, 31, and 32) assumes that the ἄργυρολόόγοι were the city’s “highest financial officials,” who “exercised control over the expenditure of subordinate financial officials” such as the σιτοθέέται. 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 σιτοθέέται 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 also mentions the ἄργυρολόόγοι, who in this case are to pay from the allocated funds the cost of the dinner in the πρυτανείον offered to two Iasian θεωροι. Whatever their exact functions, these ἄργυρολόόγοι 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 ἄργυρολόόγεω is attested in Polybius, who uses it in the same sense as Thucydides and Xenophon. In its three instances in the


38 Hammond 2003, 373 and 375.
39 SEG 36:788 [text as established by Tréheux 1986, 423] ll. 1–2 ἀπα[γ·γε·κα·λα·ίν τοῖς] | ἄργυρολόόγος τὸ πλῆθος τοῖς οί[του τοῦ] | [πεπαραμένοι]; ll. 12–17 τοῖς θεο[ν·θέται, ἀν τις] γένεται ἐγκήθει, ἄπατηγε·κά·λαίν αὐτοῖς τὸ πλῆθος, τοῖς θείς ἄργυρολόόγοις | [ἐκάθισαν τοῖς] σιτοθέέταις ὥ·τι ἂν αὐτοῖς | [περιή·παραχερήσα·κα] ἐκ ἄπασις τῆς προσέπιθης [[δού· ὡτις ἂν σω]ν] ἕ·χθημι.
40 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.
41 Hammond 2003, 373 and 375.
42 Hammond 2003, 373 and 375.
43 Hammond 2003, 373 and 375.
44 Hammond 2003, 373 and 375.
Histories the verb is applied to Hannibal, who after subjugating the tribe of the Olcades levied money from their cities (3.13.7 ἄργυρολογήσας δὲ [sc. ὁ Ἀνίβας] τὰς πόλεις καὶ κυριεύσας πολλῶν χρημάτων), to Demetrius of Pharos, who launched piratical raids on the Cyclades (4.16.8 [Δημητρίου ὁ Φάριος] ὄρμησεν ἐπὶ νῆσων, καὶ περιπλέουσας τινὰς μὲν ἄργυρολόγην, τινὰς δ᾽ ἔσπορθε 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 Σπάρτιάται]. Φόρους τοῖς νησιώταις ἐπιτάττειν, ἄργυρολογεῖν δὲ πάντας τοὺς Ἑλλήνας). The last-quoted passage, in particular, makes clear the distinction between the imposition of tribute (φόρους ἐπιτάττειν) and the forceful exaction of money (ἄργυρολογεῖν).

In subsequent writers of the first century BCE and CE, ἄργυρολογέω occurs in the sense "to extort money." Diodorus Siculus uses it three times in this sense; Strabo uses it of the agents of the Roman governor Labienus (12.8.9.6 τοὺς ἄργυρολογοῦντας Δαβιγνώ), 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 ἄργυρολόγησεν) 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 ... ἡ βεβιασμέναι τινὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας ἡ ἄργυρολογήσας). The following passage of Dio Cassius, the author who uses the verb more often than any other writer (22x), eloquently illustrates the practice of ἄργυρολογία:

42.50 There, too, he [sc. Caesar] collected large amounts (ἄργυρολόγησε), 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 ἄργυρολόγητος 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 ἄργυρολόγητον, like the rest of the sanctuaries of the Gentiles, and to put up the high

42 Cf. PL s.v. ἄργυρολογέω: "j-m unter Kontribution stellen, von j-m Geld eintreiben."
43 31.31.1.11 τούς μὲν φυλακῶν, τούς δὲ φυγαδεύον καὶ τὰς οὐσίας δημιουργάς ὑμῶν τούς ἄνδρας ἄργυρολόγησε, ὡλία καὶ τὰς γυναίκας; 31.32.1.5 ἄργυρολόγων δὲ καὶ πολλῶν ἐπαινεώμενος πεντήκοντα μὲν τακόλουθοι ἐπεφάνον. Τιμίθων. 31.32.1.11 ἐνέρχετο πάντας ἄργυρολογεῖν καὶ τὰς οὐσίας τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων εἰς τὸ βασιλείου ἀναλαμβάνειν.
priesthood for sale annually. Most modern translators render ἀγρυμολόγητον in this verse as “subject to tribute,” or “taxable.” 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 ὀποτιοίκοι of the Artemision at ἀτέέλεια known that the general Prepelaus acknowledged the tax dependen κάατοικοι letters attest to the exemption from the tax on sheep conceded to the enjoyed under the previous ruler, the Seleucid king Antiochus III. 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. 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 ἀτέέλεια of the Artemision at Ephesos, a privilege that was probably renewed later by the Seleucids; a letter of King Seleucus I and his son Antiochus to the Athyrmians in 281 BCE confirms the ἀτέέλεια

---


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 προσφευμένην εἰς τὸ] ἱεροῦ δεκάατην | τῶι ἅπρο | | τῆς ἱερᾶς γης δεκάατην ἐποιήσετο].


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 ἄργυρολόόγητος 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.

We may now discuss our author’s choice to use the novel term ἁγίες ἱερεῦσιν in the context of Lysias’ intentions concerning the Temple. If the meaning of the phrase τὸ ἱερὸν ἁγιολόγητον ποιήσειν is that Lysias had in mind to make the Temple taxable, then a term from the φυλακάρχων word group would have been a more evident choice. The

\(^{48}\) Νῦσσα 4.2–3 [ἐπιστελέοντας πρὸς ἡμᾶς Αθωμβροκον πρὸς τῆς [κεκτείας καὶ ἀπογ.ακαὶ ἀτελείας]. On this letter see Welles 1934, 54–60 and Rigsby 1996, 400–401.

\(^{49}\) IG IX, 1.78.10 ὅπως ὑπάρχει άμῖν | τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρας ἡ ἀτάλα [κά] καὶ πρώτειρων.

\(^{50}\) See Bikerman 1938, 114–15; Debord 1982, 271; Ma 1999, 134n101; Aperghis 2004, 151.

\(^{51}\) See Babota 2013, 147–49.

\(^{52}\) 1 Mac 10:42 and ἐπὶ τούτων πεντακισχιλίων σύκος ἁγιρὺσεαί, ὡς ἐλαβόμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν χρεῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου κατ’ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τούτα ἀφίησαν διὰ τὸ ἀνήκειν αὐτὰ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῖς λειτουργοῖσι. Josephus gives a different figure and currency (“ten thousand drachmas”) and indicates that the recipicents of the money were “the kings” (AJ 13.55 τὰς δὲ μυρίας δραχμὰς, ὡς ἐλαβόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ οἱ βασιλεῖς, άμῖν ἀφήνας 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 Mac 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 Mac 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 λυσιοῦ προσθέεια), 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 inter sacerdotium 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 Teos57 and occurs twice in the Septuagint58 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 ἄργυρολόγητος 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 (σίίκλοι 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 ἄργυρολόγητος 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, ἄγρυμολογέω 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 φορολογουμενῆς χώρας. See Welles 1934, 15–32.
58 2 Chr 36:4 τότε ἥξετο οἱ γῆς φορολογεῖσθαι τίτι αὐτός Παρθηνός; 1 Esd 2:23 ἀποκληθούσας ἵππους ἀκολούθησαν καὶ σκληροὶ ἦσαν ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ κυριεύοντες καὶ φορολογοῦντες Κυκλῆν Σύριαν καὶ Φοινίκην.
59 2 Chr 8:8 ἀνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς Σαλωμεῶν ἐφίλεσθαι τὴν ἀργυρίῳ; 36:3 ἐπέβαλεν φόρον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν; Judg 1:28 ἢ ἄρα θεοῦ τὴν Χαναναῖον ἐφίλεσθαι τῷ γένει; 3 Kgdms 5:27 ἢ ποιήσῃ τὸν βασιλεὺς ἵππους ἐπὶ πάντως Ἰσραηλ; 1 Macc 8:2 ἢ ἀνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ φόρον.
60 Deut 20:11 πάς ὁ λαὸς οἱ εὑρεθέντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἄρνησατο τοῦ φορολογουμενοῦ καὶ ὑπῆκοοὶ σου.
61 Only Hesychius glosses it in his lexicon: γ 786 φορολόγητος· ὑποτελεῖς, λειτουργεῖ.
62 ἀφορολόγητος is first attested in a decree containing a treaty between Iasos and Ptolemy 1 (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 γην ἢν κρατήσωσιν, ἀφορολόγητον αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχειν καὶ in 1 Macc 11:28 καὶ ἐξελάθη Ιωναθάν τὸ 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).<sup>67</sup> 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).<sup>68</sup>

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 talent 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.<sup>69</sup> In that case, the temple treasure seems to have served as a sort of bank, providing the king with ready cash.<sup>70</sup>

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.<sup>71</sup> 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.”<sup>72</sup> 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 ὀνήτος, “that may be bought,” attested in literary texts in connection with the sale of offices, priesthoods included,<sup>73</sup> but the adjective

---

<sup>68</sup> See Debord 1982, 271 and 447n82.
<sup>69</sup> See van der Spek 2000, 302; Aperghis 2004, 175.
<sup>70</sup> van der Spek 1994, 23 and 54; Aperghis 2004, 174.
<sup>71</sup> Geller 1991, 2–3.
<sup>72</sup> Geller 1991, 3.
πρατός, “for sale,” derived from πέργημι, 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 and was familiar with the relevant terminology. It seems reasonable to assume that his use of ἀργυρολόόγητος likewise reflects the use of ἀργυρολογεῖν 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.

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 Lupo 2009, 44–48), or to eastern Anatolia. The purchasers bought the priesthoods (ιερατείαι, ἱερωσύναις) 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 (ἐπιπωλητεῖα) (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] ἵπποι ἀπογραφαίς ἔχοντας ἔτη, πρία καὶ μέγας ὀλίγως), 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 Lupo 2009, 48) we encounter formulas invariably containing forms and derivatives of the verbs πέργημι, “to sell” (Erythrai 60, a.1 [300/260 BCE] αἵδε ἱερατείαι ἐπιπωλητεῖα; d.13–14 ἱερατείαι αἰ πρατόσ [ἀνα] | καὶ ἐπιπωλητεῖα; Miletos 11.4 [165/158 BCE] ὡς ἱερωσύνης πραθές; SEG 50:766.35–36 [Kos, late 2nd—early 1st c. BCE] ἐπὶ ταῖς πράσεις τὰς ἱερεῖαν|[νας]), παλακεύμα (to “sell” (Priene 210.2–3 [2nd c. BCE] ἐπὶ τούτῳ πωλούμενη τὴν ἱερωσύνην τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ Φίλου; Escr. di Cos ED 62, face B, back 1 [1st c. BCE] ἦ γεγορόν ἱερωσύνης πωλητῆς ζου. . . ἔτη; Erythrai 60.65–66 [300/260 BCE] ἱερατείαι αἰ ἐπιπωλητεῖα; Herakleia Latmia 27.5 [100/ca. 75 BCE] πωλοῦντας ψα| [ες τοῦ δῆμος] τὰς προεκτενζόμενες θεάς τὰς ἱερωσύνες; SEG 55:931.31–32 [Kos, ca. 150–100 BCE] ἦ ἱερωσύνης ἀναπωλητῆ ὑπὸ τὰς πωλητές), πρίαμοι, “to buy” (IMT Scan/NebTueller 390.2 [2nd c. BCE] ἐπὶ πρώτῳ τὴν ἱερατείαν τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ Βαμβαθείου; IScM II 1, col. II. [Tomis, late 2nd/earliest 1st c. BCE] I–2 ἤ πρώτῳ τὴν ἱερατείαν τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ Βαμβαθείου, πρίαμοι, ἰσθής; Priene 211.1.1 [2nd c. BCE] ἐπὶ πρώτῳ τὴν ἱερατείαν τοῦ Ποσειδόνος τοῦ Ἐλκυνίου; Hyllarima 16.21 [ca. 188 BCE] ταύτα προπερατέων ἱερατείαις, and ἵπποι, “to buy” (Erythrai 62.38 [300/260 BCE] τὴν ἱερατείαν ἦ ἐπιπωλητεῖας; ib. 43–44 ἱερατείαι ἦς ἐπιπωλητεῖας τοῖς ἰσθήσις). Of the adjectives formed from these verbs only πωλητός occurs a single time on an inscription from Kos (HKG 17.6 [Kos, shortly after mid-4th c. BCE] καθάπερ καὶ πρὸς πωλητόν γενόμαι | τὰν ἱερωσύναιν σωτήρθη).
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 λαλία τῆς εὐνάθριας: αὐτοῦ διεξείτο πανταχῦ); his words fill the souls of the young with a manly spirit (15:17 τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις λόγοις ... δυναμένοις ... ψυχὰς νέων ἐπανθρώπωσαι); his soldiers exhibit bravery (14:18 ἀνθραγαθία) and fight as befits men (10:35 ἀρρενωδῶς; 15:17 μετὰ πάσης εὐνάθριας). 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 ψυχῶν ἐπανθρώπωσαν). 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 κατακρῆναι ἑαυτὸν ἀνδρωδῶς). Even the mother of the seven martyrs is filled with manly courage (7:21 ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀνδρωδῶς). The author not only appropriates terms and values embedded in Greek culture to extol his Jewish heroes, but also enriches the vocabulary of manliness/bravery, and its converse, cowardice, with the neologisms ἀρρενωδῶς and, possibly, ἀρρενωδῶς, a rare adverb attested in Xenophon (in Isocrates (12.31), in Teles (apud Stob. 4.44.83.87), in Polybius (9x), in 1 and 2 Maccabees (1 Macc 6:31 ἐπολέεσαν ἀνδρωδῶς; 2 Macc 14:43), in Diodorus Siculus (19.96.1), and then only in a couple of ecclesiastical writers.

76 εὐνάθρια 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.
78 See the comment on this verb at 4.2.1. ἐπανθρόω 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 manner (ὅταν ἀνδρωδῶς, καὶ ἔστη πᾶν ἐνεένειν ὡς ἑαυτὸν ἀνδρωδῶς). 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 εὐγενέως θέλων ἄποθανεν ἄπθανεν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔλεγξισις ὑποχείριοι γεγένηται καὶ τῆς ἡλίας εὐγενείας ἀνέμελη ὑπερβηναι ... ἀνθραγαθίως γεγένηται ἐπὶ τὸ τείχη κατακρῆναι ἑστεν ἀνθρωδῶς εἰς τοὺς δῆλους) 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 τοῖς ἀνθρωδῶς ἐπῃ καὶ γεγένη, ἀφετέρους δὲν ὑπομένειν ἐλεύθερον ... ἐμ' ὑπέρ ἀγεννέως καὶ ἀνθρωδῶς τοὺς πρὸ τοῦ πράξεως ὑπομείνας). Cf. the cognate adverb ἀνθρακώς: Ar. Eeq. 81 ἀλλα σκόπει; ὡς ἄποθανεν ἀνθρωδώτεια; Pl. Thit. 177b ὡς αἷς ἄποθανεν ἀνθρωδώτειας πολὺν κρόνον ὑπομείνας καὶ μὴ ἀνθρωδῶς φυγαίνων.
81 Cf. the cognate adverb ἀνθρεικώς: Th. 63. 7 ὡς ἄποθανεν ἀνθρείκωτας παλέν κρόνον ὑπομείνας καὶ μὴ ἀνθρωδῶς φυγαίνων.
At 10:35, ἀρρενωδῶς is conjoined with θηριώδει (reminiscent of the ἄρσεν θυμῷ at 7:21), which is echoed in the adverb θηριώδει at 12:15 (ἐνέέσεισαν θηριωδῶς τῷ τῶν πολεμίων). Manly valiance (or its absence) appears, the n, 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 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,” ἄνδρείως and ἄνθρωπος.

2.2.3 δεινάζω ‘to be indignant’

4:35 πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θυμῶν ἔδειναζον καὶ ἐθυμούρον ἐπὶ τῶν ἄνδρος ἀδίκῳ φόνῳ
13:25 ἐθυμούρον περὶ τῶν συνθηκῶν οἱ Πτολεμαῖοι—ἔθειναζον γὰρ ὑπεράφακα

The neologism δεινάζω (from δεινός) is unattested in Greek outside 2 Maccabees. Ancient lexicographers gloss it as δεινῶς φέερω.

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 “irritate, indignate” and is followed by GELS “to become angry”; LEH offers a combination of the aforementioned 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) “lärnten . . . 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 ἀρρενωδῶς γὰρ ἡ τοιαῦτα 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 ἔδειναζον; δεινός ἐφέρων. Ps.-Zonaras adds the gloss “to revile, to abuse” (8 p. 489 δεινάζειν; λαδορεῖν; ε’ p. 615 ἔθειναζον, δεινός ἐφέρων, ἦ ἐκακολόγου), probably because he confused δεινάζω with the rare and poetic δεινάζω, which has this meaning.
The only other verb that derives from δεινός is δεινῶς, “to exaggerate” (Th. 8.74.3), which does not help elucidate the meaning of δεινάζω. More illuminating are the rare compounds δεινολόγος, 135δεινολογεέο, 135δεινολογεέο “to complain loudly,” and δεινοπαθής, 135δεινοπαθής “to complain loudly of sufferings,” as well as periphrastic expressions such as δεινόν ποιόμεθα, 135δεινόν ποιόμεθα “take ill, complain of, be indignant at a thing,” or δεινά ποιομένου, 135δεινά ποιομένου “make complaints.” 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, 135σχετλιάζω “complain of hardship, utter indignant complaints,” which is often attested in conjunction with ἄγανακτεόντων ἐρωτομένων, just as δεινάζω forms a hendiadys “with δυσφορέω in its two instances in 2 Maccabees.”

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 (ἄγανακτεόντων, τοῦ καθαροῦ, παραδόξω) are Septuagint neologisms and two (δεινάζω and δεινοπαθέúος) which are neologisms of this book. Unlike δεινοπαθής, 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 συγνακτεόντων, 135λαμπεντιάζω, “to be horrified by sb or sth, to be appalled at sb or sth.”

85 On this verb, see Walters 1973, 131.
2.2.4 doξικός ‘glorious,’ ‘splendid’

8:35 τῆν δεινήν ἀποθέμενος ἑσθήτα

Of the eighty adjectives in -ικός occurring in the Septuagint, nine are neologisms: ἄρτοκοπτικός (1 Chr 16:3); δοξικός, ἄρηκμικός (Ps 101:7a; 119:4b), λαμπερικός (Num 7:3); Μαρθοπακτικός (2 Macc 15:35); πενθικός (Exod 33:4; 2 Kgdms 14:2; the adverb is already found in Xenophon); πουκικικός (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 GELSW external splendour, magnificent appearance, which is occasionally used in the Septuagint with respect to splendid, honorific garments. At 8:35, δοξικός modifies ἑσθής, 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). 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 τίς, “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. Kinkel, “δόξα in the LXX and Hellenistic Apocrypha,” TDNT 2.242–45; C. Spicq, “δόξα, etc.,” TDNT 1.362–76.

94 Cf. Exod 33:5 ἀφέλαις τὰς στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν ὑμῶν; Add Esth C:13 ἀφελμένη τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης αὐτῆς; Add Esth D:1 ἐβδύσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς προστάσεως καὶ περιβλέπει τὴν δέξαν αὐτῆς; Isa 3:18 ἀφέλαι κοίρου τὴν δέξαν τοῦ ἱερατεύουσαν αὐτῶν 1 Mac 14:9 οἱ νεονόμοι ἐνδύσασθεν δέξας καὶ στολὰς πολέμου; Sir 6:29b καὶ ἐπάνω σύ τας κύριοι αὐτῆς [περὶ τῆς σωφρίας] εἰς στολὴν δέξης; 6:31a στολὴν δέξας ἐνδύσασθι αὐτήν 27:8b καὶ ἐνδύωσεν αὐτὴν [περὶ τὸ δίκαιον] ἀνάμεσα δέξας 45:7d καὶ περιέχεσθαι αὐτὸν περιστολὴν δέξας Ps Sol. 11:7a ἐνδυόμενος, ἑρωστάλημεν, τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης σου. Cf. also Let. Aris. 96 μεγάλῃ δὲ ἐκπλήξῃ καὶ παρέσχεν ἀνέπαυσθεν τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον ἐν τῇ λατρείᾳ, τα τοῦ στολομοῦ καὶ τῆς δέξης, ἀναστέθη ἐν τῇ ἐνδύσει ὑμῶν, ἀφελεῖ καὶ παρέσχετε ἀνέπαυσθεν. The cognate adjective ἐνδόξα occurs sixty-nine times in the Septuagint, but is never applied to garments. Cf., however, T. 12 Patr. 3.8.5 περιμένεται μοι στολήν ἄτια καὶ ἐνδόξης, NT Luke 7:25 ο ἐν ἱερατεύῳ ἐνδύωσαν ἈPhi. 144.15 Bonnet ἐξεικνύει με τὴν ἐνδύσει σου στόλον.

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 (τῆς τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου πορφύρας περιέλαμβας καὶ τοὺς χιτῶνας περιέρρεξας), 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 καθεστακαμένη σε σήμερον ἄρχερα τοῦ ἁθνοῦς σου καὶ φίλον βασιλέως καλεισθήναι—καὶ ἀπέτευυλον αὐτὸν πορφύρας 10:62 καὶ έξεῖκοσαν ἰωανθέν τα ἱμάτια αὐτῶν καὶ ένδώθουσαν αὐτὸν πορφύρας 10:64 δὲ έθελον οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες τὴν δέξαν αὐτῶν . . . καὶ περιεβλήμενον αὐτὸν πορφύρας). Cf. also the purple robe 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.

δικαύος was apparently coined by analogy to other adjectives in -υκός used as modifiers of garment-denoting nouns. 96 Even its conjunction with ἐσθής and the participle ἀποθέουμενος 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 ἀποθέουμενον ἐσθήτα τῆς ἀναλαβὼν ἀναλαβὼν περίσσει κατὰ τὴν ἄγοραν. On the other hand, the choice to create a garment-modifying adjective from δέξα, 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 δέξα in the genitive (στολῆ/ὑμάσα/ποθήρης δέξας) 98 or by the prepositional phrase εἰς δέξα (Exod 28:2 ποιήσεις στολής . . . εἰς τιμήν καὶ δέξαν), he opted for the standard Greek construction—attributive adjective plus noun—which necessitated his coining an adjective from δέξα. 99 Similarly, in 2 Macc 3:15, as well as in 1 Esd 4:54 and 5:44, we meet with the combination ἱερατική στολή, which is equivalent to the Hebraizing constructions to be found in the Septuagint Exodus (35:19 τοὺς γυνῶν τῆς ἱερατείας; 39:18 τάς στολάς εἰς τὴν ἱερατείαν). 100

96 Cf. Hdt. 1.135 τῇ Μεσικήν ἐσθήτα; Ar. Ec. 846 ἵππης στολῆς; X. An. 4.5.33 βασιλικαίς στολαῖς; Lycurg. 1.86 πτωχήν στολής; Pl. Lg. 833b τωμῆς στολῆς; SEG 43:212(B).29 [Boiotia, ca. 260–250 BCE] χιτῶνα κορικὸν γευστικῶν Phyarch, FGHS 2A.81.30; Esth AT (8):39(15) τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐσθήτα; Callix. FHG 3:2.270 γινώσκων ἰδιωτικῶν; Plb. 10.26.2 δημοτικῶν ἐσθήτα; 14.1.13 δούλων ἐσθήτας; 31.14.6 ἐσθήτας ἄνθρωποις (a Polybian neologism); D.H. 3.73.2 στολαῖς; 53.1.5 ἔσθητας ἐσθήτας; 8.59.3 τὴν αὐτοκρατορικὴν ἐσθήτα; Str. 3.4.20.28 τῇ τιμητικῇ ἐσθήτα; J. AJ 11.231 πενθικὴν ἐσθήτα; BJ 2.176 ἐσθήταν ἄνθρωποις; 4.164 τὴν ἰερατικὴν ἐσθήτα; 7.127 ἐν ἐσθήταις στρατευμάτωι.

97 Cf. Hdt. 4.78 τὴν στολὴν ἀποθέουμενον τὴν Σκυθικὴν λάβεσθαι ἃν Ἑλληνίδα ἐσθήτα; D.S. 17.97.2 ὁ μὲν Ἀλεξάνδρος ἀποθέουμενος τὴν ἐσθήτα γοβάνη τῷ σώματι τῆς ἐνδεχομένης ἐνεμφαίνετο μυστήριοι; 20.34.3 ἀποθέουμενον τὴν πορφύραν καὶ μεταλλαχθεὶς ἤντειον καὶ ταπεινὴν ἐσθήτα παρέβλεπεν εἰς τὸ μέσον; 20.104.4 ἀποθέουμενον γὰρ τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἐσθήτα διετέλεσε τριμυθός; J. AJ 8.266 τὴν στολὴν ἀποθέουμενον καὶ σχῆμα λαυβόων ἄνθρωποις; 20.217 συνεκάθεσαν τοὺς ἰμαθέας ἀποθέουμενος τὴν προτέραν ἐσθήτα φορεῖν λυγν. Cf. also Duris FHG 2.31.3 καταθέουμενος τὸν πάτριον τρίβανα, τὴν Περσικὴν ἐνδεικνύς στολῆν; D.S. 29.32.1 τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐσθήτα καταθέουμενος περιβάλλετο τίμην θένταν; Phl. Cic. 19.3 τὴν περιβάλλεισθαι ἃν τῇ βασιλείᾳ καταθέουμενος διαλύεσθαι τῇ συμφορᾷ πρόετοσι.

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 ἐκεῖσα ἔσθητα σταυροσφαλαγμοί καὶ πέπτωκς (C:13 [4:17]) into an adjectival one, πενθικὴν ἐσθήτα περιβάλλει (AJ 231), employing the adjectival πενθικῆς, used elsewhere in the Septuagint (Exod 33:4; 2 Kgs 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 (στολάς 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 ἑποίήσαν στολάς λειτουργικάς Αχαίων ὡστε λειτουργεῖν ἐν αὐταῖς).

The phrase τὴν δοξικὴν ἐποίησε φεβήντα appears thus to have been modelled after both profane Greek and Septuagintal lexical patterns.

2.2.5 δυσπετήμα ‘misfortune’

5:20 ἂ τίτοις συμμεταχων τῶν τοῦ θάνους δυσπετήματών γενομένων ἕστερον εὐφρενετήματων ἐκοινώνησε

Of all the books of the Septuagint, the deuterocanonicals/Apocrypha have the highest concentration of compounds prefixed with δύσ-: 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 δυσσεβή- and δυσφη- word-groups, favoured by 1, 2, and 3 Maccabees, are almost exclusively encountered in poetic texts.

Among the total of thirty-two δύς- compounds that occur in the Septuagint are a few neologisms: δυσαίκτος (3 Mac 6:31), δυσδέγγος (Wis 17:1), δυσνοο (Add Esth B:5; 3 Macc 3:24), δυσπέτμα (2 Macc 5:20), and δυσβέβη (1 Esd 1:49; 2 Macc 12:3). This verb, which Hesychius glosses as the equivalent of δυστυχεῖ, κακῶς ἔχει, δυσπαναχεῖ, δυσχερέα, σχετικά,106 is first recorded as late as the fourth century CE in Eusebius of Caesarea.107 Other members of the δυσπετέ- 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, δυσμενεία (3x), δυσμενεία, δυσπέτημα, δυσπολιορκητός, δυσπρόσιτος, δυσσέβεια, δυσσέβεια, δυσσέβης (4x), δυσχερεία (2x), δυσφημία (2x), δυσφημία (2x), δυσφρέω (4x).
102 δυσάκτος, δυσαίκτος (absolute harax legeomenon), δυσακτάκτος, δυσκελία, δυσκελία (2x), δυσκελία (3x), δυσκελία, δυσκελία, δυσφρέω.
103 Wis δυσάκτος, δυσδέγγος, δύσχερος; 1 Esd δυσδέγγος, δυσβέβη; 1 Macc δυσδέγγος, δυσβέβη; Add B Esth δυσδέγγος (2x), δυσδέγγος; 4 Macc δυσδέγγος.
104 Gen δυστυχεῖ; Exod δύσκολος; Jer δύσκολος; Isa δύσκολος; Prov δυσβάστακτος; Job δυσκολία.
105 See DELG s.v. πίπτω and Stanton 1968, 3n4.
106 Hch. 8 2630 δυσπαναχεῖτε; 8 2630 δυσπετήτων; 8 2648 δυσπετήτως; 8 2989 σχετικά.
107 Const. or. ad coetum sanct. PG 20:1304C.
108 Hch. 8 2650 δυσπετέως and 8 2651 δυσπετέστερος.
Hippocratic writings (Morb. 1.17; Ep. 27.267); the adjective 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. It occurs in one of Aristotle’s early works (Top. 16319) and, some two centuries later, in Polybius (33.17.2). δυσπετήμα, which is to be understood here as meaning “misfortune,” 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 Monographiè of the fourth-century CE Christian apologist Macarius Magnes111 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 ἵπποσύλλημα (4:39), as well as in δυσαύτημα, 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 δυσπετήμα 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 εὐμερεία and δυσμερεία: οὐ συννοῦν τὴν ἑαυτῶν συγγενεῖς εὐμερείαν δυσμερεῖαι εἰκό την μεγίστην.116 In both cases, the author pairs a more or less frequent noun (εὐεργέτημα, εὐμερεία) with a very rare (δυσμερεία) or perhaps novel one (δυσπετήμα), 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 (τῶν κρατίστων τῶν ἐφήβων ὑπότασον 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. s 6324 ἀποδυσπετεῖ and s 2990 σχετλιάζεται. LSJ gives as its meaning “to desist through impatience” and GE “to desist in disgust, be disheartened.” The noun ἀποδυσπετήμα, “discouragement,” in Scholia in Lucianum 25.3 Rabe, is an absolute hapax legomenon.
110 So LSJ and GE. DGE gives “desgracia.” Hesychius (§ 2649 δυσπετήματων) glosses it as ἀπότυχημα, “failure.”
111 Book 3, page 113.17 Blondel.
112 PG 99:296A.
114 See 4.2.2. In 2 Macc 5:20, a single witness, the minuscule 370, reads δυσπετήματας in place of δυσπετήματων.
115 Cf. Lys. 31.17 ἑτέροις ἥγομενος ὡς τὰ ὑμέτερα δυστυχήματα εὑρεχήματα ἔγγονον.
116 Cf. 6:29 ἐν τῷ μιρῷ πρότερον εὑρέσκειν εἰς δυστυχίαν τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄντων τὰς ἐν θυείαις καὶ συμφαράξα οἷς εὐμερείας διοικήτους ἔμελλον.
117 Prior to 2 Maccabees, δυσμερεία is found only in a line of Aeschylus quoted by Aristophanes (Rota. 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 δυσχερεί 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 περιπεσόντα δυσχερείαν ἐγκύοση); the author warns that divine chastisement befalls the impious without delay (6:13 τὸ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἐάσθαι τούς δυσσεβοῦντας, ἀλλ' εὐθέως περιπίπτειν ἐπιτιμίοις μεγάλης εὐπρεπείας σημείων ἐστιν); and, in a paronomastic wordplay involving the literal and the figurative sense of περιπέτω, 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, ἀλλ' ἐπεξῆλθε τῷ πίπτῃ τοῖς μεγάτα κενεών).

2.2.6 χρονηθὸν ‘like a spring’

14:45 φερόμενον χρονηθὸν τῶν αἵματων

χρονηθὸν is a poetic word used from Homer onwards to refer to springs of water and, figuratively, to gushes of lava and blood or to streams of words. Up to the second century BCE it is very exiguously attested in prose. In poetry, there are two instances, both in Euripides, in which χρονηθὸν 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 (χρονοὶ δ' ἐχώρουν), and in Rhesus 790 a stream of warm blood gushes from the body of the slain Thracian king (θερός δὲ κρουνός ἀἵματος νέεων). The adverb χρονηθὸν 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 φερόμενον κρουνηθὸν τῶν αἵματων) until he is totally bloodless (14:46 παντελῶς ἐξαιος). The dramatic character of this scene is verbally highlighted through the use of the absolute hapax legomenon κατευθικτέεω (14:43), LSJ “to hit exactly,” and of rare words such as ἀναποδίζω (14:44), LSJ “to step back,” and κενέω (14:44), attested here in the novel sense of “vacant space.” Similarly, in another blood-spattered scene of the book, the rare, poetic adjective κατάάρρυτος, 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 ἀπτε τὴν παρακεκεμένην λίμνην . . .
κατάρρυτον αἷματι πεπληρωμένην φαίνεσθαι). It is hard to say whether κρουνηδὸν is a coinage of the author of 2 Maccabees, as is probably the hapax legomenon λεοντηδὸν (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 ὅπας αἷματι κατερρεῖτο . . . κρουνηδὸν ἐχεχομένῳ), may be a verbal reminiscence of 2 Macc 14:45.²¹² In its later occurrences, κρουνηδὸν came to be used with respect not only to water and blood but, mainly, to tears.

2.2.7 λεοντηδὸν ‘like a lion’

11:11 λεοντηδὸν δὲ ἐντναξάντες εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους

Frohwein (1868, 52-58) lists some 120 Greek adverbs with the manner-denoting suffix -γθόν. They occur in poetry, mainly epic, tragic, and comic,²¹³ but are also favoured by prose writers, especially those of the Hellenistic period.²¹⁴ A small number among them, chiefly attested in tragic and comic poetry, are formed from nouns denoting or referring to animals: βοηθόν, “like oxen” (Agatharch. GGM 1:38), ζωηθόν, “like beasts” (Plb. 6.5.9), ἰππηθόν, “like a horse” (A. Th. 328; Supp. 431; Ar. Pax 81), κριηθόν, “like a ram” (Ar. Lys. 309), κτηνηθόν, “like beasts” (Hdt. 4.180), κυνηθόν, “like a dog” (Ar. fr. 722 Radt; Ar. Eq. 1033; Nu. 491), λυκηθόν, “like a wolf” (A. fr. 39° Radt), μοσχηθόν, “like a calf” (Nic. Al. 357), and ταυρηθόν, “like a bull” (Ar. Ra. 804; Pl. Phd. 117b; Nic. Al. 496). Half of these adverbs are absolute hapax legomena.

λεοντηθὸν was apparently coined by the author of 2 Maccabees on the model of the aforecited adverbs.²¹⁵ The lion simile contained in it is applied to Judas’ valiant soldiers,

¹²² On whether Philo knew 2 Maccabees, see Appendix 17.
¹²³ Hom. ἄγγελοθον, κλαγγηθόν, κριηθόν, πυργηθόν, σφαιρηθόν, ἡβηθόν, ἑλικηθόν, πλινθηθόν, θεοθ. ἰππηθόν, λυκηθόν, κυνηθόν, κτηνηθόν, ἑλικηθόν. TrGF 2.705b.15 μυκηθόν; Ar. ἰππηθόν, κυνηθόν, κρηθόν, πινακηθόν, ταυρηθόν, ταυρηθόν Theoc. ἄγγελθον Call. εὐθήνην; Arat. ἄγγελθον, κλαγγηθόν, σφαιρηθόν; A. ἰππηθόν, βοηθόν, βοηθόν Λυκ. βοηθόν; Nic. μετρηθόν, μοσχηθόν, παντεπομερειθόν, βοηθόν, ταυρηθόν; AP (Hellenistic epigrammatists): Anyt. 7.202 λαθρηθόν; Leon. 6.45 σφαιρηθόν; 6.131 στοιχηθόν 9.24 ἰππηθόν; Antip. Theos. 7.531 κυνηθόν; Antip. Sid. 7.713 σφαιρηθόν.
¹²⁴ On whether Philo knew 2 Maccabees, see Appendix 17.
¹²⁵ Frohwein (1868, 52-58) lists some 120 Greek adverbs with the manner-denoting suffix -γθόν. They occur in poetry, mainly epic, tragic, and comic, but are also favoured by prose writers, especially those of the Hellenistic period. A small number among them, chiefly attested in tragic and comic poetry, are formed from nouns denoting or referring to animals: βοηθόν, “like oxen” (Agatharch. GGM 1:38), ζωηθόν, “like beasts” (Plb. 6.5.9), ἰππηθόν, “like a horse” (A. Th. 328; Supp. 431; Ar. Pax 81), κριηθόν, “like a ram” (Ar. Lys. 309), κτηνηθόν, “like beasts” (Hdt. 4.180), κυνηθόν, “like a dog” (Ar. fr. 722 Radt; Ar. Eq. 1033; Nu. 491), λυκηθόν, “like a wolf” (A. fr. 39° Radt), μοσχηθόν, “like a calf” (Nic. Al. 357), and ταυρηθόν, “like a bull” (Ar. Ra. 804; Pl. Phd. 117b; Nic. Al. 496). Half of these adverbs are absolute hapax legomena.

λεοντηθὸν was apparently coined by the author of 2 Maccabees on the model of the aforecited adverbs. The lion simile contained in it is applied to Judas’ valiant soldiers,

In the Septuagint, adverbs in -γθόν are found only in the books originally written in Greek: in 2 Maccabees occur ἰππηθόν (3:18; 14:14), the Polybian neologism σφαιρηθόν (5:2; 12:20), and the neologisms λεοντηθὸν (11:11) and κρουνηθὸν (14:45), in Wisdom we are met with σφαιρηθόν (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 (ἡθομοδέος θυμῷ τῶν ἐμπτύπτοντα ἔχοντον); at 12:15 they attack the walls of Kaspin like wild animals (ἐνέσεισαν θηριωδῶς τὴν τείχει); and at 11:9 they are ready to wound not only men but also the most ferocious beasts (οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώπους, θῆρες δὲ τοὺς ἁγριωτάτους . . . τυτρώσκειν ὅπες ἔτοιμοι), 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 ἵππον τιν ὄνομα;), against which Samson (Judg 14:5–6) and David (1 Sam [LXX 1 Kgds] 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. It is possible that by coining the adverb λεοντηδέος, 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, where, however, the attribution of leonine qualities to humans in military contexts appears to be a royal prerogative. The Bible supplies a number of examples of valorous warriors who are assigned leonine attributes: in 2 Sam [LXX 2 Kgds] 1:23, David says of Saul and Jonathan fallen in battle that they were “stronger than lions” (Σαουλ καὶ Ἰωναθάν δὲ οὐ προσήγορευσεν ἐκ τῆς ἁγριωτάτης; in 2 Sam [LXX 2 Kgds] 17:10, a valiant man is said to be “lion-hearted” (μὸς δυνάμεως, οὐ ἡ καρδία καθὼς ἡ καρδία τοῦ λέοντος); in 1 Chr 12:9, the mighty Gadite soldiers who go over

129 attested in Polybius, and in 4 Maccabees we encounter ταυρηδόν (15:19) and the neologism ἐθνηδόν (2:19).

130 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] λείυσιν ἐνέσεισαν ἀλκαὶ ταυρηδόν; 11.129 [Agamemnon] ὁ ἐναντίον ὄρτο λέον ὡς ἐπὶ ἄρτειθης 12.293 [Sarpedon] ὡσὶν ἐπὶ ἠργεύσεσθαι λέον θ᾽ ὡς θηρίῳ 16.752 [Patroclus] ἐπὶ Καθρίνην ἂν δυσμενός / ὄρτο λέοντος ἐχων 20.164 [Achilles] ἐπὶ ἄρτειθαν ὄρτο λέον ὡς / σύντος. It is the last-quoted line that Aristotle, in his definition of a simile, chooses as a prototypical example: Rh. 1406b20–24 θετὶ δὲ καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν μεταφορά . . . ὡσὶν μὲν γὰρ εἴπῃ [sc. ὃν ὥρος] τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ὡς τῶν ἀλκαίων ἀλκαίων ἐπὶ ἄρτειθαν ἐκεῖνον ἂν δὲ ἐπὶ λέοντος ἐχων· μεταφορά διὰ γὰρ τὸ ἁμερὸ ἀνθρώπου εἶναι, προηγήθηκε τοῦ σπουδαῖον τῶν μεταφοράς. See also Pan 13.313–14, 318.

131 Cf. the following lines from the Assyrian Tusulti-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.


133 For a list of the passages in the Hebrew Bible that mention lions, see Strawn 2005, 357–74.

134 Cf. the Homeric epithet θηριακῶν (Il. 5.639; 7.228; Od. 4.724, 814; 11.267) and Tyrt. fr. 13 West αἵματος δὲ λέοντος ἔχων ἐν στήθει θηριῶν.
to David in the desert are described as having the “faces of lions” (ἰσχυροὶ δυνατοὶ ἄνδρες παρατάσεως πολέμου . . . καὶ πρόσωπον λέόντος 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 ὡς ὁ λέων ὡς ὁ λέοντα ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς σκύνος ἐρευγόνεως τ λέους τῆς φυλῆς Ἰουδαίας). 133

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 ὡς ὁ λέων ὡς ὁ λέοντα ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς σκύνος ἐρευγόνεως τ λέους τῆς φυλῆς Ἰουδαίας). 133

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 non-literary texts? We shall seek to answer these questions only with regard to the term μετάφρασις, which, together with the terms ἔπιτομα 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: ἄντιφρασις first occurs in the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise On Marvelous Things Heard (846–27), 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 2Δ:87, fr. 15.8 προσφέρονται δὲ ταῦτα [σὲ τὰ κρέα] καθαρείσις μὲν, λεοντωδῆς ἄνω).
135 Ἰουδαϊσμός: NT Gal 1:13, 14; 4 Macc 4:26. ὑπογραμμός: NT 1 Pet 2:21; TAM V,1 688.12 [Ioulia Gordos, 1” c. CE].
136 The term ἔπιτομα 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); ἐκφράσεις 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 Ptolemaeus (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), 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 μεταφράσις 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 “consider after.”
139 D.H. 3.3.2.1 θέασι Φερενιάς όμοιομενής, ἢ οἱ μεταφράζοντες εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλώσσαν οἱ μὲν Ἀνθωφόρον ... ὁ δὲ Φερενιὰς καλύσων.
140 D.H. Th. 45.19 ὃ δὲ δημιουργεῖ ... ἐπεξεργάζεται τοῦτοι καὶ μεταφράζει τὸ ῥήματα.
141 Ph. Mos. 2.38 πᾶσα μὲν διάλεκτος, ἢ δ’ Ἑλληνική διαφερόντως, ὁμοιώματα πλούσιτε, καὶ τάτον ἐνδικύμα μόνον τοις μεταφράζονται παραφράζοντα σχηματίζοντα πολλαχίς, ἄλλατε ἄλλας ἐφαρμοσάντα λέξεις.
142 AJ 8.144 ὃ μεταφράσας ἀπὸ τῆς Φοινικῶν διαλέκτου ... εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικήν φωνὴν; 9.283 τὰ τῶν Τυρίων δρόμαι μεταφράσας εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν γλώσσαν; 10.218 μεταφράσει ἑαυτὸν ἑβραϊκῶν βίβλων ... εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλώσσαν, Al. 1.73 γέγραφεν γὰρ [οἱ Μάνδυκες] Ἑλλάδι φωνή τὴν πάτριον ἑτέρον ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν [Ἑλληνικῶν] ... μεταφράσεις.
143 Cic. 40.2; Oth. 18.1.
144 Plu. Dem. 8.2.4 ἐπινοοῦσες τοὺς παντοδαποὺς καὶ μεταφράσεις ἑκατοντάδες τῶν ἑρμηνευμένων οὗτος εἶναι πρὸς ἑτέρους ψωστός, εἶναι πρὸς ἑτέρους δὲ ἐρμηνευμένος τὰ ἐπὶ ἑτέρους ἐρμηνευμένος.
145 Eus. PE 1.10.8.4=PGH 1c, 796 fr. 2.52 ἐπερ [viz. the Phoenician names] ὃς Ἑλληνες ἀγνοήσαντες ἄλλους διεξάγαντες πλευραίκότες τῆς ἀμφιθείας 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. 673); 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. 8457).
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 μετάφρασις, 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 παράάφρασις, which he equates to that of μετάφρασις: “Paraphrase is the alteration of expression preserving the same meaning; the same thing is called also metaphorasis; 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 παράάφρασις, 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 παράάφρασις δέ ἐστιν ἐρμηνείας ἀλλοίωσις τῇ αὐτῇ διάνοιᾳ φυλάττουσα. τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ μετάφρασις προσαγιμένης: δι’ ἡς ἡμᾶς οὕτω τάσσεται προφέρειν, οὔτε τοῦ λεχθέντος οὔτε πραχθέντος ἀφισταμένους οὔτε ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἀκριβῶς τῶν λέξεων μέννας. 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).


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.”

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).

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; 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.

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.

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. In Cicero’s *De oratore* (1.34.154), the orator Lucius Crassus (140–91 BCE) mentions an exercise that

---


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.”


160 *Prog. 62.23–25* Spengel πάντες οἱ παλαιοὶ ραίνονται τῇ παραφράσει ἄριστα καθερμένοι, οὐ μόνον τὰ ἐκατόν ἄλλα καὶ τὰ ἄλλακτα 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. 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.

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.

Aside from the grammatical and the rhetorical paraphrases 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).

---

162 Gram. et rhet. 4.7 Secundum quam consuetudinem posteriores quoque existimo, quamquam iam tum discretis professionibus, nihilominus uel retinuisse uel instituisse et ipsos quaedam genera meditationum ad eloquentiam praeparandam, ut problema, paraphrasis, allocutiones.

163 See Patillon and Bolognesi 1997, ix–xii and cf. Roberts 1985, 7n9, who quotes M.L. Clarke: “Our knowledge of the progymnasmata 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, Choeروبoscus); 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 ποιούντος), 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. The terms that he uses for his interlingual translation are ἑρμηνεία and μεθερμηνέω (Pro:20, 30). The second letter prefixed to 2 Maccabees uses a similar term (διερμηνέω) to denote an interlingual rendering. 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. 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 ἴσος ἐστὶν αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταφέρῃ εἰς ἄλλην γλώσσαν.
168 2 Macc 1:36 νεφθαρ, ὃ διερμηνεύεται καθαρίσις.
169 See C. Spicq, "διερμηνεύω, ἑρμηνεία, ἑρμηνευόμαι," 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 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 ὑποίσον (2:27) and τὸ διακριβῶν περὶ ἐκάστων (2:28) are previously attested only in Isocrates; the phrase ἐντεῦθεν οὖν ἀρχῶν (2:32) also has previous parallels in the orators. Terms such as περίπατος, ὕλη, ψυχαγωγία, and the comparisons from architecture and painting belong to the metaphorical terminology of Greek rhetoric. 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 ὑπογράμμος, 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...
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 ὁπλολογεῖν ‘to collect arms from’

8:27 ὁπλολογήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ σκύλα ἱδαύσαντες τῶν πολεμίων

8:31 ὁπλολογήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐπιμελεῖς πάντα συνέθηκαν εἰς τοὺς ἐπικαίρους τόπους, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἤγεγκαν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα

---

174 Ph. Socr. 51.10 ἣ ν τῶν προτέρου βιβλίων ἐθηλόσαμεν; Gal. 6.568 Kühn διά τοῦ προτέρου βιβλίου διεθήλαθε 11.246 ἐθήλασε δὲ ἡ ἄνοιγμα τοῦ βιβλίου; D.C. 56.28.6 διὰ βιβλίων τῶν Λυσίστατον ἠθηλάθει; SB 18.137.64.23 (148–161 CE) ὡς διὰ δημοσίων βιβλίων θηλοῦσα。


176 D.H. Imit. Fr. 31.5.7.2 εἰς ἁφελείας τῶν ἐντυχεμένων; Ph. Mut. 126 ἐκ ἁφελείας τῶν ἐντυχεμένων.

177 D.C. 5.162.2 Wellmann μέχριν τῆς συντάξεις καὶ πλῆθους ὑλάς.

178 Plu. Alex. 14.1 εὐτελείας καὶ μετρίότητας; Mor. 150D 6 σὺν εὐτελεία καὶ μετρίωσι; D.C. 72.8.3 μέτρου καὶ εὐτελείας.

179 Vett. Val. 4.11.57 τοὺς ἐντυχεμένους ταύτα τῇ συντάξει; 4.11.236 οὐ δὲ μέκλοντες ἐντυχεμένοι τῆς μου τῇ συντάξει.
In 1 and 2 Maccabees we encounter two compound verbs, both neologisms, having ὡπλον as their first constituent: ὡπλοδοτέω, 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 θύους αὐτοῦ),181 and ὡπλολογέω, 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 153—to be disarmed" (Placc. 92 τῶν κατὰ τήν χώραν Αἰγυπτίων ὡπλογείηντων ὑπὸ Βάσσου τινός).

ὡπλολογέω 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, (b) military terms, (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: ἐκατολογέω, GELS to pick olives" (Deut 24:20),186 ἐπικαταλογέσωμαι, GELS to overdo in gathering" (4 Macc 2:9), ἐπιπροωλογέσωμαι, GELS to overdo in harvesting grapes" (4 Macc 2:9), and ὡπλολογέω (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 ὡπλοπτοσία, which occurs in the sense GELS to use as weapon" in Wis 5:17 (ὡπλοτοινεῖς τὴν κτίσιν εἰς ἄμεναν ἐθῆρείων). The verb recurs in Strabo, who uses it in the sense "to make weapons" (15.3.18 φιατογείναι καὶ βιοτομεῖν ἄςκεσαι καὶ ὡπλονος). 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, 1. “to gather top” (AP), ἀνθολογέω, “to gather flowers or honey from flowers” (Arist., Thphr.), βλαστολογέω, “pick off young shoots” (Thphr.), βετολογέω, “gather herbs” (Hp.), ἐκλογέω, “clear by picking off the stones” (Thphr.), καρπολογέω, “gather fruit” (inscr.), καρπολογέω, “to gather dry twigs” (Thphr.), παλμολογέω, “gather fruits” (J.), σταχυολογέω, “to gather dry twigs” (Thphr.), σιτολογέω, “glean ears of corn” (sch. Theoc.), συκολογέω, “to gather stone fruits” (Tob 13:17), which is previously attested in an inscription from Delos.


184 ἔλαιολογέω, “to levy money” (Th., X., Plib., inscr.), δικαστολογέω, “collect as tribute” (orators), ἐνοικολογέω, “receive rent” (pap.), πεντηκοστολογέω, “collect the pentecost” (Poll.), τριτολογέω, and τεταρτολογέω, “have one third/one fourth of one’s property confiscated” (pap.), ἄλαιολογέω, “collect or exact copper money” (inscr.), ψηφολογέω, “to levy tribute” (Plib., LXX, inscr.).

185 ἡμιλογέω, 1. “to gather customarily," or θημολογέω, “collect in a heap” (AP), κεραλογέω, “collect dung” (Ar.), κεραλογέω, “pick loose flocks off a garment” (Hp.), ἄστρολογέω, “gather bones” (Is., Men.), κοπρολογέω, “catch fleas” (Ar. Bybl.), στρατολογέω, “pick up seeds, like birds” (Hp.), etc. All the above-quoted 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].
The booty-related vocabulary in the Septuagint consists of ἀπαρτία (Num 31:17, 18), ἄρπαγχα (Isa 10:2), ἄρπαγη (Isa 42:22), διαρπασμα (16x), διαρπασματικόν (Num 21:1), διαρπασματικόν (Jdt 15:11), διαρπασματικόν (3x), δειμα (4 Macc 8:2), διαρπασματικόν (41x), διαρπασματικόν (43x), πολεμικόν (1 Macc 4:23), πολεμικόν (10x), πολεμικόν (Ep Jer 17:4), ἀρπαγχα (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.

8:20 ἀπαρτίας πολλῆς ἔλαβον; 8:27 τὰ σκῦλα ἐκδύύσαντες τῶν πολεμιῶν; 8:28 ἐκδύύσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκυλῶν; 8:30 ἐπλάσων πλεύνα ἐξερήσαντο; 8:31 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκυλῶν ἔνεγκαν εἰς ἱεροτύπωμα; 9:16 ἐπλάσασαν ἄγων νεῶν.

190 ἀπαρτίας is also used in the Septuagint in the sense “to despoil.” The author of 2 Maccabees seems to be using the two nouns indiscriminately: at 8:28, after the battle at Emmaus against Nicoran, Judas’ soldiers give a share of the σκύλα to the tortured, the widows, and the orphans, whereas at 8:30–31, after the victory over Timothy and Babchides, the same groups of people are allotted the same portion of the captured gear.


192 1 Kgdms 31:8–9 καὶ ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν ἀρπαγχα τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ εὐρήσκουσι τὸν ἱππαλ. . . καὶ ἐξέδυσαν τὰ σκυλάκια αὐτοῦ; cf. 1 Chr 10:8–9 καὶ ἔδυσαν ἀρπαγχά τοὺς σκυλεύμας τοὺς τραυμάτως καὶ εὐρέαν τὸν ἱππάκλα. . . καὶ ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐλαβον τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ σκηνήν αὐτοῦ.

193 2 Kgdms 23:10 τὰ δὲ λαφυρεύματα ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ πλὴν ἐκδύδοσεν.


λάφυρα as the combatants, while the remainder of the σκύλα 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 ὀπλολογήσαντες 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 συνιδώζαντες αὐτούς, 8:26 κατατρέχουσαντες αὐτούς, 8:27 ὀπλολογήσαντες αὐτούς.) Or should we take it to be reflexive (ἐαυτού), “they gathered their own weapons”? Indeed, at 8:31, the Codex Venetus reads ὀπλολογήσαντες ἐκατονταύς197 and one of the Old Latin translations seems to have understood this to be the reading at 8:27, too: LaⅠ 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 ὀπλα (contained in ὀπλολογήσαντες) and σκύλα 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 ὀπλολογήσαντες and τὰ σκύλα ἐκδύσαντες might appear to be an example of pleonastic construction or of synonymic parallelism, typical of the biblical language,199 given that ὀπλα and σκύλα are often used as synonyms.200

196 8:28 τοῖς ἤκοιμώμενοι καὶ ταῖς χήραις καὶ ὄρφανοις μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοῖ καὶ τὰ παχύAX διεμερίζωντο; 8:30 ὑπὲρ τοὺς δισμωρίως αὐτῶν ἄνεκλον καὶ ὑστατόθεν ώρθον καὶ μᾶλλον ἕγκαιρος ἔγενοτο καὶ λάφυρα πλείονα ἔμερίζαντο θησαυρίως αὐτοῖ καὶ τοῖς ἤκοιμοις καὶ ὄρφανοις καὶ χήραις . . . ποιώντες: 8:31 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἔρηκαν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. 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 ὑμῖν ἐκδύσας ἐκατονταύς; 8:13 ἐξετόπιζον ἐκατονταύς; 8:35 ἐξηκατονταύς ποίησας; 10:13 φαρακκαὶς ἐκατονταύς; 12:42 συντηρὰς αὐτοὺς ἀνακαρτῆτος; 14:43 κατεκρίθησαν ἐκατονταύς.

198 At 8:27, the other Old Latin translations run thus: LaⅠ arma uulneratorum collegerunt secum et spolia illorum exuerunt; LaⅠ arma autem ipsorum et spolia congregantes; LaⅠⅠ aitlatis armis eorum et spoliis et praedis; LaⅠⅠ armisque eorum lectis, et spolia hostium exutis. At 8:31, the Greek text that the translator of LaⅠ had before his eyes must have read ὀπλολογήςαντες ἐκατονταύς, for he translated the participial phrase as “et cum armassent se.”

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” (γυμνοῖ), 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 προπεττωκότες 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 ὑπλα and the rest of the σκῦλα, suggesting that σκῦλα is a generic term, which includes the ὑπλα. 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 a

203 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 προπεττωκότες 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 ὑπλα and the rest of the σκῦλα, suggesting that σκῦλα is a generic term, which includes the ὑπλα. 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 χτυπώνες 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,
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 παρεισπορεύμαι ‘to enter furtively’

In the Septuagint πορεύμα forms eleven double and three triple compounds, παρεσπορεύμαι and επιπορεύμαι being the most frequent (161 and 157 instances, respectively). Three of these compounds occur in 2 Maccabees: επιπορεύμαι, in the figurative sense GRLS “to adhere to” (2:28), καταπορεύμαι, GELS “to return home” (11:30), and παρεισπορεύμαι. The latter is a neologism208 and an absolute hapax legomenon.209 The notion expressed by the prefix παρά is that of “to get in by the side,


205 Judg. 8:24 καὶ δότε μιᾷ ἀνδρὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν σκυλῶν αὐτῶν· ἵνα ἔνωσιν χρυσὰ πολλὰ ἡ αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐγενήθη ὁ στρατὸς τῶν ἐνώπιων τῶν χρυσῶν, ὅτι ἐπέστειλεν κύλιοι καὶ ἐπεκάλουσι χρυσὸν πλὴν τῶν πορφυρῶν καὶ τῶν ὁμίσθων ενκρατίᾳ καὶ τῶν περιβολῶν τῶν πορφυρῶν τῶν ἤτοι κατακλύσασιν Μακιαμ καὶ πλὴν τῶν κλείον τῶν χρυσῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐπιχέρθη τῶν κατάληθεν 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.”


208 The type παρεισπορεύσεως occurring in a passage of Phylarchus quoted by Athenaeus (4.21.35 KaeIb=FGH 2A, 81, fr. 44.53 ἀκρόριμο δὲ οὐδέν οὐδέποτε παρεισπορεύσεως) is KaeIb’s unnecessary emendation for the MSS reading παρεκπορεύσεως. 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 Athenaeus for the LCL. LSJ and GE cite Phylarchus’ passage s.v. παρεπισπορεύμαι, under the meaning “to accompany.”

209 The verb παρεισπορεύμαι, 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 παρεσπερευτῶ).
to sneak in,”

reinforced by the adverb λεληθόότως, “secretly,” which stands adjacent to the participle παρεισπορευόόνον. 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 παρεισπορευόόνοσ 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 περισκυθίίζω ‘to scalp in the Scythian manner’

7:4 τὸν γενόόνον κατὰ πανήγυρην γλωσσοτοῖν καὶ περισκυθίάναν άκρωτηριάζειν

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 ἐλέγει, ἀπελύθησαν ἄκατάγνωστοι). 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. 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


211 Compounds prefixed with παρεισ- (παρεισάάγο, παρεισδύύνω, παρεισέέρχο, παρεισπίίπτω, παρεισρέέω) are favoured by Polybius and other Hellenistic writers. They are often conjoined with adverbs signifying furtiveness (κρύύφα, λάάθρᾳ, λεληθόότως) or with the verb λανθάάνω. Cf. Antig. Mir. 52a.4 ἐὰν λάάθωσιν παρεισελθόόντες; Hermipp.Hist. fr. 38 Wehrl. λαθραίως παρεισῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατὴρα; 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 παρεισελθόντες ἔλαθον; Plb. Prov. 2.26 ἐνα μὴ λάθῃ δέπλα παρεισέρχοντα; J. BJ 4.251 λαθρά-περισκοδέμονες εἰς τὴν ἰερὰν πόλιν; 5.498 εἰ δὲ τι λάθρα παρεισκοδέμονες, Plu. Cic. 28.2 εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν κατὰ παρεισῆλθε κρύφα. See also the comment on λεληθόότως at 3.2.5.

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 ἔπι Σκύθων 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 ἐξετάασεως ἄνευ καὶ πάασης ἀνακρίίσεως execution without any prior investigation, with the cruelty of their enemies, which

213 Trans. L.H.G. Greenwood, LCL.
214 Cf. also Cic. Prs. 8. Quis hoc fecit ulla in Scythia tyrannus, ut eos, quos ludum adficere, 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 gymasia 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 audito discum audire quam philosophum malunt: qui simul ut increpuit . . . philosophum omnes uotiones causa relinquunt). Cf. 2 Macc 4:14 τῶν θυσιῶν ἀμαλλοῦντες [sc. οἱ ιερεῖς] ἐψευδοτ μετέχειν τῆς ἐν παλαιότερᾳ παρακολούθησες μετά τῆς τοῦ δίκου προσκλησιν. 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 τα Σαρασσαίων γένη καὶ Σκύθων, ἄπερ νῦ ἤτοι ἔξεγιγμα τῶν Γερμανικῶν; J. Ap. 2.269 ἡτοί τῆς Σκύθων ἐξ ἄνδρος ἀθρόον τε καὶ βραχῦ τῶν θηρίων διαφέροντος. 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 Bübler 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, have been adduced as evidence corroborative of Herodotus’ account; 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.

The verb that Herodotus uses to designate scalping is ἀπεσκυθίσθαι (τήν κεφαλήν). The first appearance of the ethnic verb σκυθίίζω, and the compound ἀποσκυθίζω, is recorded in the literature postdating the publication of Herodotus’ Histories (430–424 BCE). Both verbs are mainly attested in the sense “to shave the head” or “to crop the hair close to the head”: in Euripides’ Electra (417 or 413 BCE), the heroine has her head and hair shaved with a razor in the Scythian fashion (l. 241 κράτα πλόκαμον τε ἐσκυθισμένον ξυρῶ); in the Trojan Women (ca. 415 BCE), tattered garments and a head shaved à la Scythe (l. 1026 κρατε ἀπεσκυθισμένον) 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 (τήν ἑρ’ ὃβρει κουράν ἀπεσκυθισθαι προσηγόρευσαν); 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. 350–250 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, 83–84; 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. Riedberger (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 ethological parallels.


220 Cf. Hsch. s 6253 ἀπεσκυθισμένης κεφαλής: x 6050 ἀπεσκύθηται κέκαρται; Hdn.Gr. 3.1.62 Lenzi τὸ ἀποσκυθίσθη τὸ τοῦ σιδήρου τῆς τρίχης τεκείν: Scholia in Iliadem (scholia vetera) 2.11b1 ἵππας δὲ τρίχας ἐκφέροντο διό καὶ ἀπεσκυθησαν ἔκφεροντα. σκυθίζω is also attested in the sense (a) “drink immoderately” (Ath. 11.101.10 Kaibel; cf. ἐποκυθίζω) and (b) “talk Scythian” (Clem.Al. Strom. 1.16.77.4).

221 Cf. Esch. 4.701.18 ἡν, φασί, καὶ φορτικὰ κουρά, ὡς καὶ ἐπεσκυθή τινα ἐκ Σκύθων, ἢν καὶ μοισίντες τὸ ὄστο πάλαιν ἀπεσκυθόθαι προσηγόρεαν. Canfora (2001, 3:1305) argues that Clearchus may have...
Sophoclean expression refers to a totally shaven head or a scalped skull. 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.

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 ἄποσκυθίζω, and its derivative σκυθισμός, ever display a sense explicitly related to scalping. It is only the adverb σκυθιστί, in the aforequoted line σκυθιστεῖς 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—così 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).”


223 Cf. Hsch. σκυθιστί, χειρόμακτρον οἱ Σκύθαι τῶν λαμβανομένων πυλεμέων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἔκδέροντες [ήσον] 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 (ξε στόματος γυνώς ἐξούθ' ἔχει τριχώματα [emended to θριγκώματα by most editors]). See Torrance 2029. On Scythia and the Scythians in Greek literary sources, see Rolle 1991a and Bäbler 1998, 163–74.

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, ἄποσκυθίζω in 4 Mac 10:7 is the counterpart of περισκυθίζω in 2 Mac 7:4. Yet, late lexicographers, such as Photius and Suidas, give “to scalp” as the main meaning of ἄποσκυθίζω and “to cut the hair” as a secondary meaning (cf. Phot. π 2658 ἄποσκυθίζοντο κυρίως μὲν τὸ ἐπίτευγμα τὸ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ θέμα πάντως θείες, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ τὸ ἄποκείμενον). 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. 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 περικείερονται). If Cteorchus’ 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.

One may also express reservations as regards the generally held assumption that it was through Herodotus’ ethnographic excursion 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], depicts a Greek warrior wearing a Corinthian helmet, on top of which is fixed a wreathed scalp. 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 (Rudekno 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 Flamininus 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).
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. 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.

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.

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 περιταχμόν . . . περί τα ὀτα). 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.

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.
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, ethnic 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 Achaean 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 ὄτε τὴν ἄγιον τάς τιμωρίας Βέσσου ἐπικαί, ἄλλα ἐπτέμεικεν ἐναὶ τῆς τῶν ἄρχοντων τῆς λαβίας (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 and in one of Ps.-Phalaris’ letters (dating from the first/second to the fourth/fifth centuries CE) enumerating methods of torture and execution implemented by the notorious Acragantine tyrant. Byzantine lexicographers (Photius and Suidas, s.v. περισκυθίσαντες) gloss it as σπαράσαω, 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. 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 μενομαχίας καὶ κοντήσεως)—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 Mac 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 Reimann 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 Casinum (238 B.C.E.), the women of this Germanic tribe were scalped by the Romans (5.16.17 abscisis enim cum crine ureticibus inhonesto satis ululare 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. mort. 23.12 ἀποκεφάλισεν περισκυθιστή τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ οὕτως ἔνεγκε τὸν περισκυθισμὸν ὡς ἄλλος τὴν διὰ τὸν θείου νόμον περιτομήν, Hipp. Dan. 2.20.4 Λεύστε ἐκέλευσεν γλωσσοτομεῖσθαι καὶ περισκυθισόμενας ἀκρωτηριάζειν.

236 See Russell 1988, 96–97 and Merkle and Beschoner 1994, 164n112.

237 Phalar. Ep. 147.3 Hercher τινὲς δ’ ἄκρα περιεκόπησαν καὶ κατὰ τροχῶν ἐλυγίσθησαν, καὶ κεφαλὰς ἄλλα περισκυθισθέντας.

238 Sir. 11.14.14 φας δὲ καὶ Ἡθρακίων τινὸς, τοὺς προσαγορευομένους Σαραπάρας, ὅσον κεφαλοτύμωσαν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀρμενίας, πλήρους Γουρανίων καὶ Μῆθων, θρησκείας ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀπεθάνησαν, ἄρεστοι, περισκυθιστές τα τε καὶ ἀποκεφαλιστές.
(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 occupied with the man’s “horn,” one warming it and stretching it out in his hand (II. 5–6 ιάιίνοι δὲ Δίων τὸ δ’ εὔπτετοχον ἐν χερί τείνων / σὸν κέέρας), the other granting it a service allusively designated by the verb under discussion here (I. 6 Ὄλιάάδης δ’ αὐτῷ περισκυθίσα). 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 περισκυθισ 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 1958. In its single instance as a non-medical term, in Origen’s paraphrase of 2 Maccabees 7 (mart. 23.13 Koetschau), περισκυθισ designates scalping as a method of torture.


\(^{241}\) In Ps.-Galen’s *Introduction* (14.781.16 Kühn), περισκυθισ denotes an operation performed not only on the head but also on the prepuce, if it turns black (ἐπὶ πίεσις μελανθισε).\(^{243}\)


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 δέξειν δεθρυμαιν, “to flay a flayed dog,” and in line 953 the participle ἀποδέερω seems to refer to Myrrhine’s having enticed Kinesias to an erection and peeled back his foreskin prior to her leaving him unsatisfied.

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. 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, 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.

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, 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.

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

246 ἀποδέερω 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” (Έγω’ς ἀποδείρα [sc. τὴν ἄμορχην] ἀνοίχα ἀκά ἰνίχμα). an expression that carries a sexual innuendo. See Henderson (1991, 167), who characterizes the metaphor as “agricultural.” LSJ, s.v. ἀποδέερω, 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 ἐκδέερω in Ar. V. 450.
248 See Gutzwiller 1998, 276–77; ead. 2013, 47.
250 See 1.2.4.
251 See Habicht, 1979, 176.
first-century Palestine or slightly later.” 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. 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.

2.2.12 πολεμοτροφέω ‘to keep up war’

10:14 οἱ Ἰδου µαῖοι ... πολεμοτροφεῖν ἐπεχείρουν
10:15 οἱ λεγόµενοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ἀσιδαῖοι ... πολεμοτροφοῦσι καὶ στασίαζουσι

LSJ lists some fifty compounds having -τροφέω as their second component. Of these, ten are Classical, six first appear in Aristotle and in Theophrastus, and six are first attested in the first century BCE, in Posidonius and in Diodorus Siculus. 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); SHehitat 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 ἀρµατοτροφέω, γαρµοτροφέω, ἵπποτροφέω, κακόµποτροφέω, καταζευγοτροφέω, νεοσσοτροφέω, ξενοτροφέω, παιδοτροφέω, σκιατροφέω.
256 ἀτροφέω, εὐτροφέω, σκιατροφέω, κακοτροφέω, συντροφέω, τεκνοτροφέω.
257 ἀκεµματοτροφέω, κακόµποτροφέω, κυκλοτροφέω, ξενοτροφέω, μυνοτροφέω, πεγασοτροφέω. 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, 1LS 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. The semantically related verb ξενολογέω, 1LS 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, πολεµόης, ἡγεϑεσκον “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 Λελένθρε ἐσται [sc. ὁ ἀντίιχριστος] ἀναιδὴ καὶ πολεµόης καὶ τύυραννος), who was likely indebted to 2 Maccabees for coining this neologism.

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 στράτοπεδον (Plb. 5.3.5; Str. 5.2.7).

2.2.13 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 ἰγνωσία, ἱγμένων, and καθηγεῖται in prose, and ποδηγός, ἱγμένας/προκηρύκης/ὑψητής, and ἱγμένος/προκηρύκης in poetry. Its first attestations

258 A Cretan decree dating from 201 BCE (IC I ii.1.10 ἐξ ξενοτροφήθεν δὲ καὶ οὗ ταῖς καθήσται) 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 σπλαγχνισός, which appears nowhere else in Greek literature (2 Macc 6:7, 21; 7:42; Hippol. Antichr. 49.38).

260 Ἰδ. 3.26 ἐπηρεάσετο ἡγεῖται ἱγμένος; 7.128, 197 καθηγεῖται τῆς ἱδρύς; 8.31 ἤγερνε ἱγμένες τῷ βαρβάρῳ τῆς ἱδρύς; Th. 3.98.1 ἵγμενων καθῆς τῶν ἱδρύς X. An. 3.1.2 ἱγμένων 8’ ὀδηγεῖς τῆς ἱδρύς ἢν. 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. 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 ὀφείλον τῆς ἱερᾶς νεώτων ἀδηγοῖς). In 2 Macc 5:15 (κατετόλμησεν εἰς τὸ ... ἀποστέλλειν ἀδηγοὺν ἔχον τὸν Μενέλαον), in 2 Esd 8:1 (οἱ ἄγγελοι καθαίρουντες μετʼ ἕμοι ἐν βασιλείᾳ Ἀρτεμισίσθα), and figuratively in Wis 7:15 (τῆς σοφίας ὀδηγοῖς) and 18:3 (πυριφλέγῃ στῦλον ὀδηγὸν 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 ὀδηγέεω has forty-four instances in the Septuagint, in most of which it has God as its subject.  

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, 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 and Deuteronomy.  

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 (cf. Exod 15:3 κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους: 15:6 ή δεξιά σου χείρ, κύριε, ἐθραύσεν 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
fighting with and for them. The most pertinent Deuteronomic verses are 1:30 (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὁ προπορεύομενος πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν, αὐτὸς συνεκπολεῦετε αὐτοὺς μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν) and 1:33 (ὡς ὁ κύριος ὁ θεός σου προτέρος ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ὤδῃ ἐκλέγεσθαι ὑμῖν τόπον, ἀδηγῶν ὑμᾶς ἐν πυρὶ νυκτὸς, δεικνύων ὑμῖν τὴν ὄδον, καθ᾽ ἑν πορεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἐν νεφέλῃ ἡμέρας), both referring back to Exod 13:21 and 14:14, 19. The phrases ὁ προπορεύομενος πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν and ὡς προτεροῦσα ὑμῖν ... ἀδηγῶν ὑμᾶς correspond to προδοθηγός and the phrase συνεκπολεύετε αὐτοὺς μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν is equivalent to σύμμαχος. The author of 2 Maccabees turned the participle ἀδήγων into the cognate substantive ἀδήγος, and attached to the latter the prefix προ-, which is emphatically repeated in the Deuteronomic phrases προπορευόμενος πρὸ προσώπου and προτεροῦσα. 269

The significance of these Deuteronomic verses for the author of 2 Maccabees is attested by the fact that he not only encapsulated the aforesaid phrases from 1:30 and 1:33 into the neologism προδοθηγός, but also borrowed from the intervening verse 1:31 the verb προπορεύομαι (ὡς ἐπροφορεῖσθαι σὲ κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ὡς εὐ προφορήσῃ ἄνθρωπος τὸν ὑπὸν 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 θηλασάν σὲ καὶ ἐκδρέψας σὲ καὶ προφορήσας). 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 Μακακάβας δὲ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ τοῦ κυρίου προάγοντος αὐτοῦ τὸ μὲν ιερὸν 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, as well as in Greek literature. 271


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 Hurwitz 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 Lipinski 1965, 407–9; Mann 1977, 30–73; West 1997, 209–10.

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 προοδήγος 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 Κύρος ἅθυα πρῶτον μὲν Δίω βασιλεύ, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς, καὶ ἦτερο τῆς καὶ εὐμενεῖς ὄντας ἡγεμόνας γενέσθαι τῇ στρατιᾷ καὶ παραστάτας ἄγαθοὺς καὶ συμμάχους καὶ συμβούλους τῶν ἄγαθων). At 3.3.58, before launching his attack against the Assyrians, Cyrus passes the watchword “Zeus, co-fighter and leader” (παραγγέλως δὲ Κύρος σύνθηκα Ζεὺς σύμμαχος καὶ ἡγεμόνοι). Similarly, prior to the battle against Croesus, he prays to the ancestral Zeus to take the vanguard and fight with them (7.1.1 αἴτησάμενος Δία πατρόν ήγεμόνα 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 ὑπέραχος, with respect to Yahweh. The verb συμμαχέω is also used in 2 Maccabees of Yahweh’s fighting alongside the Jews. In contrast to these two words, which the author employs in a martial, not in a political sense, the noun σύμμαχος at 4:11 refers to the secular alliance of the Jews with the Romans.

Thus, in 2 Macc 12:36 we find juxtaposed a novel term (προοδήγος), 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 προοδήγος has as equivalent, in Classical Greek, ἡγεμόνοι, a term characteristically coupled with σύμμαχος in the above-quoted passages of Xenophon, makes the phrase σύμμαχος καὶ προοδήγος resonate, on the one hand, with echoes of:

---

272 Cf. the watchword Zeús σωτήρ, Ἡρακλῆς ἡγεμόνοι (An. 6.5.25) used by the Greeks before attacking Pharnabazus. 2 Maccabees records two watchwords that Judas gives to his soldiers: θεοῦ μηχαναία (8:23) and θεοῦ νίκη (13:15). See Bar-Kochva 1989, 221.

273 8:24 γενέσθαι τοῖς παντοκράτοροι συμμάχου; 10:16 δὲ ἰσόμεταν τῶν θεοῦ σύμμαχον αὐτοῖς ἡγεμόνας γενέσθαι; 11:10 τὸν ἅγιον σύμμαχον ἔχοντες. Cf. 8:36 κατήγγελεν [καὶ διὰ τὸν τρόπον τούτῳ ἅγιον εἶναι] 14:34 ἐπεκαλύπτων τὸν διὰ πάντος ὑπέραχος τοῦ θεοῦ ἡγεμόνας. ὑπέραχος is first attested in inscriptions that may be roughly contemporary with the epitome (*TAM V* 1.14 [Lydia, 129 BCE?] πρόαξιον πάτρας καὶ ὑπέραχον ἡσυχίαν; *ABSA* 56 (1961) 29, 76 l. 2 [Cyprus, 127–124 BCE] Λόγου ... [τοῦ δαίμονος καὶ ὑπέραχου ... καὶ στρατηγοῦ αὐτοκράτορος; IC I x 3.29 [Crete, end 2nd c. BCE] σωτῆρας τε καὶ [δαίμονος καὶ ὑπέραχος τοῖς ὁμίλοις πάλαις]). 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 γνωστοῦ θεοῦ συμμαχοῦντος αὐτοῦ. 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 ἐποικισμόν θεοῦ ἐγκαθιστάς ἁπάνω ἐπιθαυμάστω τῶν Ἰουδαίων ως πατέρα ὑπὲρ ὀλίγων διὰ πάντος συμμαχοῦντα).

275 τὴν προσεχίαν ὑπὲρ φίλης καὶ συμμαχείας 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 ἐπιτρέψατο συμμαχεῖα). Schwartz (2008, 341), commenting on 2 Macc 8:24, writes that “the term [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 συνθήκα.

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 ἡγεμόν 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. 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 ἀταξίας προοδηγός), which has been dated to the second century CE. 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.

2.2.14 τιμωρητής ‘he who punishes’

In the Septuagint the τιμωρ- word-group is relatively sparsely attested: τιμωρία (15x) and τιμωρέω (11x) occur mainly in the deuterocanonical/apocryphal books (11x and 7x, respectively), ἀτιμωρήτης 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 ἀπλαναστάτω ἐπεσθαί ἤγεμόν ὁδοῦ ... ἀφανῆς ἄγγελος, ἐγκατελημένης τῇ νεφέλῃ προηγητήρ. Later in the text (1.178), Philo designates the pillar of cloud as ἡ ἀδήγης 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 θεόν ἵκετευ καὶ σύμφωνον καὶ μοιχὸν ἐκάλει). See J. J. Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” OTP 1:416.

277 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 Bergon εἶδε ἧδα τῆς μεγίστης δυνάμεως τούς θεοὺς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων τὰ στρατόπεδα τῶν ἄνκτων 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 τιμωρία.

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 νησίων καὶ θηλαζόντων κακαρίσακα κλίνον ἐνακ ἐνο τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου τοῦ καταλύσα ἐχθρόν καὶ ἐκδικητήν. The combination ψάριν, “the enemy and the avenger,” which lies behind ἐχθρόν καὶ ἐκδικητήν, occurs once more in the Hebrew Bible, in Ps 44:17(16), yet the Septuagint translator of the Psalms rendered ψάριν, hitpael participle of ἐχθρόν, “to avenge,” in this verse, not by the substantive ἐκδικητής, as he did in Ps 8:3, but by the present participle of ἐκδίκω, “to chase away, to persecute,” a verb that sounds similar to ἕκτικε, so that a scribal error (ἐκδικώντος for ἐκδίκητης) is not to be excluded: [LXX Ps 43:16b–17] καὶ ἡ πίστον τοῦ προσώπου μου ἐκάλυψεν με ἀπὸ φωνῆς νευδίζοντος καὶ παρακαλοῦντος, ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐχθροῦ καὶ ἐκδικήσαντος. In his more literal Greek rendering of Psalms 8 and 44, Symmachus used the verb τιμωρέω instead of ἐκδίκω: 8:3 ὥστε παῦσαι ἐχθρόν καὶ τιμωροῦντα ἕκτιν; 43:17 ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐχθροῦ καὶ τιμωροῦντος ἕκτιν.

Psalms 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-fifteenth centuries CE.284

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).
284 See Chrys. exp. in Ps. PG 55:167; Thdr. Mops. exp. in Ps. 43 Devreesse; Thdr. 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. 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 John Hyrcanus, abolished this practice. 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, 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.

---

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, but deliberately bypassed the slightly inaccurate rendering of ἐχθρόος 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 ἐχθρόος, “personal enemy,” and πολέμιος, “foreign, military enemy,” the Seleucid Greeks being πολέμιοι rather than ἐχθροί of the Jews during the Maccabean revolt.

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. But for this to be substantiated, further evidence needs to be adduced.

A third possibility is that πολέμιοι καὶ τιμωρητές in 2 Macc 4:16 is a verbal reminiscence of ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐκδίκητήν in LXX Ps 8:3c. For the sake of variation, the author of 2 Maccabees may have wanted to substitute ἐχθρόος, a substantive that he virtually never uses, with πολέμιος, his default term for expressing the notion of “enemy,” and the neologism ἐκδίκητής 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” 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 ἐκδίκητής, 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 ονειδίζοντος καὶ παραλαλοῦντος) is that the combination of φωνή with ονειδίζω, which occurs in the latter, is found in 2 Macc 7:24 τὴν ονειδίζουσαν ὑφορώεν φωνήν.

290 This said, the semantic fields of the two terms often overlap. ἐχθρόος, being a more generic term than πολέμιος, can also be used of a national foe (see SGS 3:496–97). In Hebrew, הים denotes both the personal and the national enemy and can thus be indiscriminately rendered in Greek by πολέμιος or ἐχθρόος (see W. Foerster, "ἐχθρόος, ἔχθρα," TDNT 2:811–12). In 2 Maccabees, ἐχθρόος and ἄντικείμενος occur only once in the book, at 10:26, ἐχθρεύει τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν καὶ ἄντικείμενος τοὺς ἄντικείμενοι, which is a quotation from Exod 23:22; ἄντικείμενος 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 ἐχθρόος (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 ἐμπαιγμος 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 εἰρήν(ένος) τιμωρητὴς [Σ]ενο(ὕθης ἀνέλετο αὐτὸν).

2.2.15 ὑπονοθεύω ‘to obtain by underhand means,’ ‘to deceive’

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]). 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 ὑπονοθευόµενῃ 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 [...] ὑπὲρ τῶν δηµοσίων κτήσεις εἰς τῷ κοινῷ τῆς πόλεως καρφίσµον τινῶν ἀνατείνοντος ὑπονοθεύον. 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 ὑπονοµεθεῖς. However, there is no doubt that ὑπονοθεύω 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 ἄ σεις τῆς πατρίδος ἀποξενώσας ἐπὶ ξένως 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 Syllburg to suggest emendation to προνοµεθεῖς.
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. However, the text as we have it may not be from that period. The mention of εἰκονίζομαι άγιών (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 δίκαιος τῶν συνεστίιων ὑπονοθεύει] the second time it denotes “to steal”: 98.24 [ὁ ψεύδων] ἰσχυρόν ἀποθείει μεθ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ ἀλήγον, καὶ ἄλλον τινὰ ὑπονοθεύει. The verb reappears in literary texts from the second century CE onwards in the sense (a) to seduce or corrupt a woman, (b) to deceive, (c) to tamper with, to adulterate. The rare nouns ὑπονοθευτής, “seducer,” (Ptol. Tetr. 3.14.17, 30) and ὑπονοθεύσις, “corruption, falsification,” (Eus. HE 10.6.4) are attested in the second and the fourth centuries CE, respectively.

The aforesaid 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 ἰδίον, 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 periēkέχυτε γάρ περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα δέος τι καὶ φρικασμός σώματος

The φρικ- word-group in the Septuagint comprises φρίκη (Job 4:14a; Amos 1:11), φρικάδης (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 ὑποφρικός (3 Macc 6:20). φρικασμός is likely a coining of the author of 2 Maccabees, unpeated in subsequent literature, except for what seems to be a paraphrase of 2 Macc 3:17a in a twelfth-century Byzantine chronicle. It cannot be excluded, of course, that it existed as a medical term.

299 Cf. Jo. Mal. chron. 2.16.12 Thurn ὑπονοθεύεια καὶ ἀλητέα ἐπείγεν. Arrian is here quoted very freely by Malalas.
300 Cf. Ltr. PGRH 2b, fr. 49b ὑποθεύεσθαι αὐτὸν Τραϊανὸν βασιλέα, ταξάμενος δοῦναι αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν Περσῶν. Arrian is here quoted very freely by Malalas.
301 Cf. Hom. Clem. 8.10.3 νόμον αὐτῶν ἔρισεν [καὶ ἦθει] . . . μὲ τὸ ἀλήτον τινὸς ὑποθεορεόμενον. Nicetas Choniates, Χρονικὴ διήγησις, reign Isaac 2, 1.358.10 van Dieten ἂν δέμη γὰρ φίλος καὶ φρικασμός αὐτοῦ περιεκέχυτο σώματος; ib. reign Alex 3, 2.546.8 φρικασμός ἐπεγένετο σώματος.
since the verb from which it derives, φρικάζω, a tris legomenon, is first attested in the Hippocratic writings (Coac. 24). The suffix -σμός, very productive in Ionic and in the Koine, is particularly well represented in the scientific vocabulary of Aristotle and the Hippocratics. The Septuagint employs thirty-one nomina actionis in -σμός, an impressive twenty-two of which are neologisms. Four of these neologisms occur in 2 Maccabees, which has a total of nine nouns in -σμός. Φρικάσμός, used in lieu of the common φόβος, was probably coined on the model of medical terms like σπασμός. The effect produced by its use at 3:16–17 in the pathopoetic 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: ἐκτυγχάμος καὶ ἀνατινάκμος καὶ ἐβρασμός καὶ καρδίην ὑπότρος καὶ ὄσμος ἐπὶ πάσαν ὁσρόν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον πάντων ὡς πρόσκαμμα 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 and stronger ones in extra-biblical books such as Philo’s historical treatises. The vocabulary used to express the physiological symptoms of the high priest’s agony is encountered in medical writings. The noun with which φρικάσμος 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: παραγχ (twice),

---

304 ἀγιασμός, ἀκριβισμός, γελβισμός, γλυκισμός, γυμνισμός, διασπισμός, ἐβρασμός, ἐκουσισμός, ἐνεχυρισμός, ἔξιλασμός, ἱερισμός, ἱλασμός, μεσισμός, παρατικισμός, πειρασμός, περασμός, περιουσιασμός, πυρισμός, ἱερισμός, ἱερισμός, ἱλασμός, μεσισμός, παρατικισμός, πειρασμός, περασμός, περιουσιασμός, πυρισμός, σημειωσμός, συνοισισμός, φρικασμός.
305 ἀγιασμός (2:17; 14:36, LXX neol.), ἀγιασμός (8:11, 25), ἔξιλασμός (12:45, LXX neol.), ἔξιλασμός (7:18), ἱλασμός (3:33, LXX neol.), περιπασμός (3:14, 30, 36), σπασμός (5:3, 5, semantic neol.), and φρικασμός (3:17, neol.).
307 Cf. the description of Flaccus’ and Agrippa’s agony and fear in Flacc. 176 (πολλάκις δὲ ἐδικασίων καὶ διεπτότο καὶ φιδίκε μὲν τὰ μέρη καὶ μέρη τοῦ σώματος κατεστέτω, φόβῳ 8’ ὑπερτρομοῦ ἐγένετο ἢ τὴν ψυχήν ἐκτινάσημα καὶ παλμῶν τινασιμινών) and in Legat. 266–67 (ὑπ’ ἀγίασμα παντοθετάτης χρόας ἐνίκατο ἐν τοιῶν γνώμων κύσμωσα, ἤχορος, πελενός. ἣθε δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἐκραίρω ἐχρι πολλῶν φρίκη κατέσχετο, τρόμος τα καὶ σεισμὸς πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ μέρη καὶ τὰ μέλη συνεκκομισα).
The distinction made since the time of the sophists between φόβος and δέος 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’ ἄλγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον

Diminutives are usually considered to be a feature of colloquial language incompatible with high literary style. They are completely absent in epic poetry and extremely rare in the tragedians, but the comic poets make copious use of them. 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. Later on, the Atticizing purists did not fail to frown upon the phenomenon of diminutives tending to replace their primitives. According to Swanson (1958, 147–49), the Septuagint has a total of 74 (+11) different diminutives,

309 Cf. A. Ag. 1243 πέρρικα, καὶ φόβος μ’ ἔχει; Gorg. fr. 11.56 D.-K. φρίκη περίφρικας; LXX Job 4:14a φρίκη δὲ μοι συνήντησεν καὶ τρόμος; Ph. Flacc. 115.2 ὑπὸ δέους ἐπεφρίκει; Plu. Comp. Lys. Sull. 2.4.6 φρίκην καὶ δέους ἐμπαιω. 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 (2002, 18) considers the reading χρονίσκον to be original, as it has strong textual support from the uncial A and V and the minuscules 126 (dependent on A) and 771. The rest of the minuscules have χρονον. 312 Cf., e.g., Eust. Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam 1.374.45 μεθὲ γὰρ κείσατο τὸ τῶν ὑποκορισμῶν ταπεινὸν παρ᾽ Ομήρῳ διὰ τὸ ὑψηλόφων καὶ ἱππικόν τῆς αὐτοῦ ποιήσεως. 313 See Radermacher 1925, 37: “Deminutiva fehlen im hohen Stil, wie der attischen Tragödie, ganzlich. 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 -ον, 4 conglutinates of -ον, 11 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 11 in -ίς; Polybius: 19 diminutives in -ον, 10 conglutinates of -ον, 9 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 4 in -ίς; NT: 15 diminutives in -ον, 13 conglutinates of -ον, 3 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 3 in -ίς; Post-Ptolemaic papyri: 116 diminutives in -ον, 57 conglutinates of -ον, 10 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 3 in -ίς; Post-Ptolemaic papyri: 164 diminutives in -ον, 201 conglutinates of -ον, 15 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 7 in -ίς. 315 Cf. Moer. Letter omicron 40 Hansen ὃς Ἀττικοί ὁ Ἑλληνες. 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 -ον, 12 (+5) are conglutinates of -ον, 17 have the suffix -ίσκος, and 8 (+1) the suffix -ις. In 2 Maccabees only six diminutives occur: θυρίς (3:19), μετάφρασις (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; Acts, which has roughly the same vocabulary size.

We note that παιδίον 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.

In our list of diminutives occurring in 2 Maccabees we do not include nouns such as ἀγγελόων, βιβλίον, θηρίον, παιδίον, 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 μεταφράσις, in 2 Mac 7:25, is used interchangeably with νεωτίς, without any particular diminutive force. The same probably holds for νεανίσκος at 13:15 (cf. 10:35).

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 -ον σπιρίον ‘a little piece of flesh,’

As regards the diminutives in -ίσκος/-ίσκη, we counted only 16: ἀγκώνισκος (1x), ἀσπιδίσκη (6x), βασιλόςκος (2x), βύσσικος (25x), καλεμίσκος (13x), καρύσκος (2x), μεταφράσις (2x), μηνίσκος (4x), νεανίσκος (11x), ὀβελίσκος (2x), ὀρίσκος (6x), παιδίσκη (98x), βοσκός (9x), τροχίσκος (1x), θηρίσκη (1x), χρονίσκος (1x). Of these, ἀγκώνισκος, βυσσίσκος, ἀσπιδίσκη, 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.

In our list of diminutives occurring in 2 Maccabees we do not include nouns such as ἄγγελόων, βιβλίον, θηρίον, παιδίον, 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 μεταφράσις, in 2 Mac 7:25, is used interchangeably with νεωτίς, without any particular diminutive force. The same probably holds for νεανίσκος at 13:15 (cf. 10:35).

See Meecham 1935, 162. From Meecham’s list of ten diminutives (ἁσπιδίσκη, θηρίον, κεφάλις, κυλίς, κυμάτιον, δόντιον, ὄριον, παιδίον, ποτήριον, ἱον), at least three (θηρίον, ὄριον, and ποτήριον) have to be removed. Pelletier (1962, 63) goes so far as to dismiss all of them, bar παιδίον, as non-diminutives.

de Foucault (1972, 22) counts 53 diminutives in Polybius, 13 of which are new formations.

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.

no word applying purely to the realm of sound, as φωνίον ‘a slender sound,’ no diminutive of a primarily abstract word, like βραχεῖ ‘a little coughing fit,’ σάματον ‘a little song,’ or θησεμάτων ‘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 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 subtility 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 -ακίς/ακίς, among which figures χρόνις.

325 As Chantraine (1933, 412) notes, the diminutives in -άκις/ακίς 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, 1:344–45 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 Radv. αὐτοῖς ἐν βραχεῖ . . . κολλῆτα χρόνον; Is. 6.33; Pl. Euthyd. 303ε; D.H. 3.48.3; J. AJ 7.194 εἰς πᾶνα οὐκοδμένα χρόνον; Plb. 1.59.12, passim εἰς πᾶνα βραχεῖ χρόνον; 5.88.5 εἰς χρόνον βραχεῖ παντελῶς; Ph. Spec. 4.51 χρόνον δὲ παντεπήπον οὐκοδμένα; J. AJ 19.300 παντεπήπον δὲ οὐκοδμένα χρόνον διάλογον; Hero Mech. Aut. 21.1 οὐκοδμένα παντελῶς χρόνον; D.S. 2.31.5 εἰς εὐκρόνους χρόνους; Plu. Mor. 119A μικρὸν παντελῶς διασωπήσαντα χρόνους; M.Ant. 4.6.1 έντος διάλογου χρόνου P.Cair.Zen. 1.59060.6 [257 BCE] σφόδρα οὐκοδμένα χρόνου.

327 Cf. L. Pax 1002 χρυσποτλίδων μικρῶν; V. 511 δικάδων σιμικρῶν; ib. 803 δικαστηρίδιον μικρῶν πάνω; Lys. 277 σιμικρῶν πάνω τριβάνονι; ib. 1205 σιμικρά πολλά παράδεισα; Pl. 147, 240 μικρῶν άργυρίδων; Nu. 630 σκαλαθυρία μικρᾶ; fr. 507 Kock τά μικρά τάδ’ άργυρία; Stratt. fr. 58.3 Κοκτά τά μικρά άργυρίας; Antiph. fr. 215.1 Κοκτά μικρών κρεμακάκισσος; Lync. fr. 1.6 Κοκτά μικρών πάντα πνευκάκισσος; Pl. Thot. 195a σιμικρῶν . . . ψιχρόνας Exx. 394d εἰς σιμικρῶν . . . άργυρίδων Arist. 631*18 διαλογίσθησαν σιμικρῶν PA 684*12 εἰς τῶν μικρῶν ἀργυρίδων; Lys. 19.28 χρυσίδων μικρῶν D. 56.1 βούβλιδων μικρῶν πάνω; Lys. 1.130 τῶν παράδεισι τῶν μικράτατος; Hp. Εριδ. 3.3.4 πάντα ἐπί σιμικροῖς τριμπτυχίοις; Paeon FHG 4.2.14 διὸ δι’ σιμικρῶν ἀναμνήσασθαι Plb. fr. 163.3 χαττάκισσος καίρων; D.S. 31.38.1 κυνίδα μικρά; Str. 6.2.11.44 μικρά νεκρίδα; 14.1.8.11 μικρῶν . . . προμήκης; Anl. Tact. 1.2.13 μικρὰ τίς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀποθήκη; Gem. 3.11.4 ἀστερίσκῳ ποικίλλω καὶ μικρᾷ; Disc. 1.8.1.3 θησεμάτων μικρῶν; Luc. Nul. 6.5 168
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{330} Thus, the coining of the gratuitous and incongruous diminutive \textit{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 (\textit{ἀργυρολόόγητος}, \textit{ἄρρενωδῶς}, \textit{δεινάαζω}, \textit{παρεισπορεύύο}, \textit{πολεμοτροφέεω}, \textit{χρονίσκος}) are absolute \textit{hapax legomena}, two (\textit{κεντηθόν}, \textit{φυκασ}) are non-absolute \textit{hapax legomena}, and three (\textit{δυσπέέτη}, \textit{ὁπλολογέεω}, \textit{προοδηγόός}) are \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{χρονίσκος}, in which the suffix is unsuited for an abstract noun like \textit{χρόόνος}, 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. \textit{πολεμοτροφέεω}, coined on the model of \textit{ξενοτροφέεω}). In others, which are semantic variants of previously attested words used elsewhere in the book, we can see the author’s

\textsuperscript{328} The parallel narrative in 1 Maccabees states that Lysias’ expedition took place “in the year that followed” (4:28 ἐν τῷ ἐρχοµένῳ ἔκχυστῳ) Gorgias’ defeat.


\textsuperscript{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 προοδηγόός (alluding to Deut 1:30, 33) and perhaps of τιµωρητῆς (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 δοξικόός.

The purposes served by the use of the neologisms discussed in this chapter include giving the text a tinge of poetic hue (e.g. δυσπέέτη, κρουνηδόόν) or evoking epic/poetic imagery (e.g. λεοντηδόόν); verbally highlighting passages charged with dramatic tension (e.g. κρουνηδόόν, φρικασόός); and producing a particular stylistic effect, such as alliteration, antithesis, or *homoiooteleuton* (e.g. δεινάάζω, δυσπέέτη, πολεμοτροφέέω, ὀπλολογέεω).

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). ἄκατάάγνωστος and ὑπογράμµόός, for example, recur in the New Testament as well as in first-century CE inscriptions; four words (κρουνηδόόν, ὀπλολογέεω, προσεξηγέεο, 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 ἀπαρασήήµατος ‘unmarked,’ ‘without commemoration’

15:36 ἐδογµάτισαν δὲ πάντες μετὰ κοινοῦ ψηφίσµατος µηθαµέως ἔκασαι ἀπαρασήήµατον τὴήν δὲ ἡµέραν, ἔχειν δὲ ἐπίσηµον τὴν τρισκαιδεκάτην τοῦ δωδεκάτου µηνὸς

The instances of the verbal adjective ἀπαρασήήµατος 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 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 compiler 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. ἀπαρασήήματος occurs in the ‘congratulatory’ type of letter (no. 19, l. 7), in the complimentary phrase τὸ γὰρ σὸν ἰθνὸς οὐδὲ παρὰ θεοῖς ἀπαρασήήματον ἔστι, “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 βουληθείσης τῆς Τύχης, in line 6, elsewhere occurs as late as in Libanius.5

The first of the two epigraphical instances of ἀπαρασήήματος 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.”
5 Or. 1.67.3 τῆς Τύχης βουληθείσης 1.136.2 βουληθείσης τῆς Τύχης. Cf. Plb. 2.2.10 ὃς ποτ’ ἐν ἕ τύχη βουληθῇ περιθέκαι τοῦτον τὸν στέφανον.
undistinguished” (l. 46 µῆ ἄπαρασήµαντον ἐδάσκα τὴν προαίρε[σιν αὐτοῦ]). 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 Seleucian 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 ἄπαρασήµαντος 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 Argaus (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 µῆ ἄπαρασήµαντον ἐδάσκα τὴν τοῦ ἁνδρὸς καλοκαθίσσαται). 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 consult, and accordingly as 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. 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 µῆ ἄπαρασήµαντον ἐφέανε τὴν ἄξιαν καὶ τὴν προαίρε[σιν αὐτοῦ], which Wilhelm (1932, 55, 59–60) found too long and shortened to µῆ ἄπαρασήµαντον ἐφέανε 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 ἐφέανε/ἐφέανει with ἐὰνα, 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 II ou I’ 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 ἀπαραστήματον ἔσαι, 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 ἀπαραστήματος with the more frequent adjective ἀνεπισήης, which is encountered in the same contexts as its synonym. Yet, unlike ἀπαραστήματος, ἀνεπισήης 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 παράλείπω and παρατρέχω; twice we encounter it in combination with the verb ἦσο, both times in Diodorus Siculus. In its few Patristic instances, ἀπαραστήματος is in like manner used in combination with the verbs ἦσο, 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 ἀνεπισήης, which is attested in second- and first-century BCE authors, but the very rare ἀπαραστήματος, in the formula ἀπαραστήματον ἔσαι, which is found only in the decree from Hanisa and possibly—if correctly restored—in the decree from Seleucia. 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 ἀπαραστήματον ἔσαι is even more emphasized in 2 Macc 15:36, which exhibits the rhetorical figures of litotes (μὴ διαμοίρα ἀπαραστήματος), antithesis and paronomasia (ἀπαραστήματον—ἐπίσημον), and ars-thesis, that is, the presentation of an idea first negatively (μὴ διαμοίρα ἐσαι ἀπαραστήματος) and then positively (ἐχειν δὲ ἐπίσημον). It can be noted here that it is not only the conjunction of ἀπαραστήματος 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’Ariarathé V, le grand roi philhellène qui a donné à Mazaka le nom d’Eusébeia” (p. 482).


9 Or. comm. Jo. 2.23.153, Bas. 9, 4.64, Ginet μὴ παραδραμεῖ  ἢ ἡμέρας μηδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἀπαραστήματος; Eus. PG 29.16.35 μηδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἀπαραστήματος κατάλειπων.

Hippocratic corpus (*Septim.* 9.13) and a few epigraphical instances, up to the second century CE we find it occurring only in Jewish-Greek literature; 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, is elsewhere attested from the late first century BCE onwards.

A reasonable assumption is that the passage in 2 Maccabees in which the formula μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντον ἔσσασι 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 Seleucians, 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 ἀνεπισήμαντο ἔσσαν is attested in the literature of the first century BCE, in Diodorus Siculus, and that the instances of ἀνεπισήμαντο in phrases containing verbs synonymous with ἔσσα, 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.

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 ἀπαρασήμαντο occurs was written by him. Yet, on the basis of the epigraphical attestations of ἀπαρασήμαντο, 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) 429, 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.Reg. 2.153.5 [169 CE]).

13 Let. Aris. 180; Esth 5:4, Add E:22; Esth 5:21(12); 2 Macc 15:36; J. AJ 3.129, 9.223.

14 10:8 ἐδογμάτισαν δὲ μετὰ κοινὸν προστάματος καὶ ψηφίσματος; 12:4 μετὰ δὲ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως ψήφισμα.

15 D.H. 10.10.5.4 δὲ κοινὸν ψηφίσματος; D.C. 74.2.1.3 ψηφίσματι κοινῷ; *IK Perge* 251.10 [1st–2nd c. CE] [8] δὲ κοινὸν ψηφίσματος.

16 Robert (1963, 489) adduces epigraphical examples of the “tournure recherchée” μη ἔσσα from a first-century BCE Ionian inscription (*Priene* 33 [84/01 BCE] l. 35 ὀλὲ τὸν ὑστεροῦντα καιρόν ἔσσαν ἀφ[ρόντιστον]; l. 73 ὀλὲ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα καιροὺς ἄφρονον ἔσσαν γενέσ[[θε]]).
Prior to the Common Era, ἀπροσδεήής 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 ἀπροσδεήής 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 first surviving instance of ἀπροσδεήής 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 ἀπροσδεήής is used in a non-religious context, in a letter of Jonathan the high priest to the Spartans.  
19 1) Let. Aris. 30 προνοιας γαρ βασιλειξις ου τετευχες; 2 Macc 4:6 ἀπροσδεήής | τοῦ νυμφιου αἰτομεν 玕, ἐπὶ τά πράγματα; 2) J. Al. 12.37 ἵψως ἀπροσδεήής; 3) J. Al. 9 ἐπὶ τέλος ἔγαγεν; 4) εἶναι τοῦ βασιλείου πρόθεσιν; 2 Macc 3:8 τοῦ τοῦ βασιλείου πρόθεσιν; 5) Let. Aris. 211 οὐδὲ ὀρκων ποιησθαι το τιμωτε; 2 Macc 7:24 ἐπίτατο; 6) ὀρκων ἐπιστοῦ; 2 Macc 4:10 ἐπιστοῦ τοῦ τοῦ βασιλείου; 7) Let. Aris. 104 ἔλεγον ἐκ ἀρχιν, καὶ ἀρχὴν ἐπιστοῦ; 8) Let. Aris. 16 τοῦ τοῦ αἰτεῖται; 2 Macc 3:9 ἐπιστοῦ τοῦ τοῦ βασιλείου; 9) Let. Aris. 7:35 τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ το cui
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 (ο ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἑλευθέρων τῶν παραδοξοῖς τὸν ἐκούτω τόπον ... τῶν παντοκράτορος ἐπιφανεντος κυρίου). It thus seems likely that the author of 3 Maccabees borrowed ἀπροσδεήης 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 ἀπροσδεήης 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 ἀπροσδεήης, yet it is unclear how and by whom this concept was first introduced into Jewish-Greek literature. 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, 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 ἀπροσδεήης in the Maccabean prayer.

See C.W. Emmet, “3 Maccabees,” APOP 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.”


3.2.3 ἐντινάσσο ‘to hurl’

4:41 οἱ μὲν πέτρους, οἱ δὲ ξύλων πάχη... ἐντινάσσον εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Λυσίμαχον
11:11 λεοντιδον δὲ ἐντινάξαντες εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους

Second Maccabees uses ἐντινάσσο both as transitive, at 4:41, in the sense GELSON“to hurl against,” and as intransitive, at 11:11, in the sense GELSON“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 [αὐτοῖς 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 οἱ κριῶς ἐνετίνασσεν εἰς τοὺς ἀλώωπεκας).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 [ἐνώσισθοι]... καὶ τὰ δεκαχρισάκτια... ὁ ἀδελφὸς μου λακόν ἐνετίναξεν κυτῆ σύντοκη; P.Oxy. 33.2672dupl.17 [218 CE] ἀλλὰ καὶ λίθωμεν ἐνετίναξεν κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς.


26 See Nickelsburg 2001, 361.

27 See Appendix 1 and 6.2.4.
3.2.4 ἐπιλυπέω ‘to cause somebody grief,’ ‘to harass’

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 Ism. Protr. 123.7 for the passive voice. To these we should add 3 Macc 7:9,29 the inscriptions IK Knidos I 154.2130 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 λυπέω34 commonly bears (cf. Tob III 3:10 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐλυπήθη ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ἐκλαύσατο), 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 ὑποληπηθείς A'; ἐπι λυπήθης V; ὑποληπθείς 71 L’ 311, and at 8:32 λαληπρότα 71 381.
29 κατὰ τοῦτον [κατά τῶν Ἰουδαίων] ἠν τι καικοτεχνήσωμεν πονηρῶν ἢ ἐπιλυπήσωμεν αὐτούς 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: [. . .] ἐπιλυπήθης (see Newton 1863, 742 and 743, plate 12).
31 A hexameter inscription for a killed gladiator, engraved on a grave altar found in Xanthos (Lydia) and dated to the 2nd–1st c. CE: οὗ γὰρ | καυχήσεται Εἰσαπέπετα κατ’ ἐμοὶ ὅλα ἐπιλυπήθης με | τὸν ἁθλον ὅλω δή]<σχατε.
32 See Drachmann 1964, 170; VI.73a τοῦτον ὁ πάρτος καὶ ἐπιλυπηθεὶς καταλέλυσεν ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ ἢ Ἐλκάθη. 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 ἐκλαύσατο, whereas the variant ἐπιλυπέω occurs only in two codices of inferior value, CaLaurentianus Conventi oppressi 207, 11th c., and PaParisinus 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 μένου ἂπτεν ἢ Ἡλλονίου αἰώνει προσέκειτο τι καὶ ἐκλαύσατο των Ἐλλήνων 9.61 τὸ γὰρ προσεκίνησεν σῆμα ὁ ἔλεος, ὃς ἀκούσας ἔλεε τῇ Ἐλαύσει 6.66 ὀἱ ἂπτεν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἢστι ἐν αὐτούς καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔρχον καὶ πρὸ ᾽ αὐτῶν λυπήσει Χ. Ληθ. 2.3.23.
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 ἀραρόότως (3 Macc 5:4) and εἰκόότως (4 Macc 9:2), πεποιθόότως (Zech 14:11), which is a Septuagint neologism, and λεληθόότως. 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 λεληθόότως 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. Dionysius’ treatises were composed in the last quarter of the same century. However, the passage in which λεληθόότως occurs is borrowed from Posidonius; it probably originates from the geographical treatise On the Ocean, which is estimated to have been completed shortly after 87/86 BCE. 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.

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, the majority of scholarly opinion seems to favour a date in the first

---

3.2.5 λεληθόότως ‘secretly’

6:11 λεληθόότως ἔγειν τὴν ἔβδομάδα
8:1 παρεισπορευόόνει λεληθόότως εἰς τὰς κόμας

See Aujac and Lebel 1981, 12n2.
See Baladié 1989, 8.
Diodorus, too, may be indebted to previous writers for the passages, in the Library of History, in which λεληθόότως occurs.
Buresch 1886, 18: “non ante a. 406”; Immisch 1896, 70: “Die nächsten Jahre nach 306 sind mithin am wahrscheinlichsten als Abbassungszeit 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
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 litérateur 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 ἔρμηνείας*) has similarly been assigned a broad possible date range, stretching from the third century BCE to the late first century CE. 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. Recent scholarship seems to converge on dating it to the late second or, more likely, the early first century BCE.

Ἀργοθεος of λαληθός, we can note here that Demetrius also uses the synonymous adverb λανθανός (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). However, this does not necessarily provide evidence for a post-Common Era Greek is much of the same stamp”; Thedeff 2009 [1982], 378: “Souilhè’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; Souilhè 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 (35 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 ἔρμηνείας*, 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.


46 See Chiron 1993, xxx (based on the evidence for Stoic influence on Ps.-Demetrius’ treatise): “II 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 Ier 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’Aréémon 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 λαληθός as adverbs formed from participles are typical of later Greek. The forms do not occur elsewhere before Roman times. (λαληθός
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 λεληθόότως 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 λεληθόότως is
one of the approximately fifty different Greek adverbs that Cicero uses in his
correspondence. 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 λεληθόότως
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, 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 λεληθόότως in the body of the epitome
with the use of cognate or synonymous adverbs occurring in the letters attached to the

48 See Steele 1900, 390–91; Rose 1921, 114–15; Dubuisson 1992, 194–95; Swain 2002, 146–47; Dubuisson
2005, 80.
50 See Steele 1900, 390–91; Rose 1921, 115.
51 Att. 119 [6.5.3] et mihi decessionis dies λεληθόότως otrebebat. “And the day of my departure draws
imperceptibly nearer”; Fam. 177 [9.2.3] et tamen λεληθόότως consuetudo diuœtur callum iam obduxit
stomacho meo. “And after all, long custom has imperceptibly anaesthetized my spleen.” Trans. D.R.
Shackleton Bailey, LCL.
52 Σειρῆνες διάακοιλοι καὶ δυνάει λεληθόότως δέέξασθαι τοὺς ἐν αὐταῖς ὄντας.
53 Cf. AJ 7.277 λεληθόότως ἐλθόόντες πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα; 15.366 πολλοὶ τε καὶ ἰατροί καὶ λεληθόότως εἰς τὸ
φρούριον ἀνεγίνειος 18.344 λεληθόότως αὐτῶν [sc. τῶν σεβασµιτῶν] ἐθηκαί ἐπιπέδων.
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 λαθραίως (9x), as well as the semantically cognate adverbs κρυφῇ (12x) and κρυφαίως (2x), both Classical, and κρυβῇ (3x), κρυπτώς (2x), and κρυμμένως (1x), which first appear in the Septuagint. Of these adverbs, Polybius, writing around the mid-second century BCE, uses only λαθραίως (8x) and λαθραίως (1x). Diodorus, a century later, uses the same two adverbs, although with higher frequency (λαθραίως 60x, λαθραίως 7x), plus λεληθότως (5x). Dionysius of Halicarnassus employs κρύψα (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 λάθρα (33x), λαθραίως (2x), λεληθότως (6x), κρύψα (27x), κρυφαίως (2x), κρυφίως (1x), and κρυπτώς (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 Ραζίς δὲ τις ... ἀνήρ φιλοπολίτης καὶ σφάδρα καλῶς ἀκοῦων καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐννοιαν πατήρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων προσαγορευόμενος.

In 2 Maccabees there occur thirteen compounds with φιλο- as their first element. 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).

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. Its instances in non-literate 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 δι’ θεόν] τε καὶ [ἐ]πισάλλ[θ]ν ἀστιν ἄνδρι φιλοπολίτη καὶ φρονώντες δόξης καὶ τῆς παρά τοῖς πολῖταις [εὐφρά][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-thirteenth century CE. 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 φιλάνθρωπον φιλοπολίτην νομοθέτην); and an honorary decree for Adrastos Nikoteimou (Aphrodisias 222.7 ἄνδρα μέγαν φιλόπατριν καὶ φιλοπολίτην καὶ εὐεργέτην). 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 φιλοπολίτην καὶ πάσης ἀδελφῆς ἔξετον) and an acclamation in honour of a prytanis at Oxyrhynchus (P.Oxy. 1.41 [300–325 CE] l. 6.

54 φιλάδελφος, φιλανθρώπως, φιλανθρωπία, φιλανθρωπία (τά φιλάνθρωπα), φιλανθρώπος, φιλαγγεία, φιλονεικία, φιλοστοργία, φιλοστοργικός, φιλωτής, φιλοφρονία, φιλοφρόνος.


56 Plu. Arot. 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 Philopolites (SEG 60 1482 [1st/2nd c. CE] Ἰουλίου Φιλοπολίτηος).
εὐτυχῶς τῷ φιλοπολίτῃ; l. 24 τὸν φιλοπολίτη 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 Aristaeas) 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 φιλόδήµος (SEG 47:1502.5 [reign of Augustus] Ναβαταίων βασιλείας φιλόδήµος); SEG 45:1262.1 [1st c. CE] φιλοκύµιαν καὶ φιλόδήµον and the city- or region-specific terms φιλεφέέσιος (Ephesus 1302.6 [ca. 100 CE] Τῆς Κλαυδίου | Σεκούνδου ... φιλεφέέσιον), φιλοκύµιας (IK Kyme 19,31-33, passim [2 BCE-14 CE] ὁ δὲ ἴµος στεφανοὶ Λεώκων Οὐάκκιον ... φιλοκύµιαον, ἐυεργέταιν), and φιλολύκιος (decree of Patara [Imperial], cited by L. Robert in REA, 62 (1960), n° 3-4, p. 326: ὁ ὁδὸς φιλολύκιος, εὐεργέτατος ἐφικτός ἐν τῇ 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 εὐνοικαί ἐν ἀµαθείαις ἐν ἀσκεί. 63

62 Cf. SEG 60-1073.39-40 [Alabanda, 160s BCE?] ὅπως ... γίνονται πρῶτα] ὁπως ... γίνονται ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος; SEG 53-1312, B.15-16 [Metropolis, 145/144 or 144/143 BCE] πάντα δεύτερα τοῦφεν τῆς
δικηγόροι;63 (15:30); the high priest Onias is praised for his εὐσέβεια and μισοπονηρία (3:1),64 his σωφροσύνη and εὐταξία (4:37),65 and for τὸ σύμφωνον κοινὴ καὶ κατ’ Ἰδίαν παντὶ τῷ πλῆθει σκοπών;66 he is also called ἐυρεγέτης τῆς πόλεως,67 κηδεμόνι τῶν ὀμοσεβείων (4:2),68 καλὸς καὶ ἄγαθος, and ἐκ παιδὸς ἐκμεταλληκτικὸ πάντα τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς ὀικεία (15:12); the martyr Eleazar is said to have left in his death a noble example to the young (6:28 τοῖς νέοις ὑπόδειγμα γενναίου κατακελουσίως; 6:31 οὐ μόνον τοῖς νέοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πλείοντος τῶν ἔθνων... ὑπόδειγμα γενναίοτότος καὶ μηνύσοντον ἀρετῆς καταλιπών);69 the elder Razis, aside from φιλοποιήσεις, is designated as πατήρ τῶν

63 Cf. IG II 653.27–28 [289/8 BCE] προαιρούμενος διαφανεῖται τὴν ἡμᾶς, τὴν εἰς τὸν Ἰδίαν τὴν παραδοθεμένην [ἀντὶ παρὰ τῶν προγόνων].


67 The appellation εὐρεγέτης τῆς πόλεως is attested from the early fourth century BCE onwards in numerous inscriptions. On the title εὐρεγέτης, see Passoni dell’Acqua 1976 and Gardner 2007.


69 Cf. IG VII 3059.8–12 [Boiotia, after 146 BCE] ἄνθρωπος ὑπέσχομαι, ἀπὸ τῆς... πρὸς τῆς ἑλκίας... ἐξέβαλεν τὰς προερχόμενας: IG XII 236.5–6 [ca. 100 BCE] τὸν ἐπὶ ἀρετήν καὶ ἀξίωμα τούτων ἐξόρισεν ἀπὸ τὶς πρὸς τῆς ἑλκίας... SEG 53-1357.4–6 [Silius, 2nd/1st c. BCE] ἐξετάζεται καὶ κατὰ πάντα ἀρετῆς ἐπανελθοῦσας... Sardis 7,1 8.122 [5–1 BCE] ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθός καὶ εὐγενής, ἀπὸ τῆς πρῶτος ἡλκίας σπουδάζοις πρὸς ἀρετήν. On the use of the synonymous expressions ἀπὸ τῆς πρῶτης ἑλκίας and ἀπὸ παλαιότερης ἥλκης in honorific inscriptions, see Klewegit 1991, 234–36. The terms καλός καθαρός and καλοκαθαρία are among the most frequently attested in honorific decrees.

'Ἰουδαῖον (14:37), 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). These model Jewish figures appear thus to embody the very civic virtues of CE) ὑπάρχει τοῦ[|] νόης ἐγγένετο τῆς τῶν καλῶν ὁμοίωσις. Οἱ υπάρχει[|]να παραβεβλημένος, see Panagopoulos 1977, 210. Robert (1965, 226–27) notes that the formula πρὸς ὑπάρχεια, 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 ὑπάρχεια ἄρτας), 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 patres 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 εὐάγεια, 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/καθούς/στίματος (see Brooten 1982, 68–71). With regard to πατήρ 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. 432; see also van der Horst 1991, 93–94). The closest non-Jewish parallel is found in the title πατήρ πόλεως, which occurs in Greek inscriptions from the Roman Imperial period onwards (cf. TAM III, 83.4.4 [Tersamos, 96 CE] ιτέρα Λύκειος Συμβούλιος ... φιλόπατος καὶ πατέρα πόλεως IGLSyri 1 167,5–6 [Nikopolis, Rom. Imp.] τὸν φιλόπατον ... καὶ εὐεργέτη̇ν ἴδιος [κτιστέ̇ν καὶ πατέρα] τῆς πόλεως IoPE F 42.16–17 [Olbia, ca. 200–210 CE] λέγου ταῖς ἐρείπιος καὶ πράσινον τὰ συνέργοντα πατηρ ἀπασχόλη τῆς πόλεως IG VII 3429 [Chaireonia, n.d.] ή βουλή καὶ Ἦδος Οὐλίμπου [Εὐάγγελος τόν] | [πατήρα κόσμου | [εὐεργετη̇ς | [φιλότιμος | [πατήρ χρηματουργίας, which can be compared to 2 Mac 14:37 Ραζί | κατὰ τὴν εὐάγειαν πατήρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων προσφερομένων]. 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 πατήρ συναγωγῆς ‘may itself be an adaptation of the honorific ‘father of the ekklesia/boule/polis’ which appears on inscriptions in Asia Minor.’


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 μέτα τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπιφύλακτος καθεστώς; 5:23 χειρὶ τῶν ἄριστον ἐπηρεῖτο τοὺς πολιτάς, ἐπηρεῖτο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πολιτάς Ἰουδαίους ἐχὼν διάθεσθαι), Jason (5:8 πατρίδος καὶ πολιτῶν δήμος), or Alcimus, who hypocritically claimed that he was concerned for the interests of his fellow citizens (14:8 τῶν ἰδίων πολιτῶν συμφιλικάμενος).
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, φιλοπέενης) and the Jewish Law (e.g. φιλέέντολος, φιλόνοµος). All these epithets are neologisms denoting distinctively Jewish qualities.74

To be sure, φιλοπολίιτης 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

φιλοπολίιτης, like the previously discussed adjective ἀπαρασήήµαντος, 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 εὐπάάντητος (14:9),78 of προήγορος (7:2, 4),79 of ὑπεραγόόντως (7:20),80 and possibly of ἱεέρω µα (12:40), which will be discussed further down in this chapter (3.3.3). The inscriptional attestations of

---

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): “Hé [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 ἀπαρασήήµαντος 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 F 392.6), dated to the second or first century BCE (before 72 BCE), preserves the synonymous adjective εὐπάάντητος, which is an absolute ἱεάπ λεγοµένον. Also epigraphically attested is the very rare εὐέέντευκτος, one of the instances of which in a Koan honorary decree for Augustus (IvO 53 [bef. 4 CE] 1. 28 [τὴν ἄρχον ἑλεονθρώπου εὐέέντευκτον κατασκευάζων] provides a parallel with 2 Macc 14:9 (καθ’ ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς ἐπανταχ ἑλεονθρώπως), as Robert (1935, 336) has pointed out.
79 See Chapter 8.
80 This tris λεγοµένον 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; ἐυπαρχόντως and ὑπεραγόόντως 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 λόγοι πέναν 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 ἐπανδρῶσῃ, the latest editors adopt the varia lectio ἐπανδρώσῃ: τὸν δ’ ἐνί λέεκτροις / Ὕψιπύλης εἰσάετε πανήμερον, εἰσόεκε Λήμνον / παίσιν 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: “ἐπανδρῶσῃ. So edd. with all MSS. but G, which has ἐπανδρόσῃ. As the sense is re-plenish, G must be right, for ἐπι 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 ἐπτ-, ἐς-, ἐς-ανδρόσῃ83 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

82 Trans. W.H. Race, LCL.
83 As if the choice between the two types (ἐπανδρῶσῃ-ἐςανδρόσῃ) attested in the MSS was not difficult enough, West (1963, 10) gratuitously suggested a third possibility: “ἐπανδρόω 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 
 murky 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 héro.

LSJ cites A.R. 1.874 for εἰσανδρόόω, “fill with men,” and 2 Macc 15:17 for ἐπανδρόόω, 
“make manly.” The Revised Supplement (1996, 123), s.v. ἐπανδρόόω, 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. ἐπανδρόόω, “to depopulate” [sic], 45 
together with 2 Macc 15:17, “to make manly,” and s.v. εἰσανδρόόω, “to populate.” 
εἰσανδρόόω recurs only once in subsequent literature, in the seventeenth-century poem 
Hellas (l. 708) by Leo Alatius. The adjective ἐπανδρος, “manly,” from which ἐπανδρόόω 
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 ἐπάανδρως is epigraphically attested already in the second century 
BCE (IG II² 1006.78 [122/1 BCE]; IosPE II 352.6 [ca. 107 BCE]; TAM II 582.7 [bef. 
100 BCE]). The author of 2 Maccabees could very well have coined ἐπανδρόόω 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 συστήήσασθαι

Early commentators and editors thought it necessary to emend the MSS reading ἐφηβίαν,87 at 4:9, to ἐφηβεῖον88 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 ἀνδρόοω. The sense required in the present passage is ‘populate with men’; for this one would expect 
“ἐνανδρόοω, corresponding to “ἐνανδρος.”

84 Cf. See Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera, p. 74.15 Wendel ἐσανδρώσῃ ἀνδρῶν πληρώσῃ, 
eἰρωνικῶς.

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. ἐπανδρόοω: 
“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 πλέοσα ὡς ἡ γυµνάσια ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ἐνταῦθαι [i.e. in Neapolis, Italy] σῴζεται, γυµνάσια 
τα καὶ ἐφηβεία καὶ φαρασία καὶ ἀνόµατα Ἑλληνικά. Jüthner (“Ephebeum,” PW 5, col. 2737) suggests 
emending ἐφηβεία 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. Antipater uses it in the sense of “youth,” which is the one given for this word by ancient lexicographers. 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. 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, 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 1028.42). In IG II 1008.29–30, from 118/7 BCE, τῆς [ἐφ] ἱερίας can be restored with confidence on contextual grounds, whereas in SEG 26:98.21 and IG II 2700.16, both from the third century BCE, the word has been postulated in lines heavily but reasonably restored. 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 εὕρον δὲ ἐκάστου τῶν τεθνηκότων ὑπὸ τοὺς χιτῶνας ἱερώματα τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰαωνείας εἰδώλων, ἄφ’ ὁ νόμος ἀπείργει τοὺς Ἰουδαίους

LSJ, s.v. ἱέρωμα, gives “consecrated object, offering, ἱαρώματα Supp.Epigr. 1.414.7 (Crete, v/iv B.C., nisi leg. ἱαρώματα); ἱαρ[ῶματα IG 4.917 (Epid., iv B.C.), cf. LXX 2 Ma. 12.40, J. AJ 1.19.10, Dam. Isid. 71. II. = σκόλλυς (Lacon.), Ἰχσ. The Revised Supplement of 1996, s.v., suggests the following modification: “for ‘consecrated object, offering’ read ‘sacred image’; line 2, for ἱαρώματα . . . ἱαρώματα’ read ‘ἱαρώματα Inscr.Cret. 4.145.7 (Gortyn, iv B.C.’); line 3, delete ἱαρ[ῶματα IG 4.917 (Epid., iv B.C.); read ἱαρ[ε]ῦ τὰ.’”

90 Gow and Page (1965, 1xx; 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. ε7430 ἐφηβίαν νεόταις; Suid. ε3888 ἐφηβεία: νεότης. ἡ ἂκυρή τῆς ἡλικίας.
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 ἱερ[ω]ματα (τὰ) | τῶν Ἀστυπάλεων πέμπτες[θαί]; σὺν ταῖς τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων | πολίται. Fraenkel ill-advisedly rejected Dittenberger’s conjecture ἱερ[πεί]ς, “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 conicet Dittenb. τὰ ἱερ[πεί]ς τὰ repugnat lapidi”). When, in 1929, Hiller von Gaertringen re-edited this Epidaurian inscription (IG IV2, 47), he adopted the reading ἱερ[πεί]ς, noting that the previous editors had been misled in their restoration by cracks in the stone (p. 7: “8 ἱερ[πεί]ς, τά Ἑι. ἱερ[ω]ματα πριores, 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 ἱερόματα 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 Π[ῶν]ν χ’ ἱερόματα[ς], the latter word being, as he believed, a miswriting of ἱερόματα, “perfumes.” Since perfumes were used not only for medicinal, disinfecting purposes, but also in cultic worship, the epigraphist assumed that ἱερόματα was commonly spelled as ἱερόματα.96 In line 12, he read [θῦ]ματα χ’ ἱερόματα (ἐ)τί[ν]ῶν χόννων, the last word presumably designating the recipients for keeping perfumes and incenses. Schwzyer (1923, 93) accepted Comparetti’s restoration and interpretation, noting that the χ(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; c’est un scrupule nécessaire qui peut mener à des changements de position radicaux.”
96 p. 199: “ἱερόματα: della voce ἱερόματα non si ha esempio che nel II dei Maccabei (c. 12 v. 42) ove indica oggetti sacri a idoli (donaria idolorum). Qui ἱερόματα è erroneamente scritto, come forse pur si diceva, per ἱεροματα, voce che spesso va unita all’altra che più oltre leggiamo, θύματα, come pur si vede nelle intenzioni degli Inni Orfici. È noto quanta parte avessero nel culto ἱερόματα καὶ θύματα e quantà pure nell’uso medico di cui esclusivamente si tratta quasi, benchè non senza ricordare l’uso sacro pel quale appunto poté avvenire che volgarmente si dicesse ἱερόματα περ ἱερόματα ed anche che cosi si scrivesse in atti ufficiali qual era questo”; p. 201: “Ma le principali sostanze purificatrici e disinfectanti, sulle quali più insisti il decreto, sono gli arconi e i profumi che disinfectavano così le persone come l’ambiente nelle loro fumigazioni. . . . Gli arconi erano tanto di uso religioso anzitutto, che qui li vediamo chiamati, non ἱερόματα ma ἱερόματα.”
that it is epigraphically attested elsewhere (in Epidaurus).

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 'ιαρώωµα[ία] and παρέξεξέν ἐµ[ι] ἱαρώµατα ξ[πι τ]ῶν χόονν ἄλη[ς τά], respectively, taking ιαρώµατα to be a Cretan variant, with prefixed iota, of ιαρώµατα, that is, aromatic herbs that were grinded and put into ritual vases.

In her study of the language of Cretan inscriptions, Bile (1988, 357) states that ἱαρώµατα, in IC IV 45.7, is a late term, meaning “offerings, consecrated objects,” and that it is epigraphically attested elsewhere (in Epidaurus).


98 According to Hesychius, at Sparta the word was used of the κόόννος, that is, the tuft left on the head when one offered one’s hair to the gods: 1. 331 ἱέρωµα τόν κόόννον Λάκωνες, ἐν τινες μαλλίν <χ> σκόλλων. See DELG and EDG s.n. σκόλλος. Suidas informs us that κόόννος was some sort of ornament given to girls: κ. 2047 κόόννος ἐθωρέω δὲ πάσι τὰ πρόποτα, τοις μὲν παισὶ κόόννοις καὶ Σέληνα, τοῖς δὲ νεανίσκοις δραµβάς καὶ μαχαίρις. Hesychius’ gloss of ἱέρωµα as κοσµαρίων παιδικῶν, μηγάςκοι, καὶ τά τοικάτα, and of ἱαρώµατα as κόόννοι are probably to be connected with Suidas’ gloss of κόόννοις.


100 P. 57: “Nel primo termine di linea 4 [sc. ιαρ. ...] andrà ritrovato il rendimento cretese di ἱαρώµατα (‘lane’) con un iota prolettico, come nel caso di ἱαρώµατα per ἱαρόβια ... . Nella seconda espressione di linea 7 si tratterà di una variante cretese di ἱαρώµατα, ‘erbe aromatiche’, le sole che ‘macinate’ potevano essere contenute dentro i chonnoi (vasetti rituali); [ξπι τ]ῶν χόονν ἄλης τά.”

ἵερώματα 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 ἱερώματα = ἱερώματα: Comparetti and Manganaro equated ἱερώματα to ἠρώματα, 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 “ἱερώματα . . . nis leg. ἠρώματα” with “ἱερώματα,” 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 Iamnia, 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 Iamnia, 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 Iamnia on Delos names as “the gods who rule over Iamnia.”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 Iamnia, 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 Ἡρακλῆ καὶ Αὐρώνα, θεοὶ Ἰάμνειᾶν κατέέχουσιν. 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 Iamnia, 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\textsuperscript{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 Ἰαμνίτισις νυκτὸς ἐπιβάλον ὑρῆψε τὸν ιλιμάκα σὺν τῷ στόλῳ).\textsuperscript{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 ἱερώματα 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 ἱερώματα 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 ἐρευνὰν 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.\textsuperscript{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 (κατατάσσεν τοὺς τύπους εἰς τὴν σάγχθα τῆς φερούσας αὐτὴν καμήλου). In the corresponding passages in the Septuagint of Genesis, the Greek translator uses the terms εἴδωλα and οἱ θεοί\textsuperscript{107} to render ‘teraphim’ (τεραφίμ) and ‘elohim’ (אלהים), 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

\textsuperscript{104} Most of the Old Latin translators understood ἱερώματα as referring to votive offerings (La\textsuperscript{V} donariis idolorum; La\textsuperscript{XV} donorum dona; La\textsuperscript{IV} sacri simularum). La\textsuperscript{V} 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 χρυσωμάτα.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{106} AJ 1.310 τοὺς τύπους τῶν θεῶν, ώσπερ πατρίους ὄντας φαίημαν ἥν 1.311 τοὺς ἱερὰ πάτρια ἐπεφέρετο τῶν θεῶν. 1.316 ἐρεῖ τὰ πάτρια... ὄπε τοῦ εἴδους τιμηθέντα προχώρησε καὶ ὑπ᾽ ἐξου θρησκείας τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκέλευς ἐξιποθέντα.

\textsuperscript{107} Gen 31:19 ἐκέλευς ὑπ᾽ ῾Ραχῆλ τὰ εἴδωλα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς 31:30 ἵνα τί ἐκέλευς τοὺς θεούς μου. Cf. 31:32, 34, 35.
of conjectures regarding the identity and function of the ἱερωμα 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 οὔτως· τῶν δὲ ἱερέων τοὺς διασωθέντας τὰ τοῦ Ἐνυαλίου Διὸς ἱερώματα
 λαβόντας εἰς Σενᾶρ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας ἔλθειν. 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 Enyalus 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 αἱ ἱερεῖαι καὶ Σίβυλλα λέεινος ὀὔτως). 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 πῦργον ὑπερεμεγᾶθη and τοῦ
dὲ θεοῦ ἄνεμους ἐμφυσάσαντος to the more prosaic πῦργον ὑψηλότατον and οἱ δὲ θεοὶ
ἀνέμους ἐπιπεψάντες, 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
ἵερωμα, which have been ignored by LSJ and the commentators on 2 Maccabees. Three

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 ἵερωμα to the local Apollo (ll. 10–11 ἀνέθη[σ] | τὸ ἵερωμα Ἀπόλλωνι). It is not known what this ἵερωμα 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 cannot 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 ἵερωμα | τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνι | ὑμῖν ἐν καθήρωσε). 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—and records the donation of the ἵερωμα (by which term the marble relief is presumably to be understood) by the three donors named at the beginning of the inscription (l. 3 [τῷ ἵερωμα ἐδωρήσαντον τῷ κοινῷ]).

The papyrological attestations of ἵερωμα come from the second and third centuries CE. They occur in three invitations to dinner in honour of Isis. The exact nature of the ἵερωμα Ἰσίδως 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. Similar dinners were held in honour of Sarapis, as can be deduced from some twenty invitations to a κλίίνη (banquet) of Sarapis (and one to a κλίίνη 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. Indeed, in one of the κλίίνη invitations it is the god himself who invites his guests to dinner. Youtie (1948, 13–14) and Castiglione (1961, 302) consider it likely

110 See Mihailov 1958, 110 and 671.
111 P.Fouad 76.1–4 ἔρωτα | ἐπὶ Σαραπινὸς δειπήσασα εἰς ἵερωμα τῆς κυρίας Ἰσίδως ἐν τῇ ιεραίᾳ: P.Oxy. 66.4539.2–3 ἐπὶ Σαραπινὸς δειπήσασα εἰς ἵερωμα τῆς κυρίας Ἰσίδως ἐν τῷ Ἱεραίῳ: P.Oxy. 75.5056.1–2 ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρα δειπήσασα εἰς ἵερωμα ἐν τῇ ιεραίᾳ.
112 See the comment of D. Montserrat in Gonis et al. 1999, 227–28.
113 Aristid. Εἰς τὸν Σάραπιν, p. 54 Jebb: καὶ τῶν καὶ θυσίων μένον τούτῳ θεῷ διαπεράντως κοινωνήσας ἀνθρώπων τὴν ἄκριβη κοινωνίαν, καλονύτατης ὑπὸ ἐφ᾽ ἅπαντα καὶ προστάσεως διατυμοῦνα καλύτερον καὶ ἐστίτυφον.
114 P.Köln 1.57 καλεῖ ὡς ἡ θεοὶ εἰς κλίνην γενοντεύχοντας ἐν τῷ Ἡσαπρίῳ ἀνῷ ἀπὸ ἄρθροις 0'.
that the participants in a Sarapis χλήνη honoured the god with a sacrifice and that, the χλήνη 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 Ἰσίδος 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. ἱέρωμα, "θυσία θεία, θυμαστάσι," 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 where 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 Pharía, "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 ἱ/ἱερώματα 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 ἐκάλεσεν [ὡς τεταμενύνω], ὡς ἔμπισμον [ὡς τεταμενύνω]. ἱερώματα, μέλανον πυρὶ ἐγραφαμέναν στόμαχα, translated by Halleux (1981, 162) as "huile de dictamne, crasse de porc, écorce de séséli, noir de sacrifices, mordant précité."


118 Dam. Isid. fr. 71 Zintzen τινές ἂν ἔκαλεν τὸ ἱερώμα κατάξαντες καὶ διασφαίραντες, καὶ ἀπωρυκτικον τελεστικαί βοηθεῖς οἱ ἐπιχώριοι ἀνθρωπίνην στοιχήματος τῆς τοῦ νυμφαίου μόλις ἐκατούρτων οἱ Ἀγαθώσιοι.

119 This possibility surprisingly escaped Robert (1981, 518n10), who, after quoting the conjecture of Zintzen, the editor of Damascius' text, that the ἱερώμα might have been an Isis temple destroyed by the Christians ("Christiani templum Isidis nescio quo loco stium 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.\footnote{Plu. Sull. 29.6 λέει δὲ ἐξέχων τι χρυσοῦν Ἀπόλλωνος ἄγαλματον ἐκ Δελφῶν ἀεὶ μὲν κατὰ τὰς μάχας περιφέρειν ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ. See Dölger (1934, 68–69), who provides further examples (taken up by Robert 1981, 519–26).}

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 παρεπιδείκνυμι τὴν τῶν ἔθνων 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.\footnote{Ph. Spec. 1.56, Contempl. 31, Legat. 95; Plu. Mor. 43A, 43D, 71D, 129D; Gal. 8.600.18, 8.601.4 Kühn; Luc. Hist. Consdr. 57.3; Poll. 4.98.} The earliest two attestations appear to be found in 2 Maccabees and in the tenth book of Philodemus’ treatise On Vices (Περὶ κακίων), which was likely written after 50 BCE.\footnote{See Ranocchia 2007, 1.} 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\footnote{PHerc. 1008, col. 10.30 κεφαλαίωσο.} 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.\footnote{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.} 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 εἴρων] μὲν ὡς σοφά, προσάπτειν δ᾽ ἑτέροις ὡς Ἀσπασία καὶ Ἰσχώρ Σωκράτης.
This section is introduced by the phrase φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων (16.35) and closes with a φησί (24.19), the subject of which is apparently the aforementioned Ἀρίστων. The φησί 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. 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. 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 κοφίίζειν ὑπερηφανίας. It can be noted here that Vooy’s Lexicon Philodemeum lists four other compound verbs prefixed with παρεπ- , which are first attested in Philodemus: παρεπαισθάαι, παρεπιμελώναι, παρεπιφαίαι, and παρεφάπται; 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, 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.


126 See p. 26: “Il semplice fatto di ripetere più volte la stessa espressione [sc. φησίν], del tutto rituale nel carattere epistolare, 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 rimaneva in più punti il suo originale . . . . La grande vivacità e originalità espressiva di quella parte del De superbia contenente l’opuscolo 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 ἑτεραμερής ‘divided into four parts’

8:21 ἑτεραμερές τι τὸ στράτευμα ἔτοιμον

The first attestation of this compound adjective is probably found in an Aristotelian fragment quoted, perhaps verbatim, in Ps.-Plutarch’s On Music (1139B, F). 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. Be it noted that De Bruyne (1922, 39) considers the phrase ἑτεραμερής 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 ἐξελασσόμουν
13:25 ἔθεσαν γὰρ ὑπεράγαν

This adverb appears to be first attested in a passage of Theophrastus (fr. 187 Wimmer) quoted, perhaps verbatim, by Aelian (NA 3.38 Hercher ἐνθα νοτιώτερος ὁ ἄρη ὑπεράγαν, οἱ ἐλεκτρυόμενοι τούς ἀδείερῃ, φησί Θεόφραστος). 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 λέει. 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 γλωσσοτή, 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: Ἐρέμιππος δὲ φησίν αὐτὸν γλωσσοτήν ἔχει.
131 At 8:35, Katz (1962, 15) and Kilpatrick (1963, 18) opt for the reading ὑπεράγαν, which is supported by L. 46-52 55 311, contra Hanhart (1961, [461] 39), who defends the reading preferred by him, ὑπὲρ ἀπαν, as “ursprünglich.”
132 Already in tragic poetry, ἀγαν is found in conjunction with ὑπὲρ used adverbially (E. Med. 627 ἐρωτε ὑπὲρ μὲν ἀγαν ἔλθοτες) or as a modifier of compounds having ὑπὲρ as their first component (Ἀ. Eu. 823 μηδ’ ὑπεραγόντως ἄγαν; Pote. 794 τοὺς ὑπεράγαν ἄγαν, 827 τῶν ὑπεραγάντων ἄγαν; Th. 238 μηδ’ ἀγαν ὑπερφρόον βῆς; S. Aj. 951 ἐγαν ὑπερφρόου ἐγαν ὑπερφρόου). 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 ἐξερρίπτοντο· διὸ συγχυθέντες ἀοράσια 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 διεξίπταντο 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.” 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 διεξίπταντο, 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 διεξίπταντο on the grounds that the verb διεξίπταμαι 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 διεξίπτασθαι 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.”
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Let us examine whether Kappler’s assumption is valid. ἐξίπτασθαι, later form of ἐκπέτα, is a very rare verb. Literally, it is used of birds and, figuratively, of a young man’s heart that flutters at the sight of an alluring woman, of the soul that flies out of the body, of the ephemeral wealth that flies away, or of words that fly out like arrows. ἐκπέτα and ἐκπέτασμα are mainly used literally of winged creatures such as birds, bees, butterflies, and the like. 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.

As can be seen, ἐξίπτασθαι/ἐκπέτασμα/ἐκπέτα are invariably used of birds, or other winged creatures, but not of humans, except in Aristophanes, where one man turns into a sparrow and another is envisaged as being able to fly like a bird, or when reference is made to Daedalus and Icarus, who flew with bird-like wings. In the Septuagint, too, ἐκπέτασθαι is used of humans who are likened to birds. Therefore, we find it hard to agree with Kappler that διεξίπτασμα 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 incongruence of the image passes unnoticed in most of the translations that follow Kappler and Hanhart, as the translators, in rendering the compound διεξίπτασμα, emphasize the notion of scattering, which is conveyed by the prefix 

135 Arist. apud Ath. 9.41.29 Kaibel ἡ πέρδες . . . ἐξίπτασταί; Callix. apud Ath. 5.31.10 Kaibel περιστεραί καί φάσσασαι καί τρυγόνες καθ’ ὕλην ἐξίπταντο τὴν ὕδων.
136 LXX Prov 7:10 ἡ δὲ γυνὴ . . . ποιεῖ νέων ἐξίπτασθαι καρδίας.
137 Phld. Mor. col. 8.18 Henry ἡ ψυχὴ . . . πῶς οὐ[ν] ἐξίπταται.
139 Ach. Tat. 6.10.5 ὅταν τὸν Ἰδαίσακα τοξεύει τὸν λόγον, ὃ μὲν δίκαιον βέβαιος ἐξίπταται. Cf. Plu. Mor. 90C ἐνι ἐξίπτασθαι τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτῶν.
140 LSJ, DGE, LEH, and GELS differ as regards the verb forms that they cite under the entries for ἐκπέτα, ἐκπέτασμα, ἐκπετάνωμι. We here follow the DGE.
141 See Arist. 551’23, passim; Thphr. CP 2.9.5, passim.
142 Hes. Op. 97–98 Ἐπείπος . . . ένδον έμεινε πτόσιν . . . οὐδὲ θύραξε/ἐξίπτατ’; Pl. Th. 81e ἡ ψυχὴ . . . ἐξίπτατο; Batr. 211 ψυχὴ δὲ μελέες ἐξέπτατη; Luc. Rh. Pr. 6.16 οἱ ἐπαινοὶ . . . Ἐρωσί μικρῶς έκικότες . . . ἐκπέταμεσις; Sir. 43:14δ καί ἐξέπτησαν νεκράλικος ρήματα. Cf. the late verb διεξίπτασι, which in the Septuagint occurs in Wis 5:11 ὡς ὄρνειον διαπάντος ἄρχα.
143 V. 228 στρούσσον αὐὴν γίνεται/ἐκπετάται.
144 Αν. 786–88 τῶν θεάτων εἰ τὴν ὑπότερον . . . ἐκπέτομες ἐν οὖντες ἐρίστησαν ἑλθὼν οὐκάδε. 
146 Pss. Sol. 17:16 ἐφύγοσαν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν οἱ ἄγαντες συναγωγὰς ἑως, ὡς στρούσσα ἐξεπέτασθησαν ἀπὸ κολύτων αὐτῶν; Hos 9:11 ἑρίσατο ὡς ὄρνεεν ἐξεπέτασθα.
147 The verb is not registered in LSJ. Of the Septuagint lexicata, GELS glosses it as “to dash out in different directions” and GS as “fly off (fig.) flee in all directions.”
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 διασκορπίζω 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.149 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: ἀστραπὴ corresponds to κεραυνος, βέλη to τοξεύματα, and συνετάραξε to ταραχή. skorpiizω 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 κεραυνὸς—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).150 The use of ἀορασία, which has no counterpart in 2 Kgdms 22:15 and in Ps 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 διεξίπτα, on the contrary, does not establish any connections either with profane Greek or with Septuagint texts.

The reading διεκόπτοντο, that Kappler regards as a gloss, certainly makes better sense contextually than διεξίπταντο. διεκόπτω 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


149 Cf. Isa 9:11 ο θεὸς . . . τοὺς ἐχθροὺς διασκεδάστηκεν; Ps 17:15 καὶ ἐξεπέστειλεν βέλη καὶ ἐπόρμησεν αὐτούς; Ps 88:11b εν τῷ μεριχόν τῆς δυνάμεως σου διακόπτησας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου.

150 2 Kgdms 22:15 καὶ ἐπέστειλεν [ὁ θύσιος] βέλη καὶ ἐπόρμησεν αὐτούς, ἄστραπὴν καὶ ἐξέστησεν αὐτούς; Ps 17:15 καὶ ἐξεπέστειλεν [ὁ θύσιος] βέλη καὶ ἐπόρμησεν αὐτούς καὶ ἄστραπὴν ἐπλήθυνεν καὶ συνετάραξεν αὐτούς; Ps 143:6 ἀστραφὸν ἄστραπὴν καὶ σκορπιεῖς αὐτούς, ἐξαπέστειλαν τὰ βέλη σου καὶ συνετάραξαν αὐτούς.

151 See Schwartz 2008, 383; Doran 2012, 211.


153 Cf. 2 Kgdms 5:20 καὶ ἐκοίμη τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους ἑκάτεροι, καὶ οίπερ Δαυὶδ Διεκόπτης τοὺς ἐχθροὺς. 
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Polybios-Lexikon, I.2, s.v., cites Plb. 3.74.4 and 3.115.6 for the meaning “durchbrechen” and 2.30.7 for the meaning “zersprengen, durcheinandergebracht sein (vgl. 2.30.7 διέστρεφον τοὺς κατόπιν § 4).” For the last-cited passage, the older Lexicon Polybianum by Schweighäuser, s.v. διακοπτέσθαι, 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 διεστρεφον τοὺς κατόπιν (2.30.4) that comes before the participle διακοπτον ενοι 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 διακοπτον ενοι: Paton (rev. by Walbank and Habicht, 2010, 347) as “almoß cut to pieces,” Pédech (1970, 73) as “criblés de blessures,” and Drexler (1961–1963:1:140) as “niedergehauen wurden.” If we accept διεκοπτον 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 εκοπτον or κατεκοπτον or διεκοπτον, are unanimous in rendering it as “were cut down.”

In corroboration of this rendering comes the verb κατασφάαζω, in the immediately following verse (10:31 κατεσφάάγησαν δὲ δισµύριο), which should be seen as a stronger synonym for διακόπτω, employed for the sake of variation. The same verb is paired with the simplex κόόπτω in 2 Macc 5:12. It also has to be noted that κόόπτω and διακόπτω occur just a few verses after 10:30, at 10:35 (τὸν ἐµπίπτοντα ἐκοπν) and 10:36 (τὰς πύλας διέεκοπν), 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 διεξί iptαντο over διεκοπτον. 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 διεξί iptα can figuratively convey this sense in a military context such as that of 10:30, as Kappler assumes. The fact that the verb ἐξί iptα and its cognates, in their sparse instances in

154 3.74.4 πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ἀποκτείναντες διέκοψαν τὴν τῶν Καρχηδονίων τάξιν; 3.115.6 διέκοψαν ἐκάθισ τὴν τῶν ὑπεραντιῶν τάξιν.
155 τὸ δὲ πλῆθος . . . συμπέσον τοῖς τολμέωσις ἐκ χειρός ἐπιτείμη μάχην ἰσχυρὰν διακοπτόμενον γὰρ ἐμένων ἐπὶ θυσίων ταῖς ψυχαῖς.
156 La V caedebantur; La BM concidebant.
157 καὶ ἐκέέλευσε τοῖς στρατιώταις κόπτειν ἀφθαρσίας τοὺς ἐμύπτπτοντας καὶ τοὺς ἐς τὰς οἰκίας ἀναβαίνοντας κατασφάζειν. Cf. 10:17 κατάσφαξαν τοὺς ἐμύπτπτοντας, ἀνείλην δὲ οὐχ ἦττον τῶν δισµύριων.
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 διεξίπτα 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 (ἀπαρασήήνας, ἀπροσδηής, ἐντινάςσω, ἐπιλυπέω, λεληθόότως, φιλοπολίίτης) 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 with in the last two centuries BCE; three (ἐπανδρόόω, ἑφηβίία, ἱέέρω) 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 (ἐπανδρόόω) or dubious epigraphical readings (ἐφηβίία, ἱέέρω); three (παρεπιδείίκνυμι, τετραμερής, ὑπεράάγας) 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 (διεξίπτα) 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 ἀπαρασήήνας 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 φιλοπολίίτης 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 ἱέέρω 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 Mac 8:7, A’/55 preserve the reading διηχεῖτο (ἡλιὰ τῆς ἐυανδρίας αὐτοῦ διηχεῖτο πανταχῇ), whereas the other MSS read διεχεῖτο. διηχεῖτο is the lectio difficilior, as διηχέέω, “to resound,” is a rare verb, not attested prior to Plutarch (Tim. 21.6 η Ἑλλὰς διήήχει τὸ µέέγεθος τοῦ κατορθώτους), whereas διεχεῖτο is the lectio facilior, as διαχέέω, “to spread,” is a Classical verb, attested in the Septuagint (29x) and in 2 Maccabees (10:28 τῆς ἀνατολῆς διαχεούµενης). 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 (διηχείτο τῆς φλόός), where the MSS exhibit both διηχεῖτο and διηχέέω, although the latter reading evidently does not fit the context. A reason for preferring the lectio difficilior in 2 Mac 8:7 is that 3 Mac 3:2 uses the combination φήή...ἐξηχεῖτο, which is a synonymic parallel to καλλία... διηχεῖτο, in 2 Mac 8:7, and may even have been coined on the model of the latter. According to Hanhart’s critical apparatus, in 3 Mac 3:2 Alexandrinus reads έκεχείτο. The verb διηχέεω is not used figuratively of a spreading fame or rumor prior to Gregory of Nyssa (v. Macr. 33.4 Maraval φήής διαχεθείς), whereas διηχέεω and ἐξηχεῖτο 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 aforesaid words invites caution in drawing any strong conclusions.

Apropos of ἀπαρασήήµαντος 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 ἀνεπισήήµαντος 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 ἀπαρασήήµαντος, 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, ἀπροσδεήής 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; ἐπανδρόόω 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 διεξίπτωµαι, 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 aforementioned 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] (“Makkabiäerbücher,” PW 14, cols. 792–93, 798: “IIIM. ist von Iason von Kyrene bezw. vom II. Makkabiäerbuch 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’ (δυσσέёβησις, τρισαλίτηης), ‘attitudes and emotions’ (δειλανδρέεω, ἐπιλυπέεω, ύψαυχενέεω), ‘violence, harm, destroy, kill’ (γλωσσοτοµέησις, οἰωνόοβρωτος), ‘military activities’ (ἐντινάάσσω, ἐπιλυπέεω), ‘divine attributes’ (τερατοποιόός), 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,⁴ occurs in the epitomator’s prologue, as well as in the main text of the epitome; three words (γλωσσοτοµέω, ἐπιλυπέεω, ἐντινάάσσον) are doubtful neologisms, two of which were briefly discussed in the preceding chapter; another couple of words (δυσσέεβησις, ἐσθησις) 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.

³ On the relationship between 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras, see Gardner 1986, 20 and Canessa 1995, 87–89, 102; 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 ἐπιλυπέεω is used in both an emotive (4:37) and a military (8:32) sense.

⁵ On this term, see Mason 2007. The term 'Ἕλληνισµός, 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 δειλανδρέεω ‘to be cowardly’

8:13 οἱ δειλανδροῦντες καὶ ἀπιστοῦντες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δίκην διεδίδρασκον καὶ ἐξετόόπιζον ἑαυτούς

In the Septuagint there occur a variety of verbs deriving from δειλόός: δειλιάαω, GELS "to be afraid, fearful" (seventeen instances, of which one is in 2 Macc 15:8), δειλιαίίνω, GELS "to make afraid" (only in Deut 20:8), δειλαίίνο, GELS "to be overcome with fright" (only in 1 Macc 5:41), and δειλόόμαι, GELS "to fear, be or become scared of" (only in 1 Macc 4:8, 21; 16:6). The compound δειλανδρέεω 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). δειλανδρέεω 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 δειλόόπυς (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, 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. 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. From the phrase φοβούμενος καὶ δειλός τῇ καρδίᾳ, in Deut 20:8, he retained only the
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 (ζῇ τῇ καρδίᾳ, “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, δειλανδρέεω 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), ἀνδραγαθεύω (2:21), and ἀνδραγαθία (14:18). Considering that the only compound verbs in -ανδρέεω attested prior to 2 Maccabees are πολυανδρόω, LSJ “to be full of men, to be populous,” (Th. 6.17.2) and εὐανδρέεω, 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–ἐξετόόπιζον) 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 δειλοὶ ἐστε, ὕποτιστοι; Mark 4:40 τί δειλοὶ ἐστε, ὡς ἤχετε 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 -ανδρέεω listed in LSJ are late and infrequent: ὅλιγανδρέεω, “to be scant of men” (D.S. 15.63.1), ἀτισανδρέεω, “to be in want of men” (Str. 6.1.6), µονανδρέεω, “to have but one husband” (Malalas), ἀτισανδρέεω, “ἀτισανδρέεω 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 ἀνδρείας (6:27), ἀνδροδίας (14:43), and ἀρρενωδίας (10:35).
12 Cf. 4:14 τοῦ μὲν νῦν κατακηροῦντες καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἁμαλλοῦντες; 12:14 λοιδοροῦντες καὶ προσέτι βλασφημοῦντες καὶ λαλοῦντες, δ. μὴ θέμες.
4.2.2 δυσσέβημα ‘impious act’

The δυσσέβημα word-group is represented in 2 Maccabees by the adjective δυσσεβής \[^{13}\] and its derivatives δυσσεβέω, \[^{14}\] δυσσαφεία, \[^{15}\] and δυσσεβημα. 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 δυσσαφεία and δυσσεβεία in the Hippocratic treatise On the Sacred Disease (1.67, 73) \[^{19}\] and δυσσαφημα in Demosthenes’ On the Crown (323). In the Septuagint, δυσσαφημα 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 δυσσεβεία and δυσσεβημα in 1 Esdras (1:40 and 1:49, respectively).

The noun δυσσεβημα was coined analogically to ἀσεβημα, which is attested as early as Thucydides and the Attic orators. Polybius, who gives us a handy definition of it, \[^{20}\] uses ἀσεβημα 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 δυσσεβημα instead of the more common ἀσεβημα 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 θυμοθέντα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἐθνεὶ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὰ δυσσεβηματα).

Now, the instance of δυσσεβημα 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 δυσσεβής Σίμων; 8:14, 15:33 τοῦ δυσσεβής Νικάνωρ; 9:9 τοῦ δυσσεβής [καὶ Ἀντίόχου].
\[^{14}\] 6:13 τὸ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἔσσεθα τοὺς δυσσεβοῦντας.
\[^{15}\] 8:33 τοῦ ἄξιον τῆς δυσσαιφίας ἐκοινώσατο μεσθὲ σὺ.
\[^{16}\] 1:17 ὁ θείς, ὃς ἠθέτησε τοὺς ἀσεβήντας; 4:13 τοῦ ἀσεβέως καὶ τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασις Ἀντιόχους; 4:17 ἀσεβεῖν εἰς τοὺς θείους νόμους; 4:38 τὸν Ὀνίιαν ἀσεβήσασθαι; 8:12 τὸν νόον τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων βεβηλωθέντα; 10:10 υἱὸν τοῦ ἀσεβῆς [καὶ Ἀντίόχου].
\[^{17}\] The instances of the ἀσεβ- word-group in poetry are as follows: ἀσεβής: Thgn. 1x, Xenoph. 1x, A. 5x, S. 3x, E. 2x, Eupr. 1x; ἀσεβεία: E. 2x; ἀσεβείω: E. 1x, Ar. 1x, Philippid. 1x, Timocl. 1x, Alex. 1x, Phillem. 1x, Men. 1x; ἀσέβημα: Men. 1x.
\[^{18}\] δυσσαφής: A. 3x, S. 6x, E. 17x, Theoc. 1x, Lyc. 1x, Diph. 1x, Men. 1x, Mosch. Ttrag. 1x; δυσσαφής: E. 1x; δυσσεβεία/δυσσεβημα: 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): 254–257.
\[^{20}\] 36.9.15 ἀσεβημα μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ πείρα τοῦς θεοὺς καὶ τοὺς γυναῖκας καὶ τοὺς πατέντας θάνατον.
Like 2 Maccabees, 1 Esdras is usually dated to the second century BCE, 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. 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.

Second Maccabees shares with 1 Esdras eleven words that occur nowhere else in the Septuagint: ἀκόόλουθος, ἀκολούθως, ἀπονοέα, δαπάαν, δυσσέεβεια, ἐπιβολή, ἐπιφωνέω, ἑσθής, ἔπαρχος, ἐξοδεύω. There are also nine words that the two books share with one more Septuagint book: ἔπαρχος (2 Esd), ἐπιφωνέω (3 Macc), ἑσθής (Esth AT), εὐθαρσής (3 Macc), εὐφυής (Wis), μεταλλάσσω (Esth), προσφώνεω, προστάτης (1, 2 Chr), φιλάνθρωπος (Wis, 4 Macc). Moreover, the two books share a


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 τῷ λατρεύουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ has no counterpart in a canonical text, but 5:44 στολάς ἱερατικάς ἐκατόν parallels Ezra 2:69, whose Septuagint rendering (2 Esd 2:69) is χιτῶνας τῶν ἱερέων ἐκατόν (Vaticanus). χιτῶνας/κοθωνωθ render τις, “tunics,” which in 2 Esd 17:70, 72 (MT Neh 7:70, 72) is transliterated as χοθωνωθ (χοθωνωθ τῶν ἱερεῶν). 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 location ἐν τῷ 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 ποιήσωσιν τὴν στολὴν τὴν ἑγάνε Ἀρών εἰς τὸ ἁγιόν, ἐν ἥ ἱερατείας μοι) and 35:18–19 (ἐκ τῶν στολῶν τὰς ἁγίας Ἀρών τῷ ἱερείῳ, καὶ τὰς στολάς, ἐν αἷς λειτουργήσωσιν ἐν αὐτῆς, καὶ τοὺς χιτῶνας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀρών τῆς ἱερατείας). 29 Both στολή and χιτῶνας in these verses translate τις, “garment.” The relative clause ἐν ἥ ἱερατείας, 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 λειτουργικάς in Exod 31:10 and 39:12 στολάς λειτουργικάς.

It seems likely, then, that it was the translator of 1 Esdras who introduced the combination ἱερατική 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. Ph. 290d and in Arist. Pol. 1285α10. In the papyri and the inscriptions, it is attested from the second century BCE onwards. Cf. O.Wilck. 721.3 [159 BCE] ὑπ’ ἵερατικοῖς; [παρόν]; MUSJ 29.2.1951/52.33.4 [92/91 BCE] ἐπεθετείων ἐκ τῶν ἱερατειῶν.
predilection for words containing the ἑρ- root. Second Maccabees 3:15, on the other hand, where the same combination occurs (οἱ ἱερεῖς πρὸ τοῦ θυσιαστήριον ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς ἔριζαντες ἐκυτοῦς), 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 ἱερεῶν (1:16 τῶν δὲ ἱερεῶν ἐν πᾶσιν ταῖς ἐσθήσεσι προσπεσόντων). 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 δυσσεβήμα, 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. Talshir (2001, 83) conjectures that the reading in the Vorlage of δυσσεβήμα is the result of “double translation,” i.e., the single Hebrew term ʿemareh was rendered by both ἄκαθαρσία, “a straightforward equivalent,” and δυσσεβήμα, “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, ʿemareh and possibly ἁμαρτία, “sin,” as in 2 Kgs 21:17 and 2 Chr 33:19.

The fact that δυσσεβήμα and δυσσεβήμα (as well as the more common ἄκαθαρσία 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 ἱερέως/ἱερόν, ἱερεῖς, ἱερωσύνη, ἱερατεύω, ἱερατικός, ἱερόδουλος, ἱεροψάλτης, ἱεροστάτης (absolute hapax legomenon), ἤπειρος, ἄρχιερες. See Talshir 1999, 249–55, especially 251. 2 Maccabees has an equally rich ἱερ- vocabulary: ἱερέως/ἱερόν, ἱερεῖς, ἱεράτευμα, ἱερατικός, ἱεράτης, ἱεροψάλτης, ἱεροσυλία, ἱεροσυλέω, ἱεροσύνη (absolute hapax legomenon), ἱεροσύνη, ἄρχιερες, ἄρχιερωσύνη. Especially noteworthy is the combination ἵερα σκέπα, 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 ἵερα σκέπα 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 ἵερα σκέπα τοῦ κυρίου, which occurs five times in the latter book. Also, the combination ἵερα σκέπα occurs in the Septuagint uniquely in 1 Esdras (1:50) and in 2 Maccabees (5:15; 15:11; 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 τήν ἱερὰ στολὴν; Mos. 2.159 ἵερα ἐσθήτη; J. AJ 25.6 τὴν ἱερὰν στολὴν; BJ 1.437 τὴν ἱερὰν ἐσθήτη. ἵερα ἐσθήτη also occurs in two passages of 1 Esdras (8:68, 70).

32 Chr 36:16–17 οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ κυρίῳ ἐν τῷ λαῷ κυρίῳ, ἐν τῷ ἕνῳ ἐν τῷ πάσῃ ἑν τῷ θυεῖ κύριον διὰ τὰ δυσσεβήματα προστάξας ἀναβιβάσας ἐν' αὐτοῦ κύριον θυεῖ κύριον τῶν Χαλδαίων.
no clue about the reason why the translator used them in preference over other, more common terms such as ἀσέβεια, ἀσέβημα, or ἀμάρτήμα. 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, as is the case with ἀσεβεέω/δυσσεβεέω and ἀσέβης/δυσσέβης in 2 Maccabees. Moreover, unlike ἀσέβεια and ἀσέβημα, δυσσεβεέω and δυσσέβης were not “terms common in the translator’s milieu,” as Talshir (2001, 71) contends, although the concepts they embody were, of course, common. As noted earlier, within the extant corpus of Greek literature prior to the second century BCE, δυσσέβεια occurs almost exclusively in tragic poetry, while δυσσέβης 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, 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. ἐγχάάσκω (4:19), “to gape,” ἐπακουστόός (4:12), “to be listened to, to be obeyed,” χαµαιπετήής (8:88), “prostrate.” Of special note is the usage of ἐπινίίκιον, 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), ἀσεβέια (1:22, 47), δυσσεβεέω (1:40), and δυσσέβης (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 clout of interrelated, almost onomatopoetic 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 LJSJ “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 LJSJ “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; Pha. 13.10.8.
πορευθῆναι ἐν σοῦ, 

for verbs of motion is not unattested in the Septuagint (El. 692 ἐνεγκὼν πάντα τὰ πτινίκια). 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 λάφρα πλείων ἐμερίσαντο), collected the enemies’ weapons (8:31 ὑπολογήσαντες αὐτῶν), and brought the rest of the spoils to Jerusalem (8:31 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἔγραγαν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα); 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 δὲ τοὺς ἐμπρήσαντας τοὺς ἱεροὺς πυλῶνας καὶ Καλλισθένην ὑφῆς εἰς ὑπαλίθους περεγυμνάσαντο). ἐπινίκια, in this very corrupt verse, is unanimously taken to mean “victory feast.” 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 σκύλα/λάφρα 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 ὅπως ἔκακηνοι [sc. οἱ ἐπιφανεῖς τῷ κατὰ τὴν μάχην διαπράξαμενοι] τὴν ἐν τῶν ἐπινικίων ἀπενέέγκων μούραν. 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 have to be modified by a prepositional phrase introduced by ἐν (ἐν τῇ πατρίδi) however, ἐν for εἰς with verbs of motion is not unattested in the Septuagint (cf. Tob 5:5 πορευθῆναι μετά σοῦ ἐν Ἱεροσόλυμα) or outside the Septuagint. 


40 See Kappler 1929, 63–64. 

41 The expression ἐπινίκια ἔγειν is previously unattested, but it occurs in later literature. Cf. Plu. Sull. 19 τούτης δὲ τὰ ἐπινίκια τῆς μάχης ἔγειν ἐν Θήβαις; Paus. 6.22.1 τὰ ἐπινίκια ἔγειν παρὰ τὰς θεῖας, wodurch das καὶ ἐμμηνὴλλη γίνεται, scheint mir eben aus dem Grunde bedenklich, weil auf diese Weise ἔγειν nicht mehr auf τοὺς ἐμπρήσαντας bezogen waren, und dadurch der dem Verfasser von Mac. II vertraute Gedanke der dem Vorgehen entsprechenden Vergeltung an dieser Stelle aufgehoben wäre.” 

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 καὶ ἐμμηνὴλλη γίνεται, scheint mir eben aus dem Grunde bedenklich, weil auf diese Weise ἔγειν nicht mehr auf τοὺς ἐμπρήσαντας bezogen wäre, und dadurch der dem Verfasser von Mac. II vertraute Gedanke der dem Vorgehen entsprechenden Vergeltung an dieser Stelle aufgehoben wäre.” 

43 See Johannesohn 1926, 330–32, and Blass, Debrunner, and Rehkopf 2001, §§ 205, 218. 2 Mac 5:27 ἄναχράφης οἱ τοῖς ἱερεῖς θηρίων τρίστοι διέξερσε τὸν τὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν cannot be adduced as an example of the use of ἐν for εἰς, because ἄναχράφης is here used in an absolute way (see Hanhart 1961, 20 [442]). Besides, V L ‘542 55 58 La Sy Arm Lucif read here ἄναχράφης 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 δυσπέετημα (5:20) and the absolute hapax legomenon ἱεροσύύλημα (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 (Περίδος 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, 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 Ἱασίωνα δυσσέβημα τι / πράξαν περὶ Δήητος λέγουσα ἵγαλμα). 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 δυσεβημάτων εἰσηγητὴς ἑγένετο), which, however, are of a political rather than of a religious nature.

The preceding discussion shows that, although there are conspicuous lexical points of contact between 1 Esdras and 2 Maccabees (ἱερατικόος, 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 νεκροὶ πάλιν ἐράνησαν τῷ Ἑλιοδώρῳ ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἔσθησεν ἔστολισμένοι

With regard to the type ἔσθησεν, which occurs in 2 Macc 3:33, the BDAG lexicon gives the following comment under the word ἔσθης:

The dat. pl. form ἔσθησεν, 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 ἔσθησιν Jos., Bell. 2, 176 becomes ἔσθησεν 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 ἔσθης; 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 ἔσθησεν.

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: ἔσθης εὑρήκατο παρὰ λογογράφοις καὶ ἔσθησις τὸ δὲ ἔσθησις παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ τοι τῶν ῥητόρων. 47 In Classical Greek, ἔσθης 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; 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 ἔσθης on the

---

47 Cf. the following etymological comment in the Etymologicum Gudianum (11th c.), s.v. ἔσθης: . . . τὸ δὲ ἔσθησις ἐσθήσεως σχετίζεται καὶ αὐτὸ τῇ ἔσθητα, γίνεται δὲ εὐθὺς ἐν ἔσθηει καὶ πλεονάσμω τοῦ τὸ γίνεται. θέμα παρεπτωμένον ἐσθής πρὸς ἀντικειμένων τοῦ ἔσθω τοῦ σχετικοῦ τῷ ἔσθω, οἱ μέλλων ἔσθησιν καὶ εἰς αὐτοῦ ἔσθησις ἐσθήσεως, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ ὡς ἔγγυλοι ἐν ἐσθήσεσιν ἄστρομπταισίς.

basis of the latter’s lengthened dative plural ἐσθῆσεσι and in analogy to ὑπόδεσις, “footgear” (Xenophon, Plato), and ἔνδυσις, “clothing” (LXX).

Modern grammarians and philologists generally treat the type ἐσθῆσεσι as belonging to ἐσθῆς. 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 ἐσθῆσεσι. In a subsequent study, Fraenkel (1910, 106–7) embraced Schulze’s suggestion that ἐσθῆσεσι is a “pleonastische Erweiterung” of ἐσθῆς and not a dative plural of ἔσθησις on the grounds that, unlike the dative plural ἐσθῆσεσι, 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 ἵ περὶ τὰς ἐσθῆσες καὶ ὑποδέεσ&eacute;ς... πολυτέελεα), where the accusative plural ἐσθῆσεσι is used in lieu of ἐσθῆτας, possibly in analogy to ὑποδέεσι, with which it is conjoined. Schwyzer (1953, 604) adduces another parallel (“ion. att. σφί∂ις–σιν neben σφί etw&uuml; wie ἐσθῆσεσι neben ἐσθῆς”) 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 ἐσθῆσεσιν Lk 24,4vl Apg 1,10 ist die Dativendung zur Verdeutlichung gleichsam nochmals gesetzt (statt ἐσθῆς).” Moulton and Howard (1929, 133) consider ἐσθῆσεσι to be a heteroclite dative plural of ἐσθῆς and refer to Cröner (1903, 173), who furnishes similar examples from MSS of Hellenistic writers. Lexicographers, on the other hand, from Stephanus onwards,49 treat ἐσθῆσεσι 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, ἐσθῆς 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 ἐσθῆσεσι 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 αὐτ&aring;ς ἐσθῆσεσιν ἐστολισµένοι).51 In their first appearance,

49 See, s.v., Moulton and Milligan 1914–1929, LSJ, GE, LEH, GELS, GS, SV and BDAG cite ἐσθῆσεσι under the entry for ἐσθῆς.
50 The reading ἐσθῆσεσιν is almost unanimously supported by the MSS; only three Lucianic minuscules (19 62 93) read ἐσθῆσιν.
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 τῆν περιβολήήν). 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 πρός 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 μὲν . . . 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 aforementioned 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 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+ative). 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.

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 ἐστήσησαν διὰ τὴν περιβολήν τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ; 26 παραστάντες. The phrase διαπρεπεῖς τὴν περιβολήν, in verse 26, however, does not correspond closely to the phrase ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν ἑστολισμένοι 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 ἔχουσα); another heavenly horseman, who leads Judas’ army into battle against Lysias, is described as being clad in white (11:8 ἔφιππος ἐν λευκῇ ἐσθήτι); 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 ἐξοντας); 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 (νεανίας ἐστιν διαπρεπεῖς τὴν περιβολήν). We may conjecture that the phrase ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν ἑστολισμένοι 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 ἱερεῶν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐσθήσεσι προσεπέσαντον. 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 ἥχαρι δὲ καὶ ἀηδὲς τὸ σκάλα δημάκτης πρὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς ῥίψαντες ἑαυτούς; 3 Macc 1:16 τῶν δὲ ἱερεῶν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐσθήσεσι προσεπέσαντον. 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

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 υἱοταις 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-ἱερατικεῖς. 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, 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 ἐσθήσις; Mos. 1.153.4 ἐν ἐσθήσι καὶ τροφαῖς; Spec. 2.20.9 ἐσθήσαν ἠλουργαίσι) and ἐσθήσασι 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 ἠχοκήσαν αὐτοῦ; 2.152.5 τοῖς ἱερεῖσι καὶ ταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν υἱών). 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, the dative plural ἐσθήσεσι 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 στρικκαίσι). The latter dative is followed, a few verses further on, by the dative ἐσθῆσι (7.137 ἠλουργαίσι ἐσθήσι), 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 ἐσθήσις) shows that ἐσθήσεσι is far from being the unanimous reading of the MSS in the six aforementioned passages. Several MSS, among which are some of the best textual witnesses, read ἐσθησεσι/ἐσθητεσι/αισθησεσι instead. Eusebius (HE 2.6.7; 2.20.5), quoting from Jewish War (BJ 2.176, 255), also has ἐσθήσεσι instead of ἐσθήσασι; Eusebius’ quotations are earlier than all the other textual witnesses of Josephus. As can be seen, the only apparent reason

57 In the critical apparatus to his edition of De virtutibus (1906, 5:277), Cohn notes that at 39.4 ἐσθήσις is the lectio vulgata; two MSS read αἰσθήσις and some others ἐσθησεσι.
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 ἔσθησαν into the main text and relegated the MSS reading ἐσθήσεσι 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 ἴδον ἄνδρες δύο ἐπέστησαν αὐταῖς ἐν ἔσθητι ἀστραπτούσῃ) and the second in the ascension narrative (Acts 1:10 καὶ ἴδον ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς ἐν ἔσθησεσι λευκαῖς). A number of textual witnesses read ἐσθησεσιν ἀστραπτουσαις instead of ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ in Luke 24:4, and ἐσθητι λευκη instead of ἐσθῆσεσι λευκαῖς in Acts 1:10; in the latter verse, ἐσθῆσεσι 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. 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. 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


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 Mack kannte oder irgendeine andere Fassung der Heliodorlegende.” Windisch was criticized by Lönig (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 ἐσθήήσεσι in non-Jewish Greek literature. They are clustered mainly between the first century BCE and the second century CE. 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 Théiler] ἀνθιναῖς ἐσθήήσεσι). Théiler assigns this passage to Posidonius’ early work On the Ocean, which was likely completed shortly after 87/86 BCE. 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. Posidonius wrote the parts of these works that, according to Lasserre, served as sources to Strabo after 72 BCE. Strabo himself composed the third book of his Geography in 17 or 18 CE. Another Posidonian passage bearing the type ἐσθήήσεσι 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 Théiler] ἐσθήήσεσι πολυτελέσι); ἐσθήήσεσι, in this passage, was obviously chosen for the sake of homoioteleuton. Athenaeus, as noted previously, preserves the single attestation of the accusative plural ἐσθήήσεις (1.32.27 Kaibel ἡ περὶ τὰς ἐσθήήσεις καὶ ύποδέέσεις . . . πολυτέελεια), which is contemporary (second half of the second century CE) with the single instance of the genitive singular ἐσθήήσεως in Pollux’s Onomasticon (10.51 τὰ τῆς ἐσθήήσεως εἴδη). In the same second century belong the instance in Polyænus’ Strategemata (6.49.1.9 οἰκετικαῖς ἐσθήήσεσι), in Aquila’s translation of Isaiah (23:18 εἰς ἐσθήσιν μετάπρεσως), and the earliest of the three papyrological instances (BGU 1.16.12 [159/160 CE] ἐρεάῖς ἐσθήήσεσι). It is hard to date with precision the occurrence of the dative plural in Memnon of Heraclea (FHG 3:59.28 ἐν πενθίίς ἐσθήήσεσι), a historian of the Imperial period, whose work cannot be placed later than the second century CE.

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 ἐνικέναι τε φησιν αὐτὸν ζωγράφῳ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσι καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς σχήμασι

62 Almost all the subsequent instances of the type ἐσθήήσεσι 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.
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.
πάσας ἐπικοσμοῦντι τὰς γραφές, ἐσθησί is Ammon’s emendation\(^7\) of the MSS reading ἐσθησεσι/αισθησεσι, which was adopted by all editors since Usener and Radermacher.\(^7\)

The emendation is not really justified, given that the type ἐσθησεσι is attested, as we saw, in authors slightly anterior or posterior to Dionysius (Posidonius, Philo). The question is whether ἐσθησεσι might have originated with Dionysius or with Philonicus. The former uses ἐσθησ ὀντες forty-eight times, two of which are in the standard dative plural ἐσθησι (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.”\(^7\) His date cannot be fixed more narrowly than between the fourth and the first centuries BCE. If the type ἐσθησεσι 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.\(^7\)

To summarize, aside from 2 Maccabees, the type ἐσθησεσι, 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, καὶ ταφῆς ἀξιῶσαι, οἰωνοβρώωτους δὲ σὺν τοῖς νηπίιοις ἐκρίζειν θηρίοις

A search in LSJ yields some thirty compound adjectives that have the verbal βρωτόος as second member. Of these, only four are Classical,\(^7\) some fifteen are first attested in literary and documentary texts from the time of Aristotle to the end of the first century BCE,\(^7\) 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. 1386’3 τοὺς συναπεργαζόενους σχῆς καὶ φωναῖς καὶ αἰσθησι καὶ ὅλως ἐν ὑποκρίσει. αἰσθησι is the reading of the most authoritative manuscript, A (Cod. Parisinus 1741). Other manuscripts read ἔσθησι, 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 (1386’2) occurs the type ἔσθητας, which gives support to the reading ἔσθητι or to its emendation to ἔσθησι, which matches the plurals in the polysyndeton σχῆς καὶ φωναῖς καὶ αἰσθησι.

\(^{74}\) ζῷος (S.), ἐθνοῖσθεντος (S.), ἡμιώνοσ τος (X.), καλανήμοσ τος (A.).

\(^{75}\) ἀὐτόριστος, εὐρίσκωτος, θηρίορίσκωτος, κρισίσκωτος, κυτίσκωτος, κυνήγωτος, κυνηγὸς, παιδίσκωτος, πυρίσκωτος, σκελετός, σκελητοῦκος, ἀσκελητόκος,
met with ἡμιοπρόβατος, **GELS** "eaten by wild beasts” (Gen 44:28), καρπόβρατος, **GELS** "with edible fruit” (Deut 20:22), ὀλιγόβρατος (2 Macc 9:15; 3 Macc 6:34), and στητόβρατος, **GELS** "moth-eaten” (Job 13:28b), which are neologisms, as well as with ἡμιβρατος, **GELS** "inedible” (Prov 24:22e), first attested in the active sense of "without eating" in a Sophoclean fragment (967 Radt). Aside from 2 and 3 Maccabees, ὀλιγόβρατος occurs in Philodemus, in Strabo, and then only in lexico-graphical 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. ὀλιγόβρατος 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 (οἱ τε πρὶν εἰς ἄλθρον καὶ ὀλιγοβράτως υἱῶτος [sc. τούς Ἰουδαίους] ἔσεσθαι τοῖς θηρίονος), in the same context of an unfulfilled 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 ὀλιγόβρατος, and its counterpart κυνόβρατος, are used to describe the fate of soldiers killed in land battles (Mort. 33.21–22 Henry ὀλιγόβρατοι καὶ κυνόβρατοι γε[γο][νασ][θ]υμ[α]); 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 [8'] ὑπὶ ἱζ[ής]ον κ[ρα][τ]ερο[θ]ηματι[α] ... τ[ου] γη<σ> εκερμαμένον ὑπὶ εὐλόχων καὶ σκωλήκην). The juxtaposition of ὀλιγόβρατος and κυνόβρατος resonates with Homer’s frequent pairing of οἰνοὶ with κυνὲς 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 ὀλιγόβρατος in surviving Greek literature is found in Strabo. The geographer employs it with respect to the Zoroastrian Magi, whose co-

---

76 Kuiper 1925, 96.
77 Kuiper (1925, 86n8) sees in the conjunction of the two verbal adjectives an allusion to the op-

---

78 “surprisingly infrequent occurrence” and “a rather uncommon formula in the *Iliad*.” The combinations θρία and οἰνοί (Od. 24.292) and κύνες and γυναι (Il. 18.271; 22.42) are indeed infrequent.

79 Cf. 15.1.62, where Strabo, drawing on Aristotle, one of Alexander’s historians, reports that at Taxila the bodies of the dead are thrown to the vultures: τὸ γυνὴ ἔβλποσθα τοῖς τετελευτημένοις.
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, in Near Eastern literary and documentary texts, and in the Hebrew Bible. 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. Creon ordering that Polyneices and the defeated Argives be left unburied to become carriorn for birds and dogs is as cruel as the Assyrian kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal who issued similar decrees, 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, 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 (ἔτειγόωξει), not as a fait accompli.

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 νόμοι (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.
85 Compare II. 13.831 Τριώνες κυρίες κόνις ζηνοθ’ οἰωνοὺς / δημίου καὶ σφέρσει μεν 1 Kgdms 17:44 καὶ δόσω τας πάρκας σου της πετεινοῦ του οὐρανοῦ καὶ της κτήνου της γης.
86 Cf. Th. 1020–21 τηρίαν τον ζηνοθ’ οἰωνον δοκει / ταρεμίν οἰωνον τούτον έτειγομεν καί η θαμαν / η λαμαν δε γικαν / και προς οιωνον δεμες / και προς κυνον δεστον / E. Ph. 1634 έτειγομεν έτειγομεν έτειγομεν οἰωνον δοκειν.
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, zibu-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 ή πλήθος άταφων ἐκρύφαι).
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 οἰωνόμπρωτος, it is rather unlikely that the author of 2 Maccabees chose, or coined, it on the basis of the similarly formed compound θηριόμπρωτος in Gen 44:28, as there does not seem to be any intertextual connection between the latter verse and 2 Macc 9:15: θηριόμπρωτος, a free rendering of that of 1 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 ἑκατομῶν ἐκτενῶς ἑβδομαδιαίως ἔκει κατὰ μέρος ἐδώσαν τοῖς ἀρνίοις.


3 Kgdms 12:24m, 16:4, 20:24; Jer 15:3.


93 Cf. Ath. exp. Ps. PG 27:357 τούτων ἑδίκον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀναφερόμενων πικρῶς κατὰ τῶν καιρῶς τοῦ Ἀντιόχου; Eus. d. e. PG 22:721 τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐβδομηκοστοῦ ἐγκύου, ἐπερίποιτο κατὰ τοὺς Ἀντιόχου χρόνους τοῦ κηθήντος Ἑσιφρόνος, ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ἐλληνίζων, πλείστως ὡς ὧν ἠδραν νομοῖς καὶ γυναικαῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἰκείου νόμου καὶ τῆς πατρίδος εὐσεβείας ἄνθρωποι, ποικίλας προακιζόμενος τιμωρίας, εἰς ἑκατον τυχόντων τὸν καιρόν, καὶ εἰς τούς μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν Ἀντιόχο τὸ ἑκατάκτου, ἀναρχεῖ ο Ἀράχων τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐβδομηκοστοῦ ἐγκύου ἐκλείου, ἀρρητοὶ δὲ τὸ λόγω ἢ τῶν καλουμένων Μακεδονίων γραφῆς [continues by quoting 1 Macc 7:12–17]; Thdt. Ps. PG 80:1504 Ἀντιόχου, τοῦ ἐπίσκοπον Ἑσιφρόνος, τὴν κατὰ τὸν λαόν τῶν Ἰουδαίων μανίαν ὧ προφητικῆς θεσπίζει λόγως.
and Jer 7:33, the slaughter that ensued the destruction of Jerusalem: 2
ἔθεντο τὰ θνησικαῖα τῶν δούλων σου βρώτα χταῖς γῆς. 3 ἔξεχεν τὸ ζώον των ἀτόμων ὡς διωρ κύκλω Ιερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ο θάπτων. These verses are partially quoted in 1 Macc 7:17 (κρέας ὡς διωρ κύκλω Ιερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ο 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 αὐτόόν) 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.” Thus, although Psalm 79 [LXX 78] was not written in the Maccabean period, its text served to actualize events that occurred in that period.

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 κατάβρωται τεθάπτων τοις 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.


97 Dimant (1988, 390–91) adduces 1 Mac 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 ἀπεκαλέσατο τὸν τερατοποιόν 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, τὰ σημεία, and τὰ τέρατα, the two last terms often found in conjunction with one another.98 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 Ἔστω, δέσποτα, ἀπέστειλας τὸν ἄγγελόν σου ἐπὶ Εζεκίου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀνέλει ἐκ τῆς παρεβολῆς Σενναχηρεί ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκον πέντε χιλιάδας. ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθὸν 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:(7)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 παντεπότης (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 τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐν πάσιν τοῖς θαυμασίοις μου, ὰις 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 ὁµιως σου, δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἀγίως, θαυμαστός 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. 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, ἐγέθει βραχίονός σου ἀπολιθωθήσαν, 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 παρεβολῆς τῶν ὕιων 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 ἅδηγησον τὸν λαὸν τούτον εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὅν εἰπά σοι: ἱδοῦ ὁ ἄγγελός μου προπορεύσεται πρὸ προσώπου σου; 33:2 καὶ συναποστελῶ τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρότερόν σου, καὶ ἐκβαλεί τὸν Ἀμορραίον καὶ Χετταίον); 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 ὁ Ἰούδας τὸν κύριον σύμμαχον φανῆναι καὶ προοδηγὸν τοῦ πολέμου).

Strangely enough, the phraseology at 15:23 (ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἄγαθὸν ἐμπροσθεν 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 39:25; Ezek 12:11; OG Dan 4:34; Add Esth F6; 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 (κύριος ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ἐμπροσθέν 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 ἀνείλεν ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν Λασορίων ἐκατὸν θύυραν ἐπὶ τῆς χιλιάδας), whereas the parallel passage in 1 Macc 7:41 (ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελός σου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐκατὸν θύυραν ἐπὶ τῆς χιλιάδας) is phraseologically closer to 4 Kgdms 19:35 (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ τῶν Λασορίων ἐκατὸν θύυραν ἐπὶ τῆς 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” (παρελεύειν τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος), while the Angel of Yahweh is praised in the Song of the Sea:107 Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἐπεισέλθεν τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελός σου ἐπιφανῆς ἐπὶ τὰς οἰκίας ἥµῶν. 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 ἀποστρόφων, for which Yahweh is praised in the Song of the Sea.108 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) and 4 Kgdms 19:35 (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ τῶν Λασορίων ἐκατὸν θύυραν ἐπὶ τῆς χιλιάδας). 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.109 Although the angel of Yahweh and the Destroyer are rather distinct in their functions and appearances in the Bible,110 in Judas’ prayer they conflate into a single angel, whose apparition is invoked as a manifestation of Yahweh’s teratopoic faculty. This angel is called ἀγαθόός, 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

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 (ἀνέέλαβον ὄδην πάτρων τῶν σωτῆρα καὶ τερατοποιῶν αἰνοῦντες θεόν). Croy (2006, 107), following Grotius (1776, 381), argues that the πάτρως ὄδη 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, 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 resemblance 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 ἄγαθός has perplexed many commentators. Schwartz (2008, 421) wonders, “Can anyone imagine that God might send a bad angel? True, God was presumed to have at His disposal angles 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 ἱεροπρεπεστάατη ὄδη (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, τερατοφύλακας, 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 χήλους ἐμπότισεν ἀπὸ τὴν πρᾶσιν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἅγιαν
15:3 ὁ δὲ τρισαλιτήριος [μ. Νικάνωρ] ἐπηρώτησεν, εἰ ἐστιν ἐν υἱῷ πίθου δυνάστης ὁ προστεταχως άγιαν τῶν σαββάτων ἠμέραν

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), ἀσεβὴς (4:13; 8:2; 10:10), βλασφήμος and ἁνδροφόνος (9:28), δυσσεβής (3:11; 8:14; 9:9; 15:33), δύσφημος (13:11; 15:32), ἱερότατος (12:35), μιαρώτατος (4:38; 12:6), μιερός (4:19; 7:34; 9:13; 15:32), παράνομος (14:27), παράσινας (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, ἁνδροφόνος, ἀνόσιος, ἀσεβὴς, βλασφήμος, δυσσεβής, μιερός, and πάντων ἁνδρῶν 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, 243n4a, 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
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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 τούς ὑπὸ τοῦ τρισαλιτηρίου παραδεδομένους εἰς ἐφανειον Ἰουδαίως εὐρίσκομεν οὐ κακοῦργους ἄντας) and the Alpha Text (7(E):27(15) τοὺς οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ τρισαλιτηρίου παραδεδομένους ἡμίν Ἰουδαίως εὑρίσκομεν μὴ ἄντας κακοῦργους), 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, most likely written by the same author 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, at the time of the translation of the book, or whether they came into existence at a previous or later phase. According to the ‘colophon’ 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, the redaction of

Antiochus IV (9:9), and ἐκθυμος, in the phrase ἐκθυμος γενόμενος ὃ ἑστηκε, which occurs thrice in the epitome, is used of two different kings, of Antiochus IV (7:3, 39) and of Demetrius I (14:27).

In chapter 8, Nicanor is called δυσσεβής and τρισαλιτήριος; in chapter 15 (the same or different) Nicanor is called δυσσεβής, δύσφημος, μιρής, and τρισαλιτήριος.

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, 50n39) 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.


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 precedeed the LXX Esther and served as the model of the Vetus Latina of Esther.

So Moore 1973, 386; id. 1977, 165.

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.

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 \textit{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 \textit{terminus ante quem} is 93/94 CE, since Josephus, in his paraphrase of Esther in the \textit{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

\(^{123}\) 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 (\textit{ἀλιτήριος}) but without the intensifying \textit{τρίς} (\textit{AJ} 11.279 ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλιτηρίου πρὸς ἀπώώλειαν ἐκδοθέεντας Ἰουδαίους οὐ πονηροὺς κατανοήες).

\(^{126}\) 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 13\textsuperscript{th} of Adar.

the use of Ptolemaic terminology, which speaks for an Egyptian/Alexandrian rather than Jerusalemite 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 τρισευδαίί occurs in 2 Maccabees and not in Addition E to Esther.

The not so numerous adjectives compounded with the intensive τρῖς 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, τρισάμενος, "three-pleased, most willing," in Xenophon (An. 3.2.24), and the negatively loaded τρισκακοδαίί, "three-unlucky," in Aeschines (1.59), τρισκατάρατος, "three-accursed," in Demостhenes (25.82), and τριπάανουργος, "a whore in the third degree," in Κεθοπόμπου (ΦΓρΗ 2b, 115, fr. 253.7). In the Septuagint, the mother of the seven martyrs is characterized as τρισδιά, "three-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 Pasoni dell’Acqua 2004, 75–81, 86–88, with further references, and Κόλλερ 2014, 123.
130 Τo our knowledge, the only scholar who has postulated that 2 Maccabees postdates the LXX version of Esther is Βαρθκ (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, Μιλερ (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 Φύσκον (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 Μοζο (1924, 293) has pointed out, when Φύσκον 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 Φίλιμπος, which had started in 170 BCE. Thus, the year 145 BCE was the 25th of his reign. See Η. Βολκμάν, ”Ποτολεμαίους. Ευρέγητη;,” PW 23.2, cols. 1722–23 and Σαμουέλ 1962, 145–47.

---

131 τριπλάσιος (H. Il. 8.488; Call. Cer. 138), τριπλάνωρος (Mel. AP 12.57), τριπλήθης (Misch. 51; Βίων 58), τριπλάσιος (S. OC 372; Αρ. Παξ 242; Men. Asp. 414; Δυσ. 423, 466; Επιτ. 610; Μιν. 260; Πκ. 346; fr. 74.1 Κοκκ; Μαχ. fr. 17.396 Gωωω), τριπλάπλως (Mel. AP 12.137), τριπλασίαμος (Β. Επιμ. 3.10 Ιριγινι), τριπλασίαμος (Αρ. Αεχ. 1024; Παξ 1271; Θ. 209, 875; Ρα. 19; Εν. 1098; Πλ. 851; Men. Δυσ. 523, 620; Επιτ. 145, 913; Πκ. 978), τριπλάσιπτος (Αρχεσεφ. fr. 45.13 Βραντ; Men. Επιτ. 1086; fr. 71.1 Κοκκ), τριπλάκα (Hom. Od. 5.306; 6.184, 155; Ἑσ. fr. 211.7; Αρ. Παξ 1334; Call. Αεχ. 178.32 Πελλερ), τριπλασίπτος (Ar. fr. 60.6 West; Αρ. Αεχ. 400; Νυ. 166; Β. 1293; Αρ. 1273, 1707; Φίλημ. fr. 93.1 Κοκκ), τριπλασιοὶ (Archil. fr. 228 West; Cerc. fr. 17, col.i.13 Powell), τριπλάσιος (S. fr. 837.1 Ραττ; Αρ. Εκ. 1129; Φίλημ. fr. 93.1 Κοκκ). On the intensive τρῖς, "very commonly employed in affective speech," see Τθέλτες 1954, 177.

132 A detailed investigation of the use of ἀλιτήριος and related words is Χάτ 1908.

133 Τh. 1.126.11 ἔναντι καὶ ἀλιτήριον τῆς θεοῦ ἐκείνη τῆς [sc. the Alcmæonids, because of the slaughter of Κῦλον and his followers who had taken sanctuary at the altar of Αθηνᾶ] ἐκκλῆσθαι καὶ τὸ γένος τὸ ἂντ’ ἐκείνων; Αρ. Εγκ. 445 ἐκ τῶν ἀλιτήριων σὲ φρήμα γεγονέναι τῶν τῆς θεοῦ (reference to the Alcmæonids); Ανδ. 1.51 ἀναγγέλεται ἐν στήλης ὡς ὡς ἀλιτήριος τῶν θεῶν Λυκ. 6.52 ἄργα θεοῦ ἐν τῶν ἀλιτήριον ἄντα ἀλιτήριον ὡς ἀλιτήριον ὥστε 6.53 χρή νομίζειν . . . ἀπαλλαττομένους Λαυκάκην τὴν πόλιν καθάρειν καὶ ἀποθεατουμένους καὶ φαινομένους ἀποπείπειν καὶ ἀλιτήριον ἀπαλλαττάσθαι; 13.79 ὅπερ ἀλιτήριον
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. In the Middle and New Comedy, both these senses recede, and ἀλειτήριος 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.

In 2 Maccabees, ἀλειτήριος is applied collectively, first to Timothy’s soldiers put to flight by Judas (12:23 συγκεκόμον τοὺς ἀλειτήριον διέβατον τοις μυριάδας τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν) and then to the five hundred soldiers that the general Nicanor sends to seize Razis, the pious defender of Judaism, obliterating him to a heroic suicide (14:42 ἀνέγῳς θέλων ἀποθανεῖν ἦπει τοις ἀλειτήριον ὑποχερίον γενέσθαι). The two individuals who earn the designation of ἀλειτήριος and τρισαλειτήριος 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 his country (4:50, 5:15), and even led Antiochus IV to the Temple to plunder it (5:15), embodies the ἀλειτήριον 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


135 Eub. fr. 88.2 Kock τρέφει ἐν Θεσσαλία τες, ἄθροισες βαρβαρίας; / πουστών, πολέμισες ἐν καλότεροις, Strato Com. fr. 219.49 Austin καὶ μια δικαι θαφαενοταιούτῳ τυχόν, / δολίου γεγονος ἐκ παῖδος ἀλειτήριος / ἐπειτα πεταλείθη τῶν Ὀμυρον χημάτων; 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 Hermomis. The routed adversaries are called in this letter ἀλειτήριοι (if Crusius’ emendation of λιττηριος to λιττηριον is correct): Chr. Wück. 11 Λ, 2, Fr.C.41 [Pathyris, 123 BCE] τινος υποταγέων δ’ Ἑλλάδων ἐν τῇ [νήσῳ] συνάναπτος τοὺς ληφθέοις καὶ ἀνόσιμοι εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ἐναλάβατοι.

137 The adjective is also used in the plural in 3 Maccabees (3:16 τῷ ἱερῷ τῶν ἀλειτήριων), 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). Haman’s unaccomplished crimes are of a political rather than of a religious nature, 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 that its exclusive use in these two original Greek compositions as a designation of two potential exterminators of the Jewish people 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 ἡ ἡμῖν διὰ τέλους τὰ πράγματα; Add E:8 εἰς τὸ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀτάραχον τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώπωι μετ’ εἰρήνης παρεξέμεθα. 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 recurs in a few Byzantine writers from the fifth century CE onwards. Hesychius (s 1426) glosses it as ἀμφιπτωλός.

141 Cf. 2 Macc 8:9 Νικάνορα τοῖς Πατρόκλου τῶν πρώτων φίλων ἀπέστειλεν . . . τὸ σύμπαν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἠξάρα τὸν γόνας καὶ ἐβουλεύσατο [sc. Ἀμαχ] ἀφανίσαι πάντας τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀρταξέρξεως βασιλείαν Ἰουδαίας.
Jews in 163 BCE, granting them permission to live according to their laws and practice their religion.\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{143} royal decrees of the Antioci, 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,\textsuperscript{144} the most conspicuous phraseological parallel between LXX Esther and 2 Maccabees is that between Alcimus’ speech in 2 Mac 14:6 (οὐκ ἔωσεν τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυχεῖν) and Haman’s letter in Add B:5 (πρὸς τὸ µὴ τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυγχάνειν). Although εὐσταθεία and its cognate verb εὐσταθέω are elsewhere attested in contexts referring to political stability,\textsuperscript{145} the combination εὐσταθείας τυγχάνειν/τυχεῖν occurring in the two deuterocanonical texts is unique.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 (προσαλιτηήριος, ταῖς ἀληθείαις, and the combination of ἀτάραχος and βασιλεία and of εὐσταθεία 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.\textsuperscript{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, 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).

\[\textsuperscript{142}\] De Troyer (2000, 276 and 398).

\[\textsuperscript{143}\] On the authenticity of these documents, see 1.2.2.


\[\textsuperscript{146}\] In Add Esth B:7 we also find the phrase ὅπως ... ἐν τῷ μετέπειτα χρόνῳ εὐστάθη καὶ ἄταρχη παρέχωσιν ἥμιν διὰ τέλους τὰ πράγματα, which is echoed closely in the following line from Ptolemy Philopator’s decree in 3 Mac 3:26: διαλέγομεν εἰς τῶν ἐπίλουν χρόνων τελείως ἥμιν τὰ πράγματα ἐν εὐσταθεία ... κατασταθήσεσθαι.

\[\textsuperscript{147}\] See Appendix 8, 35–37.

\[\textsuperscript{148}\] 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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{150} For a critique of some of Motzo’s arguments, see Magliano-Tromp 2009, 60–65.

\textsuperscript{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, κώύθων (Esth 8:17; 3 Macc 6:31) and υπερχαρήής (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 κώύθων, Hacham writes that “because the verb κψθωνίζω appears elsewhere in the Septuagint this parallel carries less weight” (p. 774n39). One may concede this point to him because κώύθων, 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 υπερχαρήής, 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 Polyaeus, 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{153}

4.2.7 ψυχυχενώ ‘to carry the neck high,’ ‘to behave haughtily’

The personification of hubris in 2 Maccabees is King Antiochus IV, whose God-defying arrogance is denoted by such terms as ἀγερωχία, ἀλαζονεία, ὑπερηφανία, ὑπερήφανος, ὑπερήφανως, and ἀρχουσιν.\textsuperscript{154} It is notable that it is Addition E that preserves the Euripidean order of the substantive 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 θράσις (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).

Additions B and E seem also to have copied verbatim a phrase that originates in the story of the three bodyguards in 1 Esd. In 1 Esd 3:2, K Darius hosts a banquet for the high-ranking officials of his empire, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἅμα; ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλίκης ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλίκης ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω. In LXX Esther, the same phrase occurs in the passages immediately preceding the Additions B and E (3:12 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλίκης ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω). 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 ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλίκης ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐλικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω). 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 Rahilis. … 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.”

\textsuperscript{152} Additions B and E seem also to have copied verbatim a phrase that originates in the story of the three bodyguards in 1 Esd. In 1 Esd 3:2, K Darius hosts a banquet for the high-ranking officials of his empire, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἅμα; ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλίκης ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω. In LXX Esther, the same phrase occurs in the passages immediately preceding the Additions B and E (3:12 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλίκης ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω). 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 ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλίκης ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω; ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐλικῆς ἑκατὸν ἑταῖροι; ἄνω). 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 Rahilis. … 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.”

\textsuperscript{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 Rahilis. … 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.”

\textsuperscript{154} 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 ἑφερέω (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, 165 already employed of Antiochus, and the verbs ἐκτείνω (15:6) and μεγαλαυχέω (15:32).

μεγαλαυχέω, first attested in Aeschylus (Ag. 1528), is sparsely found in prose prior to 2 Maccabees. 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 ἐπήρεσεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σιὼν καὶ ἐμεγαλαυχήσεν 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 ... ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ). 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 ἑκτείνω, 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 θλίψις αὐτοῦ καθέξεσθαι ὡς προτειίνας προτεστάτης πίπτων. 25 ὦτι ἔχειν χεῖρας ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου, ἐναντίον δὲ κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐπηρεχθέσαι, ἐθραμαν δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρει, “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 ασφαλείας instead of ἀλαζονείας.
157 Inc. (1x), Pl. (3x), Plb. (4x).
158 Cf. Sennacherib’s threats against Jerusalem delivered through Rapsakes in 4 Kgdms 18:29 (μὴ ἐπαρέει τῇ ἑδρᾳ Εζεκιας λόγος, ὅτι οὐ μὴ δύνηται ὑμᾶς ἐξελέεσθαι ἐκ χειρός μου) and 18:35 (τὰ ἐξέτεινεν τῶν γαῶν οἳ γαῖς ἐξελέεσθαι τὰς γᾶς τῶν θεῶν, ὅτι ἐξελάντο τὰς γᾶς τῶν θεῶν ἐκ χειρός μου), and in Isa 36:20. Schwarz (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 παρακάλεσε, τῷ ἔργῳ, τῇ θυγατέρᾳ Σιὼν, “O mount Zion, your hand encourage daughter Sion” NETS).
159 Cf. 1 Mac 7:47 τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ Νικανοῦ], ἵνα ἐκτείνειν υπερηφανίας.
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 ναό.
Joban passage: τὴν χεῖρα ἐκτείνας in 2 Macc 15:32 echoes the ἑρκεν χεῖρας in Job 15:25, ψαυχενέω in 2 Macc 15:6 corresponds to ἐπραχχύλασεν (the verb, a neologism of LXX Job, means "to arch the neck proudly, like a horse") in Job 15:25, μετὰ πάσης ἀλαζονείας in 2 Macc 15:6 is equivalent to ὑβρεῖ in Job 15:26, 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 ψαυχενέω, alternatively with μεγαλοκυρία, in an attempt either to come up with a semantic variant of τραχχύλασω or, more unlikely, to render the Hebrew תָּנּוּ, "with the neck." In their aforesaid 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 ψαυχενέω, which, from its first appearance onwards, is used metaphorically of boastful individuals. The meaning "to boast" was probably transferred to it from the rare, poetical verb ὑψαυχενεώ, a synonym of the previously discussed compound

164 Cf. Hsch. τ 1292 τραχχύλασω· ψῆν αὐχήν· τ 1291 τραχχύλασας· ἐναντιωθεῖς. ἀπειθῆς· Suid. ε 3333 ἐπραχχύλασε· κατισχύσατο· ἡ ἐγαυρίεσσαν, ἀπὸ τῶν βωμῶν τῶν ἀποβαλλόντων τοῦ τραχχυλοῦ τοῦ ζυγοῦ. Theodotion’s version has κατισχύσατο.

165 The translator of Job rendered "μετὰ πάσης ἀλαζονείας ἐπραχχύλασεν" with "bid defiance to the Almighty" (NRSV), with ἐναντιωθείς, δὲ ἐναντιωθείς· ἐναντιωθείς, although it is clear that it occurs in Ps. 75:6(5) γῆς ἐκτείνεται, "[do not speak] with insolent neck" (NRSV). As he notes, the expression ἐκτείνεται 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 ἐκτείνεται, 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 "ψῆν" and rendered it by ὑβρεῖ (whereas Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus rendered it literally with τραχχύλασω). Cf. Isa 3:16 ὑβρίσθησαν καὶ θυγατέερες Σιων καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ψῆν τραχχύλης καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν θυγατέερες Σιων. 166 Dhomme (1967, 220) renders ψῆν as "with neck outstretched" (cf. Vulg. erecto collo) and relates it to Ps 75:6(5) γῆς ἐκτείνεται, "[do not speak] with insolent neck." (NRSV). As he notes, the expression ἐκτείνεται 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 ἐκτείνεται, 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 "ψῆν" and rendered it by ὑβρεῖ (whereas Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus rendered it literally with τραχχύλασω). Cf. Isa 3:16 ὑβρίσθησαν καὶ θυγατέερες Σιων καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ψῆν τραχχύλης καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν θυγατέερες Σιων. 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 (SVP 3:526) and in Jewish works written around the turn of the Common Era (Ps. Phoc. 62; Sib. Or. 2:134). The cognate adjective ψαυχής occurs in Bacchylides (13.31 Iqigoin ψαυχής κόκκος), "a high-vaulting girl") and nowhere else.
μεγαλπονέω. ὑψαυχανέω 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 μονότοι τῶν ἐθνῶν βασιλεύσειν καὶ τοῖς ἐξυπηρετήταις 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” (γνωτίζω), expressing stubbornness 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 σκληροτράάχηλος. 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 aforesaid surviving attestations of the verb start clustering.

168 Adontz (1937, 10) suggested that the words αὐχήήν, “neck, throat,” and αὐχήή, “boasting,” whose etymology is unknown, are related to the Armenian awji-, “collar.” As evidence of the relation between the two Greek nouns he adduced the verbs ὑψαυχενέω and ὑψαυχενέω: “Les mots ὑψαυχενέω ’relever la tête, être hautain,’ ὑψαυχενέω ’se vanter, être fier’ [et] ὑψαυχενός prouvent que αὐχήή ‘jactance’ se rattache à αὐχήή ‘cou.’” Both DELG and EDG, s.v. ὑψαυχέω, discard this conjecture as unconvincing.


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.
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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 (δειλανδρέεω, τερατοποιόός, τρισαλιτήήριος) are attested only in the Septuagint and the literature dependent on it; the rest (δυσσέέβη, ἐσθήσις, οἰωνόόβρωτος, ψυχυγενέω) 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, τερατοποιόός points intertextually to Exod 15:11 and δειλανδρέεω (less explicitly) to Deut 20:8; on the other hand, δυσσέέβη belongs to a word-group attested mainly in Greek tragic poetry, οἰωνόόβρωτος resonates with Greek epic and tragic poetry, and τρισαλιτήήριος 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 δειλανδρέεω and ἐσθήσις. With regard to the issue of lexical dependence, we argued that ἐσθήσις, οἰωνόόβρωτος, τερατοποιόός, and ψυχυγενέω were likely borrowed from 2 Maccabees by the author of 3 Maccabees, δειλανδρέεω by the author of 4 Maccabees, and τρισαλιτήήριος by the author of Addition E to Esther. In the case of δυσσέέβη, 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 δυσσέέβη 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: δειλανδρέεω, οἰωνόόβρωτος, τερατοποιόός, τρισαλιτήήριος, ψυχυγενέω, as well as with κατασφαλίζοµαι (which occurs in the second prefixed letter) and Ἰουδαϊσ, which were not discussed in detail in this chapter. We hesitate to add ἐσθήσις 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. 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 (τρισαλιτήηριος) 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 (δικαιοκρίίτης 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 ο’) and the Alpha Text (designated by the siglum Λ) 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), a pagan Greek divine designation originating in Greek lyric and dramatic poetry such as παγκρατής (3:22), an epithet adopted from other Septuagint books such as παντοκράτωρ (11x), but also terms that are not attested prior to the Septuagint, such as δικαιοκρίτης (12:41), παντεπόόπτης (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. 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. 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.

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, δικαιοκρίτης does not seem to allude to a specific verse in the Septuagint. Although the words δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη, conjoined with κρίων and its cognates, often occur in the Septuagint in

---

1 See Appendix 5, 25n45.
2 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.i.2 (Hymn to the Dictean Zeus); AP 7.2.
3 See Montevecchi 1957 and van Henten 1996.
4 Codex Venetus reads, reversely, δικαιοκρίτην at 12:6 and δικαιοκρίτου at 12:41.
5 8:11 οὐ προσδεχόμενος τὴν παρὰ τοῦ παντοκράτορος μελλούσαν παρεκκλειούσθαι αὐτῷ δίκην; 8:13 οί ἀπιστοῦντες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δίκην 9:18 ἐπεκλήθη γὰρ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν δικαία ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσις (cf. 7:35, 36).
6 1:24–25 Κύριε κύριε ὁ θεός . . . δ νομοδικος καὶ ἰσχυρός καὶ δίκαιος . . . δ μόνος δίκαιος.
7 See 4.2.5.
relation to God’s justice, the combination δίκαιος κριτής, aside from 2 Macc 12:6, is found only in Ps 7:12a and in Ps. Sol. 2:18 and 9:2c. In Ps 7:12a, 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.

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. 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 φανερά ποιών, 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, ἢ Ἑλέας ὑμῖν ἐξήγαγε, 34:21–22 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὀρθής ἐστὶν ἔργων ἀνθρώπων, ἐλήφθην δὲ αὐτῶν ὡδὲν ἦν πρός σοι, ὡδὲ ἐστι τόπος τὸν κρυβήναι τούς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἁμόμενα, OG Dan 2:22 καὶ ἀνακαλύπτων τὰ βαθέα καὶ σκοτεινὰ καὶ γνώσετε τὰ ἐν τῷ σκότει καὶ ἐν τῷ φωτί, 2:47 ὁ ἐκφανέρων μυστήρια κρυπτὰ μόνος, Sir 42:19b ἀποκαλύπτων ἴόν τε ἄποκρυφων, which, however, contain no parallel mention of

10 Cf. Deut 32:4 and πάντες αἱ ὅδει αὐτοῦ κρίσει: θεές πιστάς, καὶ ωκε ἐστίν ἄδικαι: δίκαιοι καὶ ὅσιοι κύριος; Jer 9:(23)24 ἤγαγεν κύριος ποιών ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; 11:20 κύριοι κρίνεις δικαιοσύνην νεφέως καὶ καρδίας, ἔθεσα τὴν παρὰ σου δικαιοσύνην εἰς αὐτούς; Ps 9:5b δὲ κρίνεις δικαιοσύνην; 9:9a, 95:13c κρίνει τὴν ὁλοκληρωμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνην 34:24a κρίνεις μετατρέπεις αὐτούς; 118:137 δίκαιος εἶ, κύριε, καὶ σόφος ἐστις σου; Ps. Sol. 2:32b μέγας καταπληθεύεις καὶ δίκαιος κύριε τον ὅπως κρίνεις καὶ κρίνεις δάκρυς; 6:24 μετατρέπεις κάθε κρίνεις δὲ θεός εἰς σοι κρίνει καὶ καταπληθεύεις κύριε; 8:26b δὲ θεός τῆς δικαιοσύνης κρίνεις τὸν ἵστα σε σου παρὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σου; 3a, are mentioned.
11 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.
12 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 πάντων ἄρθρος κριτής).
13 ὁ θεὸς κρίνεις δίκαιος καὶ ἄγιος καὶ μακάρωμεν.
14 ὁ θεὸς κρίνεις δίκαιος καὶ ἄγιος καὶ μακάρωμεν.
15 Ps. Sol. 2:16–18 ὁ ἀπαντακός τοις ἀμαρτολοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἐργαὶ αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν τὰς πονηρὰς σφόδρα ἀνακαλύπτει τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα φανῇ τὸ κρίμα σου . . . ὁ θεὸς κρίνεις δίκαιος καὶ ὁ δικαστής πρόσωπον; 9:2c–3a ὅτι σὺ κρίνεις δίκαιος ἐπὶ πάντας τούς λαοὺς τῆς γῆς. οὐ γὰρ κρύφθησαι ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως σου πᾶς ποιῶν ἄδικα.
16 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.\(^\text{15}\) Schwartz (2008, 440) has plausibly suggested that the phrase alludes to Deut 29:28 (τὰ κρυπτὰ κυρίω τῶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τὰ δὲ φανερὰ ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ποιεῖν πάντα τὰ ἔρματα 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),\(^\text{16}\) or to things that can or cannot become known to man due to the limitations of human wisdom. Second Maccabees 12:41 may have been a free reformulation of Deut 29:28 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.

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 μισοπόνγρον ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἐκφεύγεσθαι δίκην, whereas AT 7(E):23(4) has τοῦ πάντα δικαστεύοντος δικαιοκρίτου μισοπόνγρον ἐκρυμίεν 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.\(^\text{18}\) 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 πλεόνων δίκαιον).

\(^{16}\) See Rofé 1985, 313.


\(^{18}\) 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 aforementioned 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. La⁰, 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 κατοπτεύόντος αἰ̂ ̆ 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 κατοπτεύόντος αἰ̂ ̆ θεοῦ μισοπόννερον ὑπολαβάνουσιν ἐκφυγεῖν δίκην (LXX) and τοῦ πάντα δυναστεύόντος δικαιοκρίτου μισοπόννερον ἐκφυγεῖν 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 ἐκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς, 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) ἐκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς; 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

---

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. 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, 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 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. Aitken (2009, 199) has plausibly suggested that δικαιοκρίτης, before being adopted by Jewish writers as an

---


24 P.Mich. 15.688.10 [. . . δικαιοκρισίαν]; PSI 15.1514.17 δικαιοκρισίας υ’ 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 beekkeeper to the prefect of Egypt (P.Ryl. 2.113.35 [133 CE] δέξιον σε τὸν κύριον καὶ δικαιοκρίτην δικόσα [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 δικαιοδόότης, “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 λαοκρίίτης, 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 δικαιοκρίίτης in Egypt, in the language of Ptolemaic-era petitions.

Subsequently to the above-discussed texts, δικαιοκρίίτης occurs mainly in ecclesiastical writers.

5.2.2 ἐκθύμος ‘enraged’

7:3, 39 ἐκθύμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς; 14:27 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐκθύμος γενόμενος

The adverb ἐκθύμος 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 ἐκθύμοι). 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 ἐκθύμος, 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 ἐκθύμοι 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 πολῖταις); Appian uses it of a “fierce siege” (BC 5.4.38 τῆς τειχομαχίας, ἐκθυμότατης γενόμενης) and Philostratus the Younger of a troop of Mysians, who rush upon the enemy “filled with fighting ardour” (Im. p. 875.28 Καυσερ ἐκθυμοὶ τε καὶ ἐξορμοῦντες οἱ Μυσοὶ ένταξι). In its few instances in later

25 See PL s.v. ἐκθύμος.
26 The comparative and the superlative adjective forms ἐκθυμότερον and ἐκθυμότατον 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, ἔκθυµός appears in the sense of “enraged,” “furious.” It forms part of the formulaic phrase ἔκθυµός δὲ γενόµενος ὁ βασιλεὺς/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 θυµοῦ ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἔκθυµος γενόµενος, 9:7 πῦρ πνέει τοίς θυµοῖς (of Antiochus IV); 13:4 ἔξηγε τὸν θυµόν τῶν ἀντιληκοῦ (of Antiochus V). Another formulaic phrase, πυροῦσθαι τοῖς θυµοῖς, unattested elsewhere in Greek literature, is more versatilely used of King Antiochus IV (4:38 πυροῦσθαι τοῖς θυµοῖς), of Judas’ soldiers (10:35 πυροῦσθαι τοῖς θυµοῖς), and of the elder Razis (14:45 πεπυρωµένος τοῖς θυµοῖς).

In the sense in which it is used in 2 Maccabees, ἔκθυµος does not recur in Greek literature, 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 πληθυναὶ 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 ἐξανέέστη ἐκ τοῦ συµποσίου εἰς τὸν κήπον, “The king rose from the banquet and went into the garden” [NETS]), in contrast to the Masoretic Text (MT), which at 7:7 reads καθηγεόνα τῶν ἀγώνων ταττοόµενοι τὸν θυµόν; 15:10 τοῖς θυµοῖς διεγείρας αὐτούς.

La 7:7 rex autem surrexit de loco suo proiciens mappam et exit in hortum; 1 rex autem surrexit de loco proiciens calicem meri et exit in hortum; 5 et auditó hoc correptus furore rex exilivit de loco proiciens calicem meri et cum exiret in horto. 31

---

27 Cf. 10:28 καθηγεώνα τῶν ἀγώνων ταττοόµενοι 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 ἔκθυµω, “to enrage”; ε ἔκθυµω, ἔκθυµωσα.
30 The Hexaplaric MSS add, after ἔξηγε τοῦ, ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ.
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 κήπον—εἰς τοὺς κήπους ἐκ τοῦ συμποσίου) and the AT (ἀνεπήδησε—ἀναπηδήσαντος);33 for ταραχθέντος Josephus seems to have taken the cue from ἐταράάχθη, which is said of Haman in the verse preceding 7:6 in the LXX (7:6 ἀμαν δὲ ἐταράάχθη ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς βασιλίσσης), and the verse following 7:9(7) in the AT (7:10 καὶ ὁ ἀμαν ἐταράάχθη).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 ἔρυθρος δὲ γενόντως 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 ἀμαν καὶ κινηθεὶς ἐν παντὶ τῷ θυμῷ 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 πραῦτητα
   LXX D:8 καὶ μετέβαλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς πραvertisement;
   MT (no counterpart)
   La D:8 ⁸ deus autem iram convertit in miserationem et furorem ipsius in tranquillitatem; iudaeorum autem deus et universae creaturae dominus

---

32 Trans. R. Marcus, LCL.
33 Cf. 1 Kgdms 20:34 καὶ ἀνεπήδησεν Ἰωναθαν 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, 525–620; 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 ὄργαν here refers to the seat of emotions (cf. Clines 1984, 223: “disturbed with all his spirit” and Cavalier 2012, 161: “agitée 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 furem ipsum in tranquillitatem; \^ et convertit deus et transtulit indignationem eius in lenitatem; \( F \) iudeorum autem deus et universae creaturae dominus iram regis convertit in miseratione et furem ipsum transtulit in tranquillitate

J AJ 11.237 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς κατὰ βούλησιν οἴμαι 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 ἐτάκη ἡ καρδία μου ἀπὸ φόβου τῆς δόξης σου MT (no counterpart) La D:13 \( ^{R} \) et turbatum est cor meum a timore gloriae tuae; \( ^{F} \) et liquefactum est cor meum a timore gloriae tuae J AJ 11.240 ὑπεχώ&omicro;rει καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ κατελειπ&omicro;&omicr;ην ἑπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς

4) AT 7:5 καὶ εὐθυμ&omicr;ο&omicr;θη ὁ βασιλ&omicr;ε&omicr;ς καὶ εἶπεν; 7:6 εἶπεν [ἡ βασίλισσα] Μή ὀργί&omicr;ζου, κύριε. LXX 7:5 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ βασιλε&omicr;ς MT 7:5 καὶ ἔτυμηθη ὁ βασιλε&omicr;ς καὶ ὀργή ἐξεκαύ&omicr;θη ἐν αὐτῷ, “Then King Ahasuerus said to Queen Esther” (NRSV) La 7:5 \( ^{R} \) 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 βασιλ&omicr;ε&omicr;ς . . . ἐλυπήθη σφό&omicr;δρα, καὶ ὀργή ἐξεκαύ&omicr;θη ἐν αὐτῷ LXX 1:12 καὶ ἐλυπήθη ὁ βασιλε&omicr;ς καὶ ὀργί&omicr;σθη MT 1:12 καὶ ἔτυμ&omicr;θη ὁ βασιλ&omicr;ς καὶ ὀργί&omicr;σθη, “The king was enraged, and his anger burned within him” (NRSV) La 1:12 \( ^{R} \) contristatus est rex et iratus est valde; \( ^{I} \) contristatus est valde; \( ^{I} \) contristatus est et ira incensus J AJ 11.192 εἰς ὀργ&omicr;γ&omicr;ν παροξυνθ&omicr;ντα τὸν βασιλ&omicr;κα

\(^{36}\) Jobes (1996, 162) believes that the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θυμοῦ σου “can be explained if φό&omicr;βου [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 πεπυρω&omicr;&omicr;ν ἐν δόξῃ ἐνδε&omicr;βλη&omicr;ε&omicr;ν αὐτ&omicr;τ&omicr;ς τὰ πράσ&omicr;τα ἐν ἀκρι&omicr; τῷ θυμ&omicr;ε&omicr;α αὐ&omicr;τ&omicr;ου and 5(D):7(8) μετ&omicr;θε&omicr;κε τὸν θυμ&omicr;ον αὐ&omicr;τ&omicr;ου εἰς πρό&omicr;σ&omicr;τα, 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] ἐθύμωθι τῷ Μεγαλόπολιοι, καὶ ὁ ὅργῃ ἐξεκαῦθη ἐν αὐτῷ
LXX 3:5 [Αμαν] ἐθύμωθι σφόδρα
MT 3:5 ἥγαναι ὅργῃ, “Haman was infuriated” (NRSV)
La 3:5 ἀγανάκτησε, “Haman was infuriated” (NRSV)

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 Laapeake. 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, ἐθύμωθι . . . καὶ ὁ ὅργῃ ἐξεκαῦθη ἐν αὐτῷ, which is similar to the doublet at 7:9(7) (ἐκθυμοῦσ . . . καὶ πλησθεὶς ὅργῃς). The verb ἐθύμωθι 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 ὁ ὅργῃ ἐξεκαῦθη 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 (τὸν ἐθυμοῦς ὅργῃς, “the king was enraged, and his anger burned within him”). The first element of this doublet (τὸν ἐθυμοῦς, “was enraged”) is rendered by both the LXX and the AT by the verb ἐκκαῦθης, which is here used in the sense of “annoyed”;38 the second element (ὁ ὅργῃς ἐν αὐτῷ, “his anger burned within him”) is rendered in the LXX by the verb ἀγανάκτησε and in the AT, more literally, by the phrase ὁ ὅργῃ ἐξεκαῦθη 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 ἐκκαὐσάμαι, with ὅργῃ39 or θυμὸς40 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 ἱππομαι [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 ḫārah and especially ḥāsāp—nuances that are known both in Greek and in the Koine.”
39 Deut 29:20 ἐκκαὐσάμαι ὅργῃς κυρίου; 2 Kgdms 24:1 ὅργῃ κυρίου ἐκκαὐσάμαι ἐν Ισσαρί; 4 Kgdms 22:13 ὅργῃ κυρίου ἐκκαὐσάμαι ἐν ἡμῖν; Ps 88:47 ἐκκαὐσάμαι ὅργῃς παρὰ τὴν ἀδερφάν; Jer 51:6 καὶ ἐταξάμην ὅργῃς κυρίου καὶ ἐκκαὐσάμαι ἐν πόλειν Ιουδα; Sir 16:6 ἐν οἴνῳ ἀπεθανεὶ ἐκκαὐσάμαι ὅργῃς.
40 4 Kgdms 22:17 ἐκκαὐσάμαι ὅργῃς κυρίου ἐκκαὐσάμαι ἐν ἡμῖν; 34:25 ἐκκαὐσάμαι ὅργῃς κυρίου μου ἐν τῷ πόλει τούτῳ; Ps 2:12 ὅταν ἐκκαὐσάμαι . . . ὅργῃς κυρίου, Jer 4:4 μὴ ἐξεκαὐσάμαι ὅργῃς κυρίου μου καὶ ἐκκαὐσάμαι.
41 Although first attested in the Septuagint, the combination of ἐκκαὐσάμαι with ὅργῃ is not unknown to profane Greek literature. We encounter it in Polybius (6.7.8 μίσος ἐκκαὐσάμαι οὖν καὶ πυριμελικὸς ἐχθρῆς;
Returning to the doublet at 7:9(7), we notice that it conjoins the phrase ἐκθυμος 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 ὧργῆς ἐπλήθησαν) and in Nicolaus of Damascus (FHG 3, fr. 101.951 ὧργῆς ... ἐπίπλαστο). However, the Septuagint uses the synonymous phrase ἐπλήθη 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 ἐκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς και πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς.\footnote{Cf. 2 Macc 4:40 ταῖς ὁργαῖς διεπιπλασένων Memn. FHG 3, fr. 51.49 ὧργῆς ἐνπλήθησαν. The phrase πλησθεῖς ὀργῆς becomes current in later hagiographical texts. Cf. Mart. Ascen. Isa. 3.7 θυμοῦ πολλοῦ καὶ ὧργῆς πλησθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς Μανασσῆ; Acts Phil. 13.2 δ ὧργης ἐπίπλαστο ... ὧργης μεγάλῆς ἐπιλήθη.}

Since neither the MT nor the LXX nor the La\footnote{Not to be ignored, of course, is that 2 Macc 14:27 (ὡς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκθυμος γενόμενος καὶ τοῦ πατριωτῆς ἀνθράκων ἐρεθισθέντος) contains a doublet (ἐκθυμος-ἐρεθισθέντος), which may be replicated and echoed in AT 7:9(7) (ἐκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς και πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς).}, 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.\footnote{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; 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.}

What, then, is the origin of the phrase ἐκθυμος 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 ὧργη 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, ἐκθυμος 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
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 7:23(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 7:27(15). 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 εὐεργετήριος (2 Macc 8:34, 15:3, in LXX Esth E:15, and in AT Esth 7(Ε):27(15)). There are also a few words which are shared exclusively between the AT of Esther and 2 Maccabees: the noun δικαιοκρίτης, the adjective τρισαλιτήριος, and the phrase ἔκθυς ὑπὸ νόμους ὡς βασιλεῖς.

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. 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 σποδώσαντο, GELS "to strew oneself with ashes," in AT 4:2 (ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος . . . σποδώσαντο), occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint only in Jdt 4:11 ἔποθοντο τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν; LXX Esth 4:1 reads instead κατεπάσατο σποδῶν. LXX Esth C:24 reads μετάστρεψεν τὴν καρδίαν εἰς ἵσος τοῦ πολεμῶντος ἥμας, whereas AT 4(C):25(24) has μεταστρέψει τὴν καρδίαν. The combination μεταστρέψει τὴν καρδίαν occurs nowhere else in the Septuagint, whereas μεταστρέψει τὴν καρδίαν is found in Exod 14:14; in Ps 104:25, and in Hos 11:8. The phrase ἄπολεσάτο οὐλορίζει, in LXX Esth B:8, which contains the absolute hapax legomenon ἄπολεσάτο, is turned, in AT 3(B):18(6), to ὁλορίζει ἄπολεσάτο, which has a parallel in Job 4:7b. The plus in AT 3:5 καὶ ἐξῆκεν ἀνδρὶ τὸ Μαρδοχαῖον is modelled after Exod 2:15 καὶ ἐζήτει ἀνδρὸν ἀνωτέρων (cf. Dan 2:13). Cf. also the verbs ἔπρεπε (AT 5:23(14)) and ἔπεμψε (AT 3:6), and the phrases ἐν τῇ κρατῇ τῇ κρατῇ (AT 4(C):25) and ἀπὸ ἀρρενωποῦ ἐως βασιλείας (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. 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. ἐξαλλοτρίιωσις at 7(E):27(15)), should not lead us to posit a late date for the text, and that neologisms such as σκυθρωπόόο (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 µἰᾷ τοῦ µηνὸς Αδαρ Νισαν (zos ἐστι Δύστρος Ξανθικόός): 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 σκυθρωπόόο is an absolute hapax legomenon; κυρίευσις (“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 Ἀλεξάνδρου ματαλλαγῆς καὶ Πτολεμαῖου Αἰγύπτου | κυριεύεις).
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.”

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 παντοκράτωρ in Mordecai’s prayer at 4(C):13. The corresponding verse in the LXX Esther (C:2) reads κύριε, κύριε, βασιλεύ πάντων κρατών. 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 παντοκράτωρ 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 παντοκράτωρ 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 ἐθνὸς Ἰουδαίων ἀπειθὲς σπουδάσατε ταχέως ἀναπέψαυτε ἐς 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 σπουδάσετε ταχέως ἔλειν 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, 536.
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 παντοκράτωρ 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 ἔλθειν πρός 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, ἐκθύμος, and τρισαλιτήριος are dispersed in five different chapters (δικαιοκρίτης: 12:41; ἐκθύμος: 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); ἐκθύμος: 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 ἐκθύμος 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 ἐκθύμος occurs in the text preceding the inserted 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 ἐκθύμος 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” seems to indicate, sometime after 78/77 BCE and perhaps as late as the Roman period, 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 ἐκθύμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, which is in all likelihood borrowed from 2 Maccabees,

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 βασιλεὺς) and OG Dan 3:19 (τότε Ναβουχοδονοσορ ἐπλήθη 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 ἵδρως and ἀγρυπνία in 2 Macc 2:26 (ἱδρῶτος δὲ καὶ ἀγρυπνίας τὸ πρᾶµα), by which the epitomator describes his arduous effort to compose the epitome, and the word ἵδρως in AT 5(D):12(14) (καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς ἤτρον ἵδρωτος), used of the sweat on Esther’s face, and ἀγρυπνέω in AT 6:1 (καὶ ἦν ἀγρυπνών [sc. ὁ βασιλεὺς]), 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 ἵδρως and ἀγρυπνία are conjoined in 2 Macc 2:26, whereas ἵδρως 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.

61 Sir Prol:30 πολλὴν ἀγρυπνίαν καὶ ἐπιστήµην προσενεγκάµονας.
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? 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:


b) The phrase οὐκ ἔωντες 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]).


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; 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. 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’? 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 (ὤπειρα in the MT and Φρουρα in the LXX (9:26)). Esther, too, writes to the Jews to confirm Mordecai’s letter concerning the celebration of Purim/Φρουρα. In the AT of Esther (7(9):42(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)). 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

65 Compare LXX Esth 4:16 νηστεύσατε ἐπὶ τρεῖς νύκτα καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας; νηστεύων with 1 Kgdms 30:12, which speaks of a young Egyptian servant, who οὐ βεβρώκει ἄρτον καὶ οὐ βεβρώκει 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: φοιράει, φαραεία, φουραια, φουραία.
68 MS variants: φουρια, φαραεία, φουραια.
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 *φρουρεας (11.295).

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” (ῥ…ω, 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, Myâîr…wÚp, 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 φρουράα (“watch,” “guard”) and its cognates.

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 ἡ µέερας τῶν (ἡµερῶν τῶν) Φρουραί. 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 ἡ µέερα 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 αὐτὰς Φρουραί διὰ τῶν κλήρων, ὅτι τῇ διαλέεκτῳ αὐτῶν καλοῦνται Φρουραί), Φρουραί is not the nominative plural of φρουράα, as one might suppose (cf. the rendering of the Vetus Latina: custodientes), but an indeclinable word (as can be seen from 9:28 αἱ ἡµέραι αὐτὰς τῶν Φρουραί, 9:29 τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῶν Φρουραί, and F:11 τὴν προσευμένην ἐπιστολὴν τῶν Φρουραί), 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.
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enemy (Nicanor) instead of that of the victor (Judas). It would have been tantamount to calling Purim ‘Haman’s Day.’

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 ἡ µέρα 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. 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

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.

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 heredom, 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 ηµέρα 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.
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.’ 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. 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. 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.

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 Mardocheé. D’ailleurs, en 2 M 15,36, la fête de Purim n’est-elle pas désignée par les mots ‘Jour de Mardocheé?’”

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 Bougaioi=Bagaioi, 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 φωρδια 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.


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 “Ηλκωνα θεομαρδοχαῖοι). 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.

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, 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? 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?

Elsewhere in this study, 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 Μαρδοχαΐκὴ ἡ µέερα 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 γενόόµενος 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. 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. In his study on the use of the Greek Bible in 2 Maccabees, van der Kooij (1999, 128–32) discusses four explicit biblical quotations, three of which occur in the prefixed letters and in chapter 7, and one in chapter 10, and two implicit quotations, one of which is found in the second prefixed letter and the other in chapter 15. These six quotations are from Exodus, Deuteronomy, 2 Chronicles, and Isaiah. Lange and Weigold (2011, 242) have identified

---

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 2 M.” 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.
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,
that is, they do not occur in secular literature even after the New Testament. 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 (ἀγιωσύνη, βδελυκτός, ἐποργίζομαι, ἱεράτευμα, and προφοροφέω) occur in 2 Maccabees and a single other book of the Septuagint. As regards their instances in 2 Maccabees, four of them (ἀγιάζω, βδελυκτός, ἔξουθενέω, and ἱεράτευμα) are found in the two prefixed letters, twenty occur in the epitome, and six (ἁγιασμός, ἐγκαινισμός, εὐλογητός, καθαρισμός, καθαρισμοῦ, and παντοκράτωρ) occur in both the prefixed letters and the epitome. Only one of them (ἱεράτευμα) is contained in an explicit quotation.

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.
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’

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 ἐπουράνιον τῆς ἁγιωσύνης σου καθίστησιν). At 95:6b, where it qualifies God’s sanctuary (ἁγιωσύνη καὶ μεγαλοπρέπεια ἐν τῷ ἁγιάσματι αὐτοῦ), it is a free rendering of ἀξίωμα, “power, strength” (cf. its more accurate rendering in 1 Chr 16:27 ἢσπερ 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 ἀναγγέλατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τὴν ἐφέσσην τῶν δόξας 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. 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 ὑπέρ τῆς τοῦ ἰδίου σωτηρίας), and of the proclamation of Yahweh’s glory by the congregation (3:30 οἱ δὲ τὸν κύριον εὐλόγουν τὸν παραδεξαμένον τὸν ἐκατοτόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, as well as by the potential desecrator himself (3:34 διὰγγέλλει πᾶσι τοῦ μεγαλείον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος; 3:36 ἐξεμαρτύρει δὲ πᾶσιν, ἀπερ ἢν ὑπ’ ὄψιν τεθηκέναις 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 ἐμπαιγμὸς, 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 διαστέελλεν τὸν ἐπουράνιον βασιλεῖς ἐπ’ αὐτῆς), in 2 Macc 3:39 (ο ἐν τῇ κατοικίᾳ ἐπουράνιον ἔχων), and in 3 Macc 6:28 (τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ ζώντος) and 7:6 (τὸν ἐπουράνιον θεόν). 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 "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 δυσμοί), “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 ἄρα, ὃ ἐνδόκησεν ὃ θεός 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. 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, 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. Schaper (1995, 42, 45, 150; 2014, 174–75) detected in the Greek rendering of Ps 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 ἰουδαῖς βασιλεῖς 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 Ἰσραήλ τοῦ οὐρανίον.

17 See also the comment on τιμωρητές, at 2.2.14, and on οἰωνόμενοι, 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 ἀγιωσύνη, ἀγιότης (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 ἐλαττονώ ‘to defeat’

12:11 ἐλαττονώθεντες οἱ νομαδεῖς
13:19 ἐπὶ Βασιλείου φρούριον ὧμων τῶν Ἰουδαίων προσῆγεν, ἔτροποῦτο, προσέκρουεν, ἐλαττονύτο

The Septuagint employs both the Classical verb ἐλαττόω and the post-Classical verbs ἐλαττονῶ and ἐλαττονέω. ἐλαττόω occurs twenty-nine times in the sense GELS “to reduce the quantity of,” “to lower the status of,” and “to remove, take away”; ἐλαττονῶ 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); ἐλαττονέω 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 14:4), and, in 2 Maccabees, in the military sense “to defeat, vanquish.” ἐλαττονῶ has 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 ἐλαττονύντα κεράμια; l. 12 τῶν ἐλαττονύντων ἀθανάτων). ἐλαττονέω, 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 ἐλαττονῶ 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 γεγονός περί αὐτῶν ἐλάττωμα), as do Polybius and Diodorus Siculus.22

---

20 This is perhaps why the MSS of the Lucianic recension ‘corrected’ ἐλαττονεῖν, at 12:11, and ἠλαττονέω, at 13:19, to ἐλαττωθέντες and ἐλαττωμα, respectively.
21 Cf. Hdt. 6.11 ἢ μὲν φημήν τῶν δικαίων ἤ συμμετέχεια πολλῶν ἠλαττωθέσθαι; Plb. 1.59.4 ἐλαττοθέτω τῇ πέρι τὰ δρέπανα ναυμαχίας; D.S. 13.16.7 ὅτε γὰρ τὸν τὸν καλὸν καὶ ἐνυπηρέτον ἐπεμεικνύει, ἐπανεικνύει, ὅτε δ’ ἐλαττομένως, ἑπτάκοι: 20.34.7 τὰς πολεμίους ἠλάττωσαν; D.H. 3.30.2 ἐν ἕπεισιν δέ ταῖς συμπλοκαῖς ἐλαττομένων.
22 Plb. 1.32.2 διακόσια τὸ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα; 2.19.6 προσφιλονικήσας πρὸς τὸ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα; 3.96.8 προσφιλονικὴ αὐτῶν τὸ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα τὸν τοῖς ἐλαττομένοις ἐλάττωμα; 5.87.2 διὰ τὸ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα περί αὐτῶν; D.S. 14.23.6 περὶ τοῖς βασιλείᾳ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα; 15.85.8 τὸ γεγονός περί τοῖς συμμέχους ἐλάττωμα;
With regard to 13:19, commentators have drawn attention to the asyndetic juxtaposition of the four verbs προσήγεν, ἐτροποῦτο, προσέκρουεν, ἡλαττονοῦτο, 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, 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, ἡλαττονόω 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 Crocodiloopolis and Hermontis 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. ἡλαττονόω 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.


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 "ψύχαμαι", the niphal participle of "ψύχα", "roast, parch" (ὅτι αἱ ψυχαὶ μου ἐπλήσθησαν ἐμπαιγμῶν, "my loin muscles were filled with mockeries" [NETS]), whereas in Ezek 22:4 it translates "διόθωκά σε εἰς ὑδατος τοῖς έθνεσι καὶ εἰς ἐμπαιγμὸν πάσις 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 χώώραις πάασαις ταῖς, "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 for its use of Psalm 37:8a for the use of ὑδατος. The translators of and commentators on 2 Maccabees are divided as to whether ἐμπαιγμός and ἐμπαίζω in chapter 7 have to do with mockery or with torture. The
lexica clearly favour the first option. 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.

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 πυρ, “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. 9α ἐκακώθην καὶ ἐταπεινώθην ἕως σφόόδρα) 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 ἦστιν εἰρήνη τοῖς ὅστεόις μου ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ἀμαρτίων 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 ἀμαρτίας 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 tortures 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; 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,” 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. ἐμπαιζω, “to mock”; BDAG, s.v. ἐμπαιγμός, gives: “2 Macc 7:7, derision of an esp. painful kind.”


31 See Weiser 1962, 324.

32 So Briggs 1906–1907, 1:342.
rendered הָרוֹנָה by ἐμπαίζω because he understood it as deriving from הָרוֹנָה הַנִּפְפָּה, BDB Niph. “be lightly esteemed, dishonoured,” Hiph. “treat with contempt, dishonour,” and not from its homonym הָרוֹנָה הַהָדֶר, BDBa to roast, parch.” Aquila and Symmachus would later translate the verse along the same lines. To posit that the author of 2 Maccabees (a) took הָרוֹנָה הַנִּפְפָּה in Ps 38:8(7), as deriving from הָרוֹנָה הַהָדֶר, (b) understood that the Greek translator of the psalm took the Hebrew word as deriving from הָרוֹנָה הַנִּפְפָּה, and (c) employed ἐμπαίζω 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 ἐμπαίζω 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, ἐμπαίζω 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 ἐμπαίζω 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 ἐμπαίζω 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 Καλέσατε τὸν Σαµψών καὶ παιξάτω ἐνώπιον ἡµῶν καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τὸν Σαµψών ἀπὸ οἴκου δεσµοτηρίου, καὶ ἐρράπιζον αὐτόν. 27 καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ δῶµα ἕως ἐπτακύσιοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες οἱ θεωροῦντες ἐν παιγνίαις Σαµψών. The

---

33 ἂν ἄτι αἱ λαγόνες μου ἐπληρώθησαν ἀτιμίας; ἂν ἄτι ψάλι μου ἐπλήθησαν ἀτιμίας.
phrase καὶ ἐρράάπιζον 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 Σαµψών. 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 ἐρράάπιζον 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 ἐµπαιζω 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 (ὦγοντο δὲ μετὰ πικρὰς ἀνάκγκης εἰς τὴν κατὰ μῆνα τοῦ βασιλείου γενέθλιον ἥµέραν ἐπὶ σπλαγχνισµῶν), and in Dionysiac feasts, during which they were compelled to take part in processions wearing ivy wreaths (γενοµένης δὲ Διονύσιος ἑορτῆς ἠναγκάζοντο κισσοὺς ἔχοντες ποµπεύειν τῷ Διούσῳ). The phrase ἥγοντο . . . ἐπὶ σπλαχνισµῶν verbally links 6:7 with 7:7 τὸν δεύτερον ἥγον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐµπαιγµόν. \(^{36}\) ἐµπαιγµός, in this context, is the humiliating, forced partaking of pagan meat, followed, in case of refusal, by corporal 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 σπλαχνισµῶς, which included the participation in a pagan sacrifice, the trial-like questioning (7:2 τίς μέλλεις ἔρωτάν; 7:7 ἐπηρώτων Ἐι χαγεῖν πρὸ τοῦ τιμωρήθηνα τὸ σώµα κατὰ μέλος), the forced eating of pork meat (6:18 ἀναχανῶν ἴγκαζοται φαγεῖν ὑεῖαν 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 σπλαχνισµῶς (6:21 οἱ πρὸς τῷ παρακήµῳ σπλαχνισµῷ τεταγµένου) initially show kindness and benevolence (6:29 εὐµένειαι) towards the Jewish elder, owing to their old friendship with him, and even suggest helping him cheat

\(^{34}\) In secular authors, the verb ἐραπίζω 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 ἐµπαιγµῶν, in which the substantive is preceded by the definite article, denotes the place of torture, “sur le lieu du supplice.”

\(^{37}\) Cf. 7:1 ἰγκαζόσθαι . . . ἀπὸ τῶν ἰθεµίτων λείων κρεῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι μάστιξι καὶ νεφραῖς αἰνιζοµένοις.
in order to save his life (6:21 διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν χρόνων πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα γνώσιν ἀπολαβόντες αὐτὸν κατ᾽ ἵδεαν παρεκάλεσαν; 6:22 ἵνα . . . διὰ τὴν ἐρχείσαν πρὸς αὐτοῦς φιλίαν τῆς ἐκ νησίων πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα γνώσιν ἀπολαβόντες αὐτὸν κατ᾽ ἱδέαν παρεκάλεσαν; 6:29). The author only notes that, at Eleazar’s refusal, their initial εὐμενέεια turns into δυσμενέεια (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 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 (ἡγοῦν; ἐπηρώτων; ἐβασάνιζον; ἐχιζόντα). 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 παρακλήσεις γενέσθαι τοῦ εἰρακίου σύμβουλος; 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 ἐμπαιγμήνης πόλεως ἕκσιμον). As in the case of the tortured martyrs, the humiliation of the personified city is here associated with the torments (ἐκσιμώμος) 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 martyrrology 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 (δέδωκας σε ὑπὸ ὅλων ταῖς ἐγγιζούσαις πρὸς σὲ καὶ ταῖς ἐπεγγελάσεις σὰρκας σου, καὶ ἐμπαιζόται 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 ἐξευμονάτως ἀπὸ τῆς σκλαβουρίας), which provokes a fierce reaction from the Jewish elder (5:22 ἀθετεῖς δὲ ἡμῶν τὴν σκλαβουρίαν; 5:27 τὰς παρακώποις δὲ καὶ τὰς παρακωπομένας ἡμᾶς παραρέμειν, ἄλλα καὶ ἐπηθέν. ὡς τῇ ἐγκαταλείπῃ ἡμῶν μισοφοφία τοῦτον τὸ γύλωστα).
and Zech 12:3 are the only Septuagint passages in which ἐμπαιζω is used in connection with the personified Jerusalem.

Now, if one looks at the use of ἐμπαιζω and ἐμπαιγμος 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 ἔξεδικα αὐτοῖς 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: δ ἐδὲ [sc. Βασιλείας] ἑμπαιζομένων πρῶτον αὐτοῖς καὶ πρὸς ἥθουν αἰκιζόμενος ἐπειθοῦς διέφθειρεν. Josephus rightly understood that Bacchides’ retaliation included the physical maltreatment of his captives.

In 3 Maccabees, ἐμπαιγμος 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 ἐμπαιγμοι for the doomed Jews (5:22 εἰς τὸ παντοῦς μηχανάκαθι τοῖς ταλαιπώροις δοκοῦσιν ἐμπαιγμοῖς). Were these ἐμπαιγμοι “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 παραδειγματσισμῶν; 6:9 ὡριζομένως; 6:31 ἐπονοεῖτο). Yet, the author emphasizes that the spectacle they provided to the gathering crowds was a pitiful one (5:24 ὀικτροτάτης 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 ἐξενιζούσαις . . . τιμώριαις) and of having shown a cruelty more savage than that of the Scythians (7:5 νόμου Σκυθῶν ἀγωνίας ἐμπαιγμομένων θυμότητα). 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 περισκυθίςαν). The

40 Thēsōmai tēn Ieroupolēn lēthon katabatōumeno pāsai tōs εἴδειν: pās o katabatōin αὐτὴν ἐμπαιζομένων ἐμπαιζέται.
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 ταύτης ἐφήξετο μετά τὴν πληθυνήν αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν θεάτρων καὶ πολὺ καὶ σθαρῶς βασιλέως . . . ἰδου ἡ μοῖρα μακροτήτου, κρεμάξας, καταπατάς, διὰ μέσος τῆς ἀρχής ἀπαγόμενη τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτου, ταῦτα δὲ μετά τὴν κακίαν ταύτην ἐπίθεσιν ἁρρατάς καὶ μύσμα καὶ σκληρὰ καὶ ἰδία ἄλλα σκηνικὰ μακρύμετρα ἀγάνων.
43 See 2.2.11.
were not submitted to the latter punishments. "mocking and flogging" with "chains and imprisonment," as the Maccabean martyrs; v. 36

he would also not have couández; été dè δε μαστίγων πείραν ἔλαβον, ἐτί δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς, “others suffered mocking and flogging, and even chains and imprisonment” (NRSV), invariably refer to 2 Maccabees 7 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 κρείττονοι 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.

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 2 Maccabees (3:27), and its cognate verbs are thus not exclusive to 2 Maccabees and Hebrews. To use the phrase ἐμπατιγμον 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). 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 δὲ; v. 36 ἄλλοι δὲ); 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 νεφρὰς αἰκιζομένους; 7:7 ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπατιγμὸν; 7:10 ἐνεπαίζετο.
45 See discussion in van Henten 2010. van Henten considers likely the allusion of Heb 11:35–c 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, 106.
46 See Owen 1929.
47 P. Enteux. 86.6, 8 [Magdala, 221 BCE] τοῖς μάρτυρις μου ἀνετοίκησαν πάντας, λέγουσαν ἀποτυπανεῖν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἑμῖ καὶ ἐγὼ ἔγραψαν ἐκ τῆς κόμος ... ἔλειμφθην πολλὰ καὶ ἐρήμους καὶ τούτον ἀποτυπανεῖν; UPZ 1.119.37 [Memphis, 156 BCE] τὸν Ὀννύμπρον ἐφημαντον τοῖς κοιμηταῖς ἐλαβείκηθαι μὴ ἵπτωκεν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρείτῃς παραφοράς, ἵνα ἐκ ἀποτύπωσις οὐκ ἑτῶν; ὁ ἠρεύνων ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἡμῖν ἔσοι μή προσπατουσα(κε)σουσιν [ἐν 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 trials endured by the heroes of faith also partly fits Samson, whose name and exploits are mentioned or alluded to in the preceding verses. 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 ἐμπαιγμοῖς (7:7), and not the horrendous follow-up. One might also argue, in light of the preceding discussion, that ἐμπαιγμοῖς, 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 ἐμπαιγμοῖς with μάστιγες, which designates a relatively light form of torture. The first term is apparently meant to denote mockery, e.g. of the kind inflicted upon Jesus (ἐμπαιζόω is coupled with μαστιγώω 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, 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, ἐμπαιγμοῖς 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, one of which is shared exclusively between the two books: JudgA 6:2 ἐν τοῖς ὀρέσι καὶ τοῖς σπήλαιοις—2 Macc 10:6 ἐν τοῖς ὀρέσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπήλαιοις; this phrase recurs only in the New Testament, in Heb 11:38 καὶ ὀρέσι καὶ σπήλαιοι καὶ παίζω καὶ παιγμοῖς καὶ παιγμοῖς.

49 In 2 Maccabees, μάστιξ is paired with νευρά, at 7:1 (μάστιξ καὶ νευράς αἰκίζομένους), to designate the corporal punishment inflicted on the seven brothers for refusing to eat pork, and with ἐταστίγων, at 7:37 (μετὰ ἐταστίγων καὶ μαστίγων), to designate Antiochus’ eventual punishment: the ἐταστίγος (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 θείας μάστιγης).
50 Despite the doubts expressed above, it must be admitted that the reference to women who received their death by resurrection and to men who died by the γάμμακανος, with the hope of being resurrected, or were submitted to ἐμπαιγμοῖς καὶ μάστιγες, in Heb 11:35–36, as well as the phrase ἐταστίγος πλησίων καὶ ὀρέσι καὶ σπήλαιοι καὶ τοῖς ὀρέσι 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 π t w of Brooke-McLean’s edition of the Septuagint, which stand closest to the Old Greek of Judges, read ἐν τοῖς ὀρέσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπήλαιοις.
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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 ἐμπαιζω 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, ἐμπαιζω 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

ὅργιζομαι 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 ὀικούντων ἀπώργισται56 βραχέως διεσπύρης 7:33 δ ἡμῶν βραχέως ἐπώργισται57). As commentators note,58 2 Macc 5:17 relates to Isa 54:7–8 (χρόνον μικρόν κατέλησε σε καὶ μετὰ ἑλέους μεγάλου ἔλεησε σε, ἐν θυμῷ μικρῷ ἀπέστρεψά το πρόσωπόν μου ἀπό 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 martyrlogy 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), ἐποργιστε (93), and ἀποργησθαι (106).
57 Codex Venetus and the minuscules 534, 58, and 771 here read παρωργισται; minuscule 130 reads ἀπωργισται. On these textual variants, see Schwartz 2003, 109.
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 ἐπάειν τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπί, 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 ingeniously 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 συνεκερατείσας συντελείσεται 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 γιὰς τοῦ ὡς ὧν ἔτρεξε, “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 ἄγιο), then by παροργίζοµαι, at 11:36 (ποιήσει κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ παροργισθήσεται).

59 Note that ἐλύπησα αὐτὸν [sc. Israel], in Isa 57:17, stands for MT יָאָרְרֵנָה, “I was angry” (NRSV).
60 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργήν τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἥμαρν γένος δικαίως ἐπηγηγήσεν.
61 See Appendix 8, 50.
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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 Nikiprowsketsky, questionably dates to around 140 BCE.65 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

63 5:20 ἐν τῇ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργῇ; 7:38 τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργῆς; 8:5 τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ κυρίου. Cf. 5:17, 7:33. The plural ὀργαῖς is used at 4:25 of Jason’s rageful disposition (θυμῷ ἄμω τυράννου καὶ θηρὸς βαρβάρου ὀργαῖς ἔχων) and at 4:40 of an angry crowd of Jews (τῶν ὀχλῶν ταῖς ὀργαῖς διεπηκυομένων). Cf. Meecham 1935, 68: “ὁργαῖς"burst of wrath; ὀργαῖς"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 Riesler 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.
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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. 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 ἄνεκδοτὴν, οἱ δὲ εἰς διασπορὰν καὶ αἰσχύνην) and 2 Macc 7:9 (ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἀποθανόντας ἡ μᾶς ἐν 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.

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. In 2 Maccabees, the expectation of the restoration to life of the righteous permeates the account of the martyrrial death of the seven brothers and their mother in chapter 7. Put to the torture by Antiochus, the second brother expresses his belief in an “eternal revivification of life” (ἐἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς), 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 νεκροὶ, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς νεκροῖς, 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, 390–94.


72 Katz (1962, 14) and Habicht (1979, 234), following a conjecture of Schleusner, prefer to read here εἰς αἰώνιον 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 αἰώώνιον 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, 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, it is quite clear that 2 Macc 7:9 presupposes OG Dan 12:2 not only conceptually but also verbally. The phrase εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, in OG Dan 12:2, rendering ἀναστήσεις ἐκζωσιν, “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 ἀενάαουζωῆς. 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.

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 ζωῆς and the verb ἐποργίζομαι, 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. That the verb ἐποργίζομαι, which...
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 (καταλλαγήναι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις), alludes to the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (32:36 καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ παρακλῆσεται); the author replaces here the verb παρακαλέσαι with καταλλάσσει, 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.
83 See Chapter 8.
6.2.5 καθαγιάζω ‘to consecrate,’ ‘to sanctify’

1:26 διαφύλαξον τὴν µερίδα σου καὶ καθαγιάζον
2:8 ὅ τόπος καθηγιασθῆ μεγάλως
15:18 ὅ περὶ τοῦ καθηγιασμένου ναοῦ φόβος

καθαγιάζω is a frequent verb in the Septuagint (196x), but the intensified\(^\text{84}\) compound καθαγιαζομαι 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 ἁγιόν (ἡγιασμένον “holy crown, diadem”) denotes the golden leaf fastened on the headband worn by the high priest\(^\text{85}\) 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 (ἡγιασμένα “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), καθαγιάζω and καθαγιαζομαι 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 ἁγιάζας αὐτούς) and at 1:26 He is asked to consecrate His µερίσ (διαφύλαξον τὴν µερίδα σου καὶ καθαγίασον).

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 παραθύρων “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 βασιλείαν, “the consecrated diadem.”


296
of Exodus probably confused παράδοξος with παράδοξαάζω, which he derived from παράδοξος (ὁ παρὰ δόξαν ὁν), BDB "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.” The translator of Deuteronomy picked up this neologism to render αλπ at 28:59: καὶ παραδοξάσει κύριος τὰς πληγάς σου, “the Lord will make exceptional your plagues” (NETS). The translator of Sirach, in his turn, had probably the latter verse in mind when he rendered the contextually similar 10:13c as παρεδόόξασεν 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 τόοπος, 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 (παραδοχάσσω . . . 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).

It is true that δοξάζω is used with reference to the Temple in 2 Maccabees and elsewhere in the Septuagint, especially in the deuterocanonical books. Goldstein (1983, 87–88, 90–91) 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, ἐνδόξος, ἐνδόξως, and ἐνδοξάζουσι (another neologism) that the translator of the Pentateuchal book makes.

87 See Le Boulluec and Sandevoir 1989, 34; Wevers 1990, 117
88 See G. Kittel, “δοξέω, δοξάζω, 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, ἐνδόξος, ἐνδόξως, and ἐνδοξάζουσι (another neologism) that the translator of the Pentateuchal book makes.
89 See Wevers 1995, 454.
90 La magna facto locum suum; La magna glorificavit; La gloriabit; La magnificavit; La benedicebat dominum qui praeter opinionem locum suum magnificavit; Bevenot 1931, 184; "priesen die anderen den Herrn, der wider Erwarten seine (heilige) Stätte verherrlicht"; Abel 1949, 325; "bénissent 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: "rühmen 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 συνεάγεια . . . τωσ βασιλείας τιμῶν τῶν τόπων καὶ τῷ ἱερῷ ἀποστολᾶς ταῖς κρατίσσις δοξάζειν. Cf. 5:16 τα του ἄλλοι βασιλέων [σκέπτε] ἀναστάθηκαν πρὸς αὐξήσιν καὶ δόξαι των τόπων; 5:20 ὁ τόοπος . . . μετὰ πᾶσης δόξης ἐπανορθώθη.
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) the connotation “to hold in honour, to magnify, to glorify,” resulting from its association with δόξα/τιμίᾳ 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”: παραδοξάζασας [τὸν τόπον] ἐν ἑπιταγεία μεγαλοπρεπεῖ σύστασιν ποιησάμενος αὐτοῦ πρὸς δόξαν τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐντίμου ὑομάτου σου.

6.2.7 σαββατίζω ‘to keep the Sabbath’

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 σαββατίζειν ὁ λαὸς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδομῇ) and in Lev 23:32 (σαββατιεῖ τὰ σάββατα ὑμῶν) in the sense GELS to observe a sabbath,” and in Lev 26:34, 35 (σαββατιεῖ ἡ γῆ... σαββατεῖ ἐν τοῖς σάββατοις ὑμῶν) in the figurative sense GELS to lie inactive, ‘lie fallow’.” In the latter sense, it recurs in 2 Chr 36:21 (τοῦ τοῦ προσεβίβασθαι τὴν γῆν τὰ σάββατα αὐτής σαββατισά... ἐσαββάτεσας εἰς συμπλήρωσιν ἑτῶν ἐβδομάχροντα)—which refers back to Lev 26:34 and 26:35—and in 1 Esd 1:55 (σαββατεῖ εἰς συμπλήρωσιν ἑτῶν ἐβδομάχροντα), 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 ἅγειν τὴν ἐβδομάδα (6:11), ἡ ἑβδόομα δοξασθήναι (8:27), τὸ σάββατον διήγαγον (12:38), δοξασθήναι τὰ σάββατα ἣμεράν (15:3), and ἀνέκειν τὴν ἐβδομάδα (15:4). These expressions are not found in the rest of the Septuagint, which standardly employs φυλάσσειν/φυλάσσεσθαι τὰ σάββατα (11x, first

occurring in Exod 31:13). For the designation of the Sabbath as ἡμέρα καταπάυσεως, at 15:1, 2 Maccabees is clearly indebted to Exod 35:2 τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδομῇ κατάπαυσις,

6.2.8 σαπρία ‘rootteness’

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 2:9c and 7:5a (ἐν σαπρίᾳ σκωλήήκων) and with Joel 2:20 (καὶ ἀναβήησεται ἡ σαπρία αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναβήησεται ὁ βρόός αὐτοῦ).

In Joel 2:20, σαπρία renders ἡ σαπρία, “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. Its counterpart at 2:20, βρόός, “stink,” translates the Hebrew תִּפְתָּח, “stench.” In Joel 2:20, then, σαπρία is set in synonymous parallelism with βρόός 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.” 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 μὴ δὲ 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. 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

96 LSJ glosses βρόός (A) as “any loud noise”; i.e. βρῶμος (B), “stink, noisome smell,” it notes that βρῶμος frequently occurs as falsa lectio for βρῶμος. It appears, though, that βρῶμος, “loud noise,” acquired the connotation “stenk” 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'LXX odore etiam illius et foetore; La'BMI ab odore etiam tetro eius; La'B ab odore quoque eius . . . <et> foetore.
depths of the sea. 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, 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 νηστεία καὶ ἐν κλαυθμοῖς (cf. 2 Macc 13:12 μετὰ κλαυθμού καὶ νηστείων) and 2:17 ἀνά μέσον τῆς κρηπίδος καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κλαύσονται οἱ ἱερεῖς. 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 ἀνατίθενται ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπέέναντι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου). The phrase σαπρία σκωλήήκων, at 2:9c, was drawn from 7:5a (φύρεται δὲ μου τὸ σῶμα ἐν σαπρίᾳ σκωλήήκων), where it renders חֲמוֹר, “worms,” and כִּבֵּד, “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, 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

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 καταπασάέμενοι γῆν; 2 Macc 10:25 γῆν τάς κεφαλάς καταπάσαντες; 14:15 καταπασάμενοι γῆν).

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. 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, where it designates the bad smell emanating from the hero’s wound, which is unbearable to his companions. Moreover, the combination ἐν ὀδύναις καὶ ἀλγηδόόσι is previously attested only in Plato.

6.2.9 τροφοφορέω ‘to sustain by providing food’

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, ἐκτρέψασα, but also displaced, as it follows rather than precedes the phrase ἀγαγοῦσαν εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν ταύτην, “brought you to

104 Compare with Job 1:23b and ἐκείρατο τὴν κόμην τῆς κεφαλῆς, to which Codex Alexandrinus adds καὶ κατεπασατο γην επι τῆς κεφαλῆς αυτου.
105 See also the comment on ὠψαυχενέω at 4.2.7.
107 S. Ph. 890–91 τούτως δ’ ἔσον, μὴ βαρυνθῶσιν κακῇ / ὄσμῃ, fr. 697 Radt ὀσμῆς μόνον / ὄσμῳ ... μὴ βαρυνθήσεσθε 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 ἔκθερέψασαν 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 ὡς ἐτροφοφόόρησεν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ὡς εἶ τις τροφοφόρησαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, “how the Lord your God nursed you, as some person would nurse his son” (NETS). Behind the loose rendering of παίζει, “to carry, bear,” by the neologism τροφοφόρεέω 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 τιθηνόός) 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 τροφοφόρεέω 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 στοιχείιωσις and διαρρυθίζω (7:22).

It seems reasonable to assume that the person who embedded τροφοφόρεέω in 2 Macc 7:27 was also responsible for the coinage of προοδηγόός 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 τροφοφόρεέω occurs.\(^{111}\) This adds support to the idea that the Deuteronomistic 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 ἔτροφοφόρησαν and the variant ἔτροποφόρησαν, 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 ἔτροφοφόρησαν, whereas ten MSS read ἔτροποφόρησαν. 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 (ἅγιωσύνη, 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 σαφρία either from the Septuagint Job or from the Septuagint Joel; for the use of ἐποργίζομαι 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 ἔλαττόω, 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 (ἅγιωσύνη, παραδοξάζω), and another in the martyrlogical chapter 7 (ἐποργίζομαι, ἐποργίζομαι, τροφοφορέω). Two other groups of words stand out: one related to the Temple (ἅγιωσύνη, 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, μακροθυμεῖν, 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 (ἅγιωσύνη, παραδοξάζω, σαφρία). 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.” 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, 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, 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. That the author of the latter book may have drawn upon

---

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 Mac 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 Mac 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 Mac 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, 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). This agreement may indicate that the author of 3 Maccabees used Polybius either as his sole source 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.”

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 νόοῳ κατέέστρεψε 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.* 15.5, 18.5 ἡφαίστια [Νασικᾶς]), who had written an account of the battle of Pydna in a letter to a king (*Aem.* 15.5). See FGH 2B.233; Schwarze 1891, 35; Flacelière and Chambry 1966, 64, 92n1.

5 See Mélèze Modrzejewski 2008, 35.
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, 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. 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. 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, 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, it is even more conceivable that Jason may have drawn upon Polybius. However, most scholars would agree that the Cyrenian historian was a contemporary of the Megalopolitan historian rather than that he belonged to a subsequent generation. 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 ἐπιπορευσάμην τὰς δυνάμεις παρεκάλει—Plb. 5.53.6 παρεκάλει τὰς δυνάμεις ἐπιπορεύμενος [cf. 15.10.1 (ἐπιπορεύετο παρακάλει τὰς δυνάμεις)]; 3 Macc 1:5 καὶ οὕτως συνέβη τοὺς ἀντιπάλους ἐν χειρόνοις διαφθαρῆναι—Plb. 1.57.8 ἄξι συνέβαινε διαφθείρεσθαι . . . τοὺς ἐν χειρονόμῳ; 3 Macc 1:9 παραγεγένεόμενος ἐς τὸν τόπον—Plb. 31.9.11 παραγεγένεόμενος ἦ 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, θεωρούν, 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.


description of the games in Daphne, which is focused almost exclusively on the procession (mainly military in character) that opened the festival.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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) contended 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, 82n1), 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 Mac 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 ‘préféré 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’ Ἐκβαάτανα: 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, 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-date23—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

---

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. 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. Some of these neologisms recur in more than one writer (e.g. παλιµπροδισία [5.96.4], 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], “help in procuring,” χερρονησίζω [1.73.4; 10.10.5], “form a peninsula,” and φιλοστεφανεύω [1.16.10; 7.10.3], “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).

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 δυσποτέεω, “despair of oneself,” and µυριόόπλεθρος, “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 36.16.1, respectively) paraphrasing Polybius. In some other cases, the dependence can be plausibly posited, even if there is no contextual similarity. The dis legomenon στιβαδοκοιτέεω, “sleep on litter,” 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. 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.


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 ἔλθον τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πολυχρονίοις ἀρρωστίισιν δυσποτέους; D.S. 31.43.1 πίς παραλόόγους ἐννοίις ἐνέπιπτε καὶ παραπλησίους τοῖς ἐν ταῖς μακρεῖς νύσις δυσποτέους; Plb. 36.16.9 ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἱδών ἐν διαστάσει μηυροπλέθρους ἀγρὸν κατασκευάσας; D.S. 32.16.1 ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἱδών ἐκτὸτε ἄγρων 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 κωλυσιεργέεω, \(^{1}\) “hinder,” in Polybius (6.16.5), in Philo (4x), in Josephus (AJ 15.425), and nowhere else in ancient Greek literature, or of βιαιομαχέεω, \(^{1}\) “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: ἀν- (5x), ἀντι- (13x), ἐπι- (6x), μετα- (3x), κατα- (85x), παρα- (10x), προ- (9x), προς- (14x), and συν- (1x). ἀναστρατοπεδεύω first appears in Herodotus, καταστρατοπεδεύω, περιστρατοπεδεύω, 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 Ηλιόόδωρος . . . ἀναστρατοπεδεύσει 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. 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, not a general or a minister. Willrich suspected that 2 Macc 3:28 copied 3 Macc

33 Codex Venetus has ἐστρατοπεδεύσει.
34 See 4.2.3.
35 On the δορυφόροι, see Bickerman 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 (Mennn. 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, 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 ἀνέέζευξεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν]). In subsequent literature, it occurs only in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (4x), in Josephus (2x), in seven brothers. The term παραδρόμω, in the sense of “train, retinue,” recurs in Posidon. fr. 136a Théiler [=Ath. 12.59.26 Kabel; cf. D.S. 34/35.2.34], who speaks of a rich man who drove through the country on a chariot accompanied by flatters and a bodyguard of slaves who ran around his chariot (διὰ μὲν τῆς χώρας τετρακύκλους ἄπεις περαγήμονος καὶ ἄπεις καὶ θεράπων καὶ σκιαστόρων καὶ παραδρόμων 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 παραδρόμω 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 καθωπλίσενς 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 Bickerman 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 ἀντ-, ἀπ-, δι-, ἐνα-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, προ-, προσπα-, 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 ὀργήν εἰς τοὺς ταλαιπώρους Μαρωνείτας ("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 ἔστο καὶ τὴν τῶν περιγαθευκότων 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 δέντοι 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 προσπαλαι δυστυχία περί τὸν οἶκον; App. Mac. 19.3 εἰς ἐμὲ δὲ ἄποςακόντας 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

---


\(^{39}\) In Livy’s words: in Maronitâs iram effundit.

\(^{40}\) *DGE*, s.v. ἐναπερείδω Α 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 ἄγωνα τοῦ λέγου πανος ἐναπηρείσαστο τῷ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ τὸν ναὸν γυναικεῖον (“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. 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 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 LJS “to support onself upon, to rest upon,” in the same figurative sense as ἐναπερείδομαι and conjoined with the same emotive terms (θυμός, ὄργη), a usage that is found again in Josephus and in Plutarch.

41 Schwarz 1891, 73: “Comparatione igitur inter Plutarchum, Livium, Diodorum, Appianum absoluta, quoniam permutatis locis non solum de rebus, sed etiam de singulis verbis inter se mirum in medium congruent, facile quis conceserit fieri non posse, quin statuamus illos esse secutos unum eundemque fontem. Quem huissu Polybiun 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 6θὲ κοινωνία ὑπερείίδον καὶ νόμιζον νομίζειν ἄρχειν πάντων κ[λπ][κα][ι][κα][η][ι][ι][φ'][ε'] καὶ ὑποτετάβεια (“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 γάρ το μερικώμενπο χοο, ἦταν διατεμον τὴν τροφὴν ἐναπερείσθαι τῇ φάρμαι (“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. 126Ε πείζουσι σφόδρα τὰς άμαρτιας ἐναπερείδομεν τῇ μνήμῃ (“we try hard to stifle the thought of our wrongdoings, setting ourselves against their remembrance”); 236D ἐπέθρεψε τὴν λόγχην διαράθαικον καὶ ἐναπερείδον εἴπε (“he ran at it [sc. the ghost] with uplifted spear, and, as he thrust at it, he exclaimed” [trans. F.C. Babbitt, LCL]); Gal. 5.196 Κῦλα ὅταν ὁ σιαρπός ἐναπερείσθη τὸ κέντρον εἰς νεόν (“when the scorpion fixes his sting in a new”)]; Phal. Ep. 69.2 μοίῳ τῶν παρ᾽ ἐμὶ χρησάμενοι μοίραν τοῖς ἀδίλτην ἐν ὑμῖν ἐναπερείσεσθαι (“I want to bestow no small part of my property to you”); Act. ΝΑ 15.10 μία δὲ [σε, πηγαμίς] ἡ μάλιστα προτέθηκε ὅταν τὸ στόμα ἐναπερείσθη (“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 (onesel) firmly,” “to deposit.”

44 1.69.7 ἀπερείσθησαται καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ ἑκατέραν ὄργην εἰς κύτως οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι 15.25.25 τὴν ὄργην εἰς τὸν Ἀγαθοκλίνα καὶ τὴν Ἀγαθοκλίνον ἀπερείσθησαν 15.32.6 καὶ τοῦ πλῆθους ἐπὶ ὀλίγες δυνάμεις πέρας ἀπερείσθησαν τὴν ὄργην 18.36.4 ταύτα μὲν ... εἰς ἑκατέραν ἀπερείσθησαν τὴν ὄργην ὑπὸ Φίλιππο ψηφιὰς 36.7.5 ἐπὶ τούτων ἀπερείσθησαν τὸν Θεούς.

45 J. BS 2.642 βαλόμενοι δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἄιτων εἰναι μάλιστα τὴς ἀποτάσεως Κλειτὸν τινα καὶ παρακαλοῦντες εἰς ἑκατέραν ἀπερείσθησαν τὴν ὄργην; Plu. Arist. 7.2 τὴν πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν ἀπερείσθησαν διοικημένοι τυποῦσαν; Mor. 337Α τὸ δὲ μίας ἀργεῖσα, καθ᾽ ὑποκειμένων καὶ τῶν ἀπερείσθεν τροφῶν; 775Ε καὶ θέλουν δὲ ταῖς Ἀκαδημεῖον ὄταν τὸν θεοῦ ἀπερείσθησαν. Cf. Suid. a 3039 ἀπερείσθησαν, ἐκβάλει, ἐκεννειαστα, ὀπείρε ἐκεῖνος βουλομένου ἀπερείσθησαν τὸν θεοῦ καὶ ἔστησα πρὸς τὸν ἄιτων ἀπερείσθησαν ἄπει τὴν ὄργην.
7.5.3 προεξαποστέλλω ‘to send out before’

Of the ten compounds of στέλλω 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 ἐκροθον μεταλαβὼν Ἰούδου προεξαπεστειλέν ὦ Τιμόθεος τὰς γυναίκας 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 ἐφευρέσας Τινούδας... τὴν μὲν ἀποσκευὴν προπέτειλε) and in Diodorus Siculus (19.26.3 οὗτος δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀποσκευὴν προπέτειλε; 19.32.1 τὰ βαρῶτα τῆς ἀποσκευῆς προπέτειλεν).

7.5.4 προσυπομιμημήσκοι ‘to remind in addition’

μυμηνήσκω forms six compounds in Polybius: the single-prefixed ἀναμυμηνήσκοι (14x), ἐπιμυμηνήσκοι (3x), and ὑπομυμηνήσκοι (15x), and the double-prefixed παραπομυμημήσκοι (1x), προσαμυμημήσκοι (6x), and προσυπομιμημήσκοι (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, παραπομιμήσκοι, 15σκοί “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 προσαμιμημήσκοι, 15σκοί “remind of,” is found again in a passage of Nicolaus of Damascus (FHG 3:49.198), and προσυπομιμημήσκοι only in 2 Maccabees (15:9 προσυπομιμήσκοι ὅς [sc. ὁ Ἰούδας] αὐτῶς καὶ τοὺς ἀγώνας, οὓς ἐσαν ἐκτετελεκτές) and in Philodemus’ On Anger (fr. 17, col. 3.16 Indelli). From the last-mentioned verb derives the adjective προσυπομιμηστέον, 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 προ-, such three such

46 ἀναποστέλλω (2x), ἀποστέλλω (90x), διαποστέλλω (7x), ἔξαποστέλλω (207x), ἐπιποστέλλω (12x), ἐπιποστέλλω (1x), προαποστέλλω (8x), προεξαποστέλλω (3x), συναποστέλλω (2x), συνεξαποστέλλω (7x). 47 V q L’ read προεξαπεστειλέν. The Old Latin translations unanimously render the verb by “pr(a)emissit.”
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 προσμιμησες.
compounds appear for the first time in the epitome. Thus, it cannot be excluded that he coined or used προσπομομφόοκω independently of Polybius.

7.5.5 σπειρηθόον ‘divided into σπείρα’

Adverbs of manner in -ηθόον are rather rarely encountered in ancient Greek poetry and prose. 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 -ηθόον occurring in Polybius are attested in prior literature: ἀγεληθόον (1x) is first found in Homer, φαλαγγηθόον (3x) 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 (σωρηθόον γὰρ ἤδη πεπτωκόοτων ἐπ᾽ ἀλλήλων νεκρῶν), which offers a verbal parallel to Plb. 15.14.2 (τῶν νεκρῶν . . . αἱ ὑφύφτων καὶ σωρηθόον πεπτωκόοτων).

σπειρηθόον as a military term derives from σπείρα in the sense of “tactical unit.” Feyel (1935, 45–47), discussing the office of σπειράάρχης, first attested in the military code of Amphipolis issued around 200 BCE during the reign of Philip V, considers the σπείρα to be equivalent to the 256-man-σύύνταγμα, the basic tactical unit of the Macedonian phalanx under Alexander, deployed in a sixteen-by-sixteen square. Since σπείρα is not attested in any document referring to the army of Alexander or the Lagids and σύύνταγμα does not appear in the sources describing the organization of the

50 προσαναλέεσαι (8:19), in the hapax sense 15DUCTION: recount besides,” προσεξηγέεσαι (15:11), 15”relate besides,” and the absolute hapax legomenon προσπυρόοω (14:11), 15”kindle or incense still more.”

51 Hom. 6x, Hex. 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.


54 See also Walbank 1940, 293; Connolly 1987, 77; Hatzopoulos 1996, 453; id. 2001, 76–77.

55 According to Bar-Kochva (1976, 66), the σπείραι were units in both the Antigonid and the Ptolemaic phalanx. Yet, the only instances of σπείρα in the Ptolemaic documentation, in two fragmentary Heracleopolite papyri (BGU 8.1806 [51/50 BCE] l. 4 [τέ]ς [τε]ς σπείρας and BGU 8.1763 [49 BCE] l. 10 έκ τοι τοι τοί σπείρας), 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 Δίφόλος would be the commander of a Roman unit at that date and believes that the term σπείρα, in the aforementioned papyri, probably corresponding to the Latin term
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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, fighting groups of unspecified size in the Illyrian, Carthaginian, Celtic, and Iberian infantry; 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 to designate the latter unit he also employs the terms τάγμα and στρατιά. Three maniples, the historian further informs us, formed a cohort. 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. Consequently, the term σπεῖρα came to be used in Greek of the cohort in place of the maniple. Greek historiographers of the first centuries BCE and CE employ σπεῖρα for Roman cohorts variously numbering from 500 to 1,000 men. Be it noted that none of...
the military theoreticians who wrote treatises on tactics between the first century BCE and the second century CE (Asclepiodotus, Aelian, Arrian) use the term σπείρα.\textsuperscript{64}

To designate the arrangement in σπείρα Polybius uses either the adverbial phrase κατά σπείρας\textsuperscript{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 -γηδόν with an adverbial expression with κατά, as in 3.115.12 οὐκέτι φαλαγγηδόν, ἀλλὰ κατά 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 σπείρας (5.4.9 πρώτως ἐφῆκε τοὺς πελταστὰς τοὺς ὑπὸ Λεόντιοντος τοιμαζόντως, σπειρηδόν τάξας). Philip V’s Macedonian σπείρας, as already explained, most likely consisted of 256 men.\textsuperscript{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”\textsuperscript{67}(11.11.6 τὴν φάλαγγα κατὰ τέλη σπειρηδόν ἐν διαστήματα ἐπέστησε). The ancient tacticians describe τέλος as a phalanx division containing 2,048 men;\textsuperscript{68} however, the term is often used in the general sense of “military unit,” “division,” regardless of the unit’s manpower.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{64} We may add here that one of the earliest attestations of σπείρα 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 columnar. . . . Ennius quidem hominum multitudinem appalat cum dicit—spiras legionibus nexus. Grilli (1974, 281–83) argues that ‘spira,’ in this line, does not refer to Roman maniples but to Greek στρατοπεδεῖας. Cf. Ael. Tact. 10.5 αὐτῇ δὲ δῶν χειραψία μεραρχία, δισχιλίων ἄνδρων καὶ ὅκτωι καὶ τεσσαράκοντα . . . οὐ δὲ καὶ τέλος τοῦτο ὄνομαξον. Cf. Ael. Tact. 9.7; Ascl. Tact. 2.10.

\textsuperscript{65} Ascl. Tact. 10.5 αὐτῇ δὲ δῶν χειραψία μεραρχία, δισχιλίων ἄνδρων καὶ ὅκτωι καὶ τεσσαράκοντα . . . οὐ δὲ καὶ τέλος τοῦτο ὄνομαξον. Cf. Ael. Tact. 9.7; Ascl. Tact. 2.10.

\textsuperscript{66} See Kromayer 1903, 296.
no more than 12,000–14,000 men, perhaps 1,000 cavalry and 12,000 infantry, or of the number and strength of its divisions. Yet, since Philopoemen had adopted the tactical unit of the Macedonian army, we may assume that the σπείρα, 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. The adverb σπειρηδόν, as a military terminus technicus, 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- 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 ὀρείοι] καὶ ἁγώνας γυμνούς καὶ ὁπλιτικούς καὶ ἵππικούς, πυγμῇ καὶ δρόῳ καὶ ἀκροβολισμῷ καὶ τῇ σπειρηδόν 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 σπείρα.

In the Septuagint, σπείρα 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 σπείρα with reference to a military unit consisting of Jewish soldiers. We do not know what the Hebrew counterpart of σπείρα could have been in Judith’s Vorlage, supposing that it

70 See Kromayer 1923, 289–92; Roloff 1903, 118; Walbank 1957–1979, 2:282.
72 Jdt 14:11 ἐξῆλθοσαν κατὰ σπείρας ἐπὶ τὰς ἀναβάσεις τοῦ ὄρους; D.S. 23.2.1 κατὰ σπείρας μαχημένων; D.H. 5.42.2 παρακαθηρύνοντο ... οἱ Ὑπαίτιοι κατὰ σπείρας 8.65.2 τὸ πεζὸν τοῦ πεζοῦ κατὰ σπείρας μαχημένου; 8.84.1 οἱ στρατιῶται ... κατὰ σπείρας τε καὶ κατὰ λόχους συνέβαλλον 10.44.1 τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἐκσπευσαν ἵππεις τε καὶ τῶν πεζῶν 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 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 d’un millier 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 speirae of 256, the speira into four tetrarchies of sixty-four, and the tetrarchy into four 16-man dekades or sematai 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 strategiai 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 . . . sematai.” 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 σπείρα 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 σπείρας mentioned in Septuagint texts is evident even in the specialized lexis. For σπειρηδόον, GELS gives the meaning “in groups of 60 or 120 troops,” assuming that the Maccabean σπείρα had a strength equal to that of a Roman maniple, and LEH “by cohorts, in troops,” although σπείρα 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 κατά σπειρές at the Aetolian camp, in Plb. 2.3.2, quotes Hom. Il. 2.362–63 κρίν᾽ άνθρακις κατά φύλα, κατά φρέθρα, Ἀγάμεμνον, / ὡς φρέθρη φρέθρην φρέθρην δρήστην, φίλα δι φίλων and Tac. Germ. 7.3 non casus nec fortuita conglobatio turman aut eumnum facit, sed familiae et propinquitates, and reminds us that “in recent times the Albanians, descendants of Agnon’s Illyrians, fought in tribes and ‘bairaś’ (smaller kinship groups), and the Montenegrin Slavs in ‘brastva’ (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 σπείρα:

8 16 ἡ Μακκαβαίων τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν ἅρματον ἔξαςακλίως ... 21 τετραμερεῖς τι τὸ στρατεύμα ἐποίησεν. 22 τάξεις καὶ τούς ἀδέλφους αὐτοῦ προγονούμενος ἐκάτερας τάξειςς, Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ιωάννην, ὑποτάξας ἕκαστῷ χίλιος πρὸς τῶν πεντακόσιων, 23 ἐπὶ ὡς καὶ Ελεάζαρον, παραγγέλοντος τὴν ἱερὰν βῆμαν καὶ δύο σύνθημα θεοῦ βυθίζεις τῆς πρώτης σπείρης αὐτῆς προγονούμενος συνάβαλε τῷ Νικάνωρι. 29

8 16Maccabeus, gathering the 6000 in number who were with him ... 21He divided them into something of a four-part army. 22After he appointed his brothers Simon, Joseph and Jonathan as leaders of each unit, assigning to each 1500 men, 23and 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)

How are we to understand this passage? At least three possibilities present themselves to us.

The first possibility is that the author is using σπείρα interchangeably with τάξεις to designate each of the four divisions of Judas’ army. If that is so, numerically speaking, the strength of the Maccabean σπείρα (1,500 men) would far exceed that of the Antigonid σπείρα of 256 men or the Roman σπείρα/manipulus of 120 men, of which Polybios 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 τετραμερεῖς τι τὸ στρατεύμα ἐποίησεν, which is omitted by all the Old Latin versions bar La’, 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 ἐπὶ ὡς 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 polyvystoton Sýmvarna καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ιωάννην. Yet, the figure that we find here, that is, the addition of an extra element, introduced by ἐπὶ ὡς καὶ, to an array of two or three other elements, occurs often in 2 Maccabees (cf. 8:30 ἑνώμονας πίπτος καὶ τοὺς ἱερανοὺς καὶ ἱστρανοὺς καὶ χρωμας, ἐπὶ ὡς καὶ τῆς ὑπογραφῆς ἐπεπλήρως; 10:7 ἡροῦς καὶ κλάπος ἄραις, ἐπὶ ὡς καὶ ἑπίκας ἐχοντες; 10:19 ἀπολυτὰς Σύμωνα καὶ Ἰωάννην, ἐπὶ ὡς καὶ Ζαχαριὰς), 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 ἐς κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν Μακκαβαίον καὶ τοὺς τούτου ἀδέλφους καὶ τὸν τὸν ἱερὸν τοῦ μεγάτου ἱερατοῦ καὶ τὸν τὸ βουκοῦ ἐγκαταστάμον ἐπὶ τοὺς πρὸς Ἀντίοχον ... πολέμους). Grimm (1857, 140–41), Abel (1949, 391), and Goldstein (1983, 334–35), by adopting the reading παραγγελοῦσα instead of παραγγελοῦς (ὁ Χάας ... Ελεάζαρον παραγγέλοντος τὴν ἱερὰν βῆμαν), 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). 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.’ Polybius himself occasionally employs the term in this non-specific sense with regard to non-Greek/Roman army units, 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.” 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. 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.
83 See the relevant passages in PL s.v. σπεῖρα, 2. On Polybius’ ‘non-technical’ usage of terms rendering Roman realities, see Dubuissin 1985, 56–57: “Bon nombre des termes employés ne sont pas réservés aux contextes romains, ni même caractéristiques de ceux-ci. Οίκλαμος et δρ 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 ἢ δέκα μὲν εἶχον ἀλλ’ χιλίους πεζῶς, ἢ δὲ οὐκ ἔκατε δεκατρεῖς ἀλλ’ ἐκατόκις μὲν πεζῶς, ἵππες δὲ ἐκατόν ἄρσιν. In NT Acts 21:31, a σπεῖρα is under the command of a
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, 1 Maccabees 3:55 says that Judas appointed leaders of the people (i.e. the army), officers of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (κατέστησεν Ἰούδας ἡγουµένου τοῦ λαοῦ, γιλάρχους καὶ ἕκατοντάρχους 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, 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. In 1Q scroll 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). 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.

chiliarch (τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης). Appian even speaks of a praetorian cohort numbering 2,000 men (BC 4.15.115 ἦγε δὲ καὶ στρατηγίδα σπείραν, ἐς δισχίλιοις ἄνδρας).
86 Cf. J. AJ 12.301 διατάξας δὲ [sc. ὁ Ἰούδας] τὸν ἀρχαῖον αὐτοὺς τρόόπον καὶ πάρτιον 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 Mac 3:55 and in 2 Mac 8:21–22, has ingeniously posited that “the full complement of the Hasmonaean army was divided into six groups of 1,000 men each. Four of them were commanded by the Hasmonaeon brothers (with the exception of Johanan) and the remaining two by Joseph and Azariah [the commanders mentioned in 1 Mac 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 σπειρηδόόν 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 σπείραι, and once again leads himself the attack:

12 10Δωσίθεος δὲ καὶ Σωσίπατρος τῶν περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον ἡγεμόνων ἐξορμήσαντες ἀπόλεσαν τοὺς ὑπὸ Τιμόθεου καταλειφθέντας ἐν τῷ ὄχυρωματι πλείους τῶν μυρίων ἄνδρων. 12 δὲ Μακκαβαῖος διατάξας τὴν περὶ αὑτὸν στρατιὰν κατέστησεν αὐτούς ἐπὶ τῶν σπειρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Τιμόθεον ὥρμησεν. . . . ἐπιφανείσης δὲ τῆς Ἰούδου σπείρης πρώτης . . .

12 19Dositheus 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 σπείραι and their commanders? What was the manpower of each σπείρα?

The phrase κατέστησεν αὐτούς (the pronoun most likely refers to the previously mentioned commanders Dositheos and Sosipatros) ἐπὶ τῶν σπειρῶν implies that there were twο σπείραι, or rather three, since Judas, too, along with Dositheos and Sosipatros, appears to have been one of the commanders, commanding the first σπείρα. 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,” τοὺς (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.

90 The number 6,000 is given only by one of the Old Latin translations (LaV 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 σπείρα (τῆς πρῶτης σπείρης αὐτούς προηγούμενος) and 12:22, where he leads his own σπείρα (ἐπιφανείσης δὲ τῆς Ἰούδου σπείρης πρώτης).
Apropos of this conjecture, Habicht (loc. cit.) makes the following comment:

Habicht takes the σπείρα to be equivalent to the 500-man-strong Roman cohors. This is not accurate, since, as previously explained, the Antigonid σπείρα and the σπείρα/manipulus of the second century BCE differed in size from the σπείρα/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 σπείρα 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 ἑκάστος 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 ἀποσπάασαν σταδίους ἐννέα, ποιου ὡν τὴν πορείαν ἑπὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν, ἐπεζεύχαν Ἀραβεῖς αὐτῷ οὐκ ἑλάττους τῶν πεντακισχίλιων. 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 (La² Ad machabeus, ordinata circum se militia et constitutis super cohortes; La⁵ At machabeus, ordinatis circum se sex milibus et constitutis per cohortes; La⁶ Machabeus autem ordinans exercitum suum per turmas et cohortes, constituit eos in ordines; La⁷ Machabeus itaque ordinans exercitum suum per turmas et cohortes, constituit eos in ordine; La⁸ machabeus, disposito exercitu suo per quohortes, constituit eos in ordines). In La⁹ (Maccabeus autem ordinavit circum se militia et constituit super cohortes) the missing object of
as meaning that Judas divided his army into three parts: two σπείραι were under the command of Dositheos and Sosipatros,\(^94\) and the third σπείρα, 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 ἔξηλθεν ἐν τρισίν ἄρχαις ἔξοπσθεν αὐτῶν.\(^95\) However that may be, the term σπείρα appears once again to be designating a unit over a thousand men strong.

The other instance of σπειρηδὸν 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 "there appeared over all the city [sc. Jerusalem] golden-clad cavalry charging through the air, in companies fully armed with lances and drawn daggers—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)

At first glance, the adverb σπειρηδὸν seems inapoposite here: the σπείρα 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 ἵπποι and ἵππαι at 5:2–3 suggest.\(^98\) Goldstein could have been a term designating the unit commanders, e.g. ducex. See Abel 1949, 438. We note here that, in rendering σπείρα as cohorts, 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 τὴν ὑμηρὴν εὐθυκείτερον ἤλθας . . . αὐτῶς δὲ ἥ Ῥημίθως ἐμπομοὺς τοὺς 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 μαχαίρια σπασμοίς is rather to be moved after πάλης, as suggested by the Old Latin versions. See Habicht 1979, 225.

\(^97\) Occasionally, we do find mention of Roman σπείραι (=cohorts) containing both infantry and cavalry: D.H. 10.44.1 τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἔτασσεν ἵππεις τε καὶ τοὺς πεζοὺς κατὰ σπείρας; J. BJ 3.67 τῶν δὲ σπειρῶν αὐτὸς ἔθακ μὲν σίγον ἄν τι πεδίου πεζοὺς, αὐτὸς δὲ λαυταὶ δεκατρεῖς ἄν εξεσπείσας μὲν πεζοὺς, ἵππεις δὲ ἐκαστὸν ἔκοψας; App. BC 1.10.87 σπείραι πέντε πεζῶν καὶ δύο ἵππων. Polybius, too, at 15.4.4, uses the term σχημα, equivalent to the Greek σπείρα and the Latin manipulus, with regard to companies of foot and horse (προσλαβῶν δέκα σημαίας Ῥωμαίας ἰππῶν καὶ πέζων). See Walbank 1957–1979, 2.445.

\(^98\) The weapons mentioned here are mainly (but not exclusively) cavalry weapons. The κάμαξ and the μέγαχορα 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, 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 εξοπλιζομαι would have agreed in gender with λόγχας (λόγχας σπειρηδόν εξωπλισμένας). Since we have no reason to question the reading εξοπλισμένους, which is almost unanimously supported by the Greek manuscripts, we should rather dismiss this suggestion. The problem can be remedied if we accept Abel’s (1949, 348) proposal to read λόγχας, ‘(infantry) companies,’ instead of λόγχας, ‘lances.’

In the Hellenistic period, the λόγχας was the basic infantry unit, generally numbering sixteen men; sixteen λόγχας formed the 256-strong σπειρα previously discussed apropos of the Macedonian phalanx. If we adopt this emendation, we are to understand the phrase λόγχας σπειρηδόν εξωπλισμένους as a periphrastic—and, indeed, strange—way of referring to σπειρα units: it sounds natural to say that Judas arranged his army in σπειρα (12:20 τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν στρατον κατέστησεν) in a manner analogous to 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 ἀργάνων καὶ βελῶν πολλὰ παραθέσεις), yet it need not have the same meaning here.

The phrase παντοῖοι ἑπτάτακτοι δὲ αὐτῶν κατέστησεν αὐτὸν περὶ σπεῖραι, ‘troop of spearmen,’ attested in Sophocles and Euripides, ingeniously suggests a war engine (12:27 ἄργανων καὶ βελῶν πολλά παραθέσεις), yet it need not have the same meaning here. The phrase παντοῖοι ἑπτάτακτοι δὲ αὐτῶν κατέστησεν αὐτὸν περὶ σπεῖραι may refer to cataphract cavalry, on which see Bar-Kochva, loc. cit., and Sekunda 1994, 21.

κάμας, cf. Hsch. κ 557 κάμακες: ὑπάτη ἑπτάτοι for the Macedonian cavalry μάχαιρα, see Hatzopoulos 2001, 51; for the Hellenistic cavalry ἱππεῖς, see Bar-Kochva 1976, 74 and Hatzopoulos 2001, 51–54; on the λογχαφόόροι 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 ἀργάνων καὶ βελῶν πολλά παραθέσεις), yet it need not have the same meaning here. The phrase παντοῖοι ἑπτάτακτοι δὲ αὐτῶν κατέστησεν αὐτὸν περὶ σπεῖραι, ‘troop of spearmen,’ attested in Sophocles and Euripides, ingeniously suggests a war engine (12:27 ἄργανων καὶ βελῶν πολλά παραθέσεις), yet it need not have the same meaning here.

The phrase παντοῖοι ἑπτάτακτοι δὲ αὐτῶν κατέστησεν αὐτὸν περὶ σπεῖραι may refer to cataphract cavalry, on which see Bar-Kochva, loc. cit., and Sekunda 1994, 21.

99 Only the minuscule 71 reads κάμας: τὸ Θήβης παραθέσει πάνω. E. Ph. 442 μύριαν ἄγων: λόγχην.

100 Only the minuscule 71 reads κάμας: τὸ Θήβης παραθέσει πάνω. E. Ph. 442 μύριαν ἄγων: λόγχην.

101 The reading λόγχης is preserved in a small number of Lucianic manuscripts (64°-236-728-19-62-93). Of the Old Latin translations, Lα388 reflect the reading λόγχας (acies/ordines) and only Lα17 the reading λόγχας (hastis/lanceas). Apart from Abel, Hahich (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, λόγχας was a subdivision of a cavalry ἱππεῖς. See Lesquier 1973, 91.

103 See Connolly 1987, 76 and 78.
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epiphanic battles as ἱππομαχίαι, involving σπεῖραι of gold-clad λογχοφόροι cavalrymen and ἱλαι ἔπεων. In this case, we are presented with two analogically constructed phrases, ἱππεῖς σπειρηδὸν ἐξωπλισμένω καὶ ἱλαι ἔπεων διατεταγμέναι, in which ἐξωπλισμένος corresponds to διατεταγμένοι, and ἱππεῖς σπειρηδὸν (σπεῖραι ἱππεών) corresponds to ἱλαι ἔπεων. On the basis of this analogy, and considering that the Hellenistic cavalry ἰλῆ numbered 64 men, we can assume that the σπεῖραι would have been of a relatively small size, analogous to that of the ἱλαί. 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 σπεῖραι 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 Poseidonius 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 manipulatum. 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, σπεῖραι 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 σπεῖραι 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. ἐξωπλισμένος, “get under arms, stand in armed array,” and s.v. διαταγμένοι 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 σπεῖρας, and that the second-century Roman maniples that a Greek author like Polybius calls σπεῖρας 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 σπειρηδόόν 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 σπεῖρας 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 σπειρηδόόν. 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, 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 σπειρηδόόν against the camp of the Aetolians, what the exact size of the σπεῖρας mentioned was? With regard to σπειρηδόόν, 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 σπειρηδόόν from Polybius via Posidonius. A weak (inter)textual clue that might corroborate this conjecture is the aorist participle διατάαξας, to which σπειρηδόόν is attached in 2 Macc 12:20 (ὁ δὲ Μακκαβαῖος διατάαξας τὴν περὶ αὑτὸν στρατιὰν σπειρηδόόν), reminiscent of the σπειρηδὸν τάαξας in Plb. 5.4.9 (ἐφῆκε τοὺς πελταστὰς τοὺς ὑπὸ Λεόντιον ταττομένους, σπειρηδὸν τάαξας).

---

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 παρακλείεισθαι ‘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 . . . ἀλλοι σφέεις παρακλήσασι). The only two other occurrences of the verb in ancient Greek literary texts 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 παρέεκλεισαν). The Polybian lexica render παρακλείεισθαι as “imprison”—probably on the analogy of συγκλείεισθαι, which is used in this sense with regard to Cleomenes at 5.36.8 and 5.38.6—noting that παρέεκλεισαν is a lectio dubia. 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 ἄρματος ἀπέέκτειναν), which probably draws from Polybius, or from a source common to both authors, presumably Phylarchus, editors and commentators have suggested emendations in order to bring Polybius’ text into consonance with Plutarch’s: παρέεκλεισαν (Schweighäuser), παρεκέέντησαν (Schenkelius), κατέέσφαξαν (Hultsch). Walbank (1957–1979, 1:569), assuming that παρέεκλεισαν 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 παρέεκλεισαν 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 παρέεκλεισεν οὖς 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.”

Andronicus’ act as ἂδικος φόνος in the immediately following verse leaves no doubt that παρέέκλεισεν denotes an assassination.110 Could this idiomatic, and elsewhere unattested, use of the very rare verb παρακλείεια 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 ῥύύδην ‘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 streams112 (Hom. Od. 15.426 κούρη ... Ἀρύβαντος ῥυδὸν ἄφνειοι; Call. Hec. fr. 366 Pleiffer 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 ῥύύδην/θύυννάαν τε καὶ μυσσωτόν ἡμέρας πάασας/δαινύμενον);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 (κατακλείωσας), where it modifies the verb φεέροαι, said of a horse running at full speed (ὁ δὲ ἄρης ἀπὸ τῆς πληγῆς ἀποσφαλήσας ἐφέερετο ῥύύδην διὰ τοῦ έταξὺ τοῦ στρατόπεδου), as in 2 Macc 3:25 (φερόενου ῤοίζῳ ῥυδήν ὁ ἄρης ἐνέσεισε τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ τὰς ἐπροσθίας ὁπλὰς). The same verb is used in 2 Macc 9:7 to designate the rushing motion of Antiochus’ chariot (τοῦ ἅρματος φερόενου ροίζῳ), this time intensified by ροίζῳ, “with a rushing motion,” which apparently corresponds to ῥύδην in 3:25. The use of the synonymous ῥύδην and ροίζῳ may be due to the author’s striving after lexical variation. It may also

110 See Abel 1949, 342. In 2 Macc 13:21 (ὑ Ρόόδοκος ἀνεζητήθη καὶ κατελήθη καὶ κατεκλείθη) κατακλείω may also have the meaning “to kill.” De Bruyne (1921, 428–9) 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, κατελήθη, κατεκλείθη 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 Ἰάασων ἐγκληθείς πρὸς Αρέαν) 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).


112 See Hsch. p 471 μιδόν ἂ μιδήν χύδην, δαψίλες, μεστικάς, σφοδρᾶς; Suid. p 283 μιδόν μιδόν ἀφνύνονται, ἀντὶ τοῦ μιδήν καὶ μεστικάς πλουτοῦσον. ἡ κεχυμένως, ἀντὶ τοῦ πάνω.

113 The adverb also occurs, probably in the same sense, in the very mutilated fragment 104.11 West.

be that 3:25 and 9:7 were penned by different hands. As explained earlier apropos of ἀναστρατοπεδεῦω (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 ἔφευγον, 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.’ Polybius uses it at 5.84.2 of elephants clashing in battle (ἄλγη μὲν ὀνὸς τινα [sc. ηθρία] τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίου συνήρεσαι τοῖς ἐνεργοῖς) and in fr. 168 Büttner-Wobst of the Macedonians clashing with the barbarians (τῶν ἰμακεδόνων ἐκ μεταβολῆς συνερεισάαντω τοῖς βαρβάροις, εὐθέεως ἐκκλίναντες ἐκείνων). 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 Βαχχίδην συνερείσαντες, ὑπὲρ τούς δισμύριος αὐτῶν ἀνέιλον), and later in Diodorus Siculus (13.46.1 ὅποτε δὲ συνερείσεαν αὐτὸς καὶ) and in Plutarch (Them. 14.4 αὐτὸς ἀντιστροφοῦσα καὶ συνερείσασχα), 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) to meet in close conflict. first reading was adopted by Rahlfs, whereas Hanhart (2008, 26) rightly opted for the second argument that “die Art der Überlieferung (vgl. App.) legt es nahe, dass hier kein gewöhnlicher itazistischer Fehler vorliegt”). συνερίζειν, “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 littotes dont la recherche a demandé veilles et sueur à notre epitomator.” συνεριζεῖν is in fact unattested in pre-Common Era Greek literature (συνερίζειν in Hr. 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 ὑπὲρ ἑρρήθη συνερείσθη αὐτῷ [sc. τῇ Μοῖρᾳ]).
is thus only in Polybius and in 2 Maccabees that συνερείιδω 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), the tragic poets (5–14), Apollonius Rhodius (16), 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 ὀἰκτίίστῳ µόορῳ (2 Macc 9:28), which resonates with the Homeric ὀἰκτίίστῳ θανάτῳ (Od. 11.412). See Appendix 13, 28. A Homeric reminiscence may also underlie 2 Mac 8:18, where Judas Maccabeus expresses his reliance on the almighty God, who with a single nod (ἕν ἔλεξεν) can strike down not only the enemies of the Jews but the entire world. Cl. II. 1.528–30, where Zeus’ nod of assent to Thetis makes Olympus tremble (§ καὶ κυάνες ἐπ’ ὀφρύσιν ἐσυγκρονίδες Ὁλυμποὺς), and Antipater of Sidon’s epigram (AP 7.2) praising Homer for having sung the “all-powerful nod of Zeus” (νεῦα Κρονίδαο τὸ παγκρατέζερε).

120 The parallel between King Phineas, whose food was snatched or fouled by the Harpies, so that “a truly painful and unending necessity (πικρή καὶ ἄναγκης ἀνάγκης) 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 πικρὰς 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 \( \theta \alpha \alpha \xi \sigma \theta \alpha \mu \iota \) \( \pi \nu \alpha \) \( \delta \phi \iota \nu \) (Appendix 12, 4) or pairings such as \( \alpha \nu \delta \rho \rho \omega \omicron \delta \omicron \omicron \omega \kappa \alpha \gamma \gamma \nu \varsigma \omega \) (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 \( \varepsilon \pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon \zeta \iota \varsigma \tau \pi \omega \theta \mu \mu \omega \) (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 \( \varepsilon \nu \alpha \pi \varepsilon \iota \zeta \delta \omicron \omega \omicron \mu \alpha \varsigma \) 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 \( \alpha \pi \alpha \lambda \omicron \gamma \iota \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \mu \iota \nu \delta \nu \xi \chi \omicron \mu \epsilon \omicron \nu \) (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 \( \delta \nu \xi \chi \omicron \mu \epsilon \omicron \nu \pi \iota \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \mu \iota \nu \) \( \tau \iota \nu \) \( \alpha \pi \lambda \omicron \gamma \iota \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \mu \) 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 \( \pi \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \zeta \zeta \ldots \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \pi \lambda \gamma \zeta \tau \alpha \zeta \tau \iota \nu \) \( \tau \iota \nu \) \( \tau \nu \) \( \theta \sigma \omega \nu \) \( \delta \omicron \nu \kappa \iota \nu \) (Appendix 13, 5) occurs in the context of Yahweh’s epiphanic intervention

\(^{122}\) 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 βάρβαρος τὰς θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειας) 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 µόορῳ 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 οὐκίστον µόρον ἀποθανοῦσεν; 5.27.1 τὸν οὐκίστον ἀπολέσθαι µόρον; 6.7.2 τὸν οὐκίστον µόρον ἀποθανεῖν). That there is a relation of direct dependence between the epitome of 2 Maccabees and the works of the aforementioned 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. διετής χρόνος instead of δύο έτη), 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 ἐνπερείειδομαι 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 παρακλείειον), 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.
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 ... ἀπολύθῃ τοῦ θανάτου, 6:30 ἀπολύθηνα τοῦ θανάτου; 12:10, 17 ἀποσπάσαντες 14:3 ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἁμείας χρόνοις, 14:38 ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθὲν χρόνοις τῆς ἁμείας), but also at a considerable distance from one another, in different chapters. For example, verse 35 in chapter 10 (ὑποφαίνεις δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας εὐκος νεανίς τῶν περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυοῖς διὰ τὰς βλασφημίας προσβαλόντας τῷ τείχει ἀφειδῶς καὶ θηριώδει θυῳ τὸν ἐμπίπτοντα έκοπτον) contains four word combinations which recur in six other chapters, and verse 30 in chapter 3 (ὁ δὲ τῶν κύριον εὐλογεῖ τὸν κύριον εὐλογεῖ τὸν παραδοξάζοντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον, καὶ τὸ μικρὸ πρότερον δέεος καὶ παραχῆς γέμων ίερὸν τοῦ παντοκράτορος εὐφροσύνης κυρίος χαρὰς καὶ εὐφροσύνης ἐπεπλήρητο) contains five word combinations which recur in five other chapters. Some of these combinations occur elsewhere in the Septuagint (e.g. in the last-quoted example, εὐλογεῖν τὸν κύριον), others are very sparingly attested in profane Greek literature (e.g. δέεος καὶ παραχῆς is previously found in Lysias and Isocrates and ὑποφαίνει τῆς ἡμέρας in Xenophon and Polybius), whereas others are peculiar to the author of the epitome (e.g. κόπτειν τὸν ἐμπίπτοντα, πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυοῖς). 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


2 15:34 εὐλογεῖσαν τὸν ἐπιφάνη κόρον λέγοντες Εὐλογητὸς ὁ διατηρήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἀμέλεα; 10:7 καθαρισθῆναι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον; 6:29 τὴν μικρὸ πρότερον εὐμένειαν; 9:10 τὸν μικρὸ πρότερον ... δοκοῦντα; 13:16 τὴν παρεμβολὴν δέεος καὶ παραχῆς ἐπεπλήρωσαν; 6:4 τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἱερὸν ἁστίας καὶ κόμων ... ἐπεπλήρωσα.
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; all but four of them 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, we notice that in twenty-four of its forty-two verses there occur thirty-three non-trivial word combinations 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 ἐκθέμενος γενόμενος ὅς βασιλεύει, 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 καταλαγῇ ὑπερηφανίας ὦκεντο δούλοις, 8:29 is further linked to 10:38, with which it shares the phrase ταύτα δὲ διαιταράξασθαι, and 10:38 shares with 12:37 the combination μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν; 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) ἐμπνεύσεως is used of the first martyred brother at 7:5 and of Razis at 14:45, b) ὑπερηφανία and μάστίς, used at 7:36 (τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ὑπερηφανίας ἀποίησι) and 7:37 (μετὰ ἐπισκόπων καὶ μαστίγων), respectively, with reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, prefigure the king’s punishment at 9:11 (τῆς ὑπερηφανίας λήγειν ... θεία μάστιγι), c) the adverb παντέλως occurs five

---


4 χαίρειν καὶ ἐναίνειν, ὁ καθαρισμὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, γενέσεως τάξιν ἐξελευθερώσει τοῦ τόπου. On the basis of these word combinations, as well as of single words shared between the letters and the epitome (e.g. ἀνέγκαιος, ἀνεπίστατος, διασαφέως, διαφορα, ἐγκαινιομένος, ἐκβολής, καθαγαίως, κατακλάσως, κτίστης, μεγάλος, ὑπομνημάτισθαι), 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 καθαρισμῶς 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 καθά-άπερ, 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 δό-σεπ, 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 γίγνο-μαι, used with a substantive, an adjective or a prepositional phrase, occurs nine times in chapter 7 and a dozen other times in the rest of the epitome, 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. 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. “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. This said, it cannot be

---


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, 233aβ.2.

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 τής τοῦ παντοκράτορος χείρας ὑστερ ζῶν ὑστερ ἀποθανόν ἐκφεύόμεθα, and 6:31 τούτον τὸν τρόπον μετήλλαξαν having verbal parallels to 7:31 οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃς τῆς χείρας τοῦ θεοῦ, and 7:7 μεταλάξαντος δὲ τοῦ πρῶτον τὸν τρόπον τούτον, respectively) and of the suicide of Razis (14:38 σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαίσιον παραψευμένος and 14:46 ἐπικαλέσαμεν τὸν δεσπόζοντα τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεῦματος τάτα αὐτῶν πάλιν ἀποδοῦναι having verbal parallels to 2:21 ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαίσιον, 7:37 σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδομι περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων, and 7:23 τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν θεοῦ ὑμῖν πάλιν ἀποδίδοσι, 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 Habich’s (1979, 173) 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 ὑφαίνου κρίσεως, 9:5 ἄρτι δὲ αὐτοῦ καταλήψαντος τὸν λόγον, 9:7 συνέβη δὲ καὶ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν, 9:11 τῆς ὑπεργερανίας λήγεν ἀπὶ . . . θεὸς μάστιγα, and 9:18 δικαιὰ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσει share verbal correspondences with, respectively, verses 7:11 ἐξ ὑφαίνου ταῦτα κάκτημα, 7:30 ἄρτι δὲ ταύτης καταλήψασθη, 7:31 συνέβη δὲ καὶ . . . ἀναγκάζεσθαι, 7:35 θεοῦ κρίσιν, 7:36 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσει δικαια τὰ πρόστιμα τῆς ὑπεργερανίας ἀποίηση, and 7:37 μετὰ ἐπασιοῦ 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 CE15 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.

---


13 See 1.2.4 and 4.2.3.

14 See van Henten 1997, 170.

15 See Gauger 2002.
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), μεταλλάξασθαι ζῆν (7:14), ἐπιδέεχεσθαι τῶν θανάτων (7:29), and ὑπακούειν τοῦ προστάγματος (7:30) do not recur earlier than Diodorus Siculus; the combination πάρτα φιλή, 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; the same goes for the combinations γενναῖος φιλή (7:21), and μάστιξιν αἰκίζεσθαι (7:1); the closing verse of chapter 7 (7:42 τὰ μὲν ὄν περὶ τούς σπλαγχνιστὰς καὶ τὰς ὑπερβαλλόμενας αἰκίας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δεδήλωσθα) finds parallels in Josephus, although it has a remote precedent in Herodotus.

b) The use of the substantive προήγορος (7:2, 4) to designate the first martyred brother, who spoke on behalf of his family, προήγορός 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. The word has, however, several epigraphical

---

16 Cf. 1 Macc 15:2 καὶ ἦσαν [sc. αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ] περιέχουσιν τὸν τρόπον τούτον.
17 D.S. 3.33.5 ἀπολύονται τοῦ ζῆν προθύμως; 31.9.1 ἀδελφοὶ ἀπολύθησαν τοῦ ζῆν ἤλθαν; Phl. Mor. 241Ε τοῦ ζῆν ἀπόλησαν; D.S. 18.56.2 μεταλλάξασθαι αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπων; Arr. Perip.M.Euos. 23.4 μεταλλάξασθαι αὐτῶν; D.S. 8.27.2 ἐπιδέεχεσθαι τὸν ἐντύμον θάνατον; 14.67.2 τοῦ Δυναμικοῦ προστάγμασιν ὑπακούομεν; J. AJ 3.319 ὑπακούειν τοῖς Μαυσολίῳ προστάγματι; 5.154 ἀλλήλων ὑπακούειν προστάγμασι; 12.269 τοῖς Λυκίαντι 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].
20 D.H. 3.40.3, 5.51.3, 6.30.1, 7.10.5, 9.40.4, 20.5.5; 20.16.2; Phl. Flacc. 75; J. BJ 7.200, 373; Vit. 147.
21 J. AJ 3.187 καὶ τούτων δὲ ἐν τοῖς τοσούτων μηδὲν διεξάγοντι τὸν θάνατον ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐν τοσοῦτον ἀποθείον αἰκίας. J. AJ 3.187 καὶ τούτων δὲ ἐν τοῖς τοσούτων μὴν τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰναι ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἰ

---
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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, 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. 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 προήγορας ταῖς δημοσίας δίκαις) he constantly showed himself eager and zealous and procured many benefits and advantages to the city from the verdicts.” 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.

More than a dozen other epigraphical instances of προήγορος date to the Roman Imperial period and all but two are from Asia Minor. The earliest of them is found in a decree of Sardis dated by Robert (1950, 8–9) to the Augustan

Roman governor. Ardzzone (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 διά and the δουλή. See also H. Schaefer, “προήγορος,” PW 23.1, col. 105.


22 See Masson 1987, 228.

23 Trans. M. Austin in Austin 2006, 244.


period. 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 (Ἐθνός). A term related to προήγορος is συνήγορος and, indeed, a second-century CE inscription from Attaalia (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 πατρίδος καὶ πόλεων πλείστων | ἀγώνας εἰρηκότα ἐπὶ τῶν Σέβαστῶν καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν). 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. The Old Latin translators of 2 Maccabees understood προήγορος at 7:2 and 7:4, to mean “the one who speaks first,” 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, 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; it seems likely that these Jewish delegates exercised a judicial function analogous to that of the προήγοροι τῆς γερουσίας mentioned in some of the aforementioned 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,” 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: βουλευτῶν καὶ Μηνογένου καὶ Ἀττάλου καὶ Κλεάνθου στρατηγῶν καὶ προηγόρων γνωρίσας. See also H. Schaefer, “προήγορος,” PW 23.1, col. 106.


31 La 7:2 unus autem ex illis, ita primus, ait; 7:4 qui prior erat locutus; La 5:7:2 primus ex ait; 7:4 qui prior fuerat locutus; La 5:7:2 qui erat primus; 7:4 qui prior fuerat locutus; La 5:7:2 prior incipiens; 7:4 qui locutus erat prior; La 5:7:2 principes sermonis existit; 7:4 qui princeps loco verba tecī.

32 4:44 καταντήσαντι δὲ τοῖς βασιλεῖς εἰς Τύρῳ ἐπὶ κατοίκιοι ἑπιτίθεντο ἵνα τιμηθήσαντες τρεῖς ἰάδρες ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας: 4:48 ταχέως ἐν τῇ δικαιολογίᾳ ἐπιτίθεντο ἵνα περὶ πόλεως καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν προχορθήσαντες.

33 HG 1.1.27, 2.2.22; An. 5.5.7. See H. Schaefer, “προήγορος,” PW 23.1, col. 104.
cities; all its other attestations are clustered in the first and second centuries CE. Indeed, 2 Macc 4:48 finds a verbal parallel in a first/second-century CE honorary decree from Pisidia.

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.

c) The phrases ἓκθημος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς (7:3, 39; cf. 14:27) and ἀπολλυμένους νῦν ἔπτα ... μᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ημέρας (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 7:5 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 μᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ημέρας recurs in 3 Macc 4:14 (ἀφανίσας μᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ημέρας) 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: ἀφανίσας τὸ γένος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν ημέρᾳ μία. The author uses the same verb, ἀφανίσας, yet, instead of the trivial ἐν ημέρᾳ μία, he opts for the idiomatic μᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ημέρας, 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, on the other hand, support the

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.
37 With the exception, perhaps, of the aforementioned inscription from Agrigento (IGUR 1.2), in which προηγορέω occurs. The inscription has been variously dated from as high as the late third century BCE to the second century BCE. See Ardizzone 1967, 173n78. Manganaro (1965, 213) places it to the first half of the first century BCE.
38 Cf. Esth 3:7 ἰδίῳ ἀπολλεῖσθαι ἐν μίᾳ ημέρᾳ τὸ γένος Μαθοχάους, Add B.7 ἐν ημέρᾳ μίᾳ βασιλείας εἰς τὸν ἑδύν κατεπλήνοντας; 1 Macc 5:27 καὶ ἔξωρα πάντα τῶν σώματος ἐν ημέρᾳ μίᾳ, Ph. Vitr. 138.7 ἐν καρι καὶ ημέρα μία ἐγκονὸν ὅμων καὶ μνήμην κεῖνεν.
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. The latest possible date that has been suggested is the reign of Caligula or the subsequent reign of Claudius. 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.

---

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 Axiocetus 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 ἀπαρασήήµαντος (2 Macc 15:36) and φιλοσολίτης (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, προήήγορος, 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 aforementioned 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 Siculo’s *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 aforementioned 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 sparsely 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 χρόος(e.g. διετής χρόος instead of δύο έτη) 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 (ἐἰ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκυθῶν ἔλεγον/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 μεταφράσις, 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 euhemerological 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). 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX book</th>
<th>Date of translation/composition</th>
<th>Extra-LXX works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>BGS, 96: “Surely before 210, probably before 260, perhaps before 282 BCE.” CCS (Scarlata, 55): “Third or middle second century B.C.E.”</td>
<td>Menander, Dyscolus: 316 BCE. Theophrastus, History of Plants, 314 (?) BCE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>BGS, 96: “Surely before 210, probably before 260, perhaps before 282 BCE.” CCS (Salvesen, 31): Before the end of the third century BCE.</td>
<td>Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus, 280s BCE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Voitilla, 45): “Leviticus was translated at the same time as the rest of the Pentateuch, commonly dated to the third century BCE.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Evans, 59–62): Third century BCE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>BGS, 96: “Surely before 210, probably before 262, perhaps before 282 BCE.”</td>
<td>Philo of Byzantium: 242–220 BCE.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Perkins, 72–73): Third or second century BCE; <em>terminus ante quem</em>: mid-second century BCE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (van der Meer, 89): “Late third century BCE... in the period between the fourth (219–217 BCE) and fifth (202–195 BCE) Syrian wars.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>BGS, 96: “The translation dates from the same period as the OG of 1-4 Kingdoms [Bartleby]. It is posterior to the translation of the Psalms [Munnich]. First half of the second century BCE (?)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Satterthwaite, 105): “LXX Judges was in existence by the end of the second century BCE. ... It was produced no earlier than the 160s BCE.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 Kings</td>
<td>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.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Hugo, 129): “Early second century BCE., with the translation of the first book perhaps circulating before the second; <em>kaige recension</em>: first century BCE.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4 Kings</td>
<td>BGS, 96–97: “2 and 3 Kingdoms are posterior to the Psalms [Munnich]. 3 Kingdoms is anterior to 150 BCE.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Law, 149–50): “The middle of the second century [B.C.E.] is the latest date for the translation of Kingdoms. ... The <em>kaige</em> revision of 3–4 Kingdoms can be dated to the first century BCE.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Good, 169): “Second century BCE. prior to the citations of the Greek translation in Eusebius (ca. 150 BCE.).”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>BGS, 97: “150 BCE [Gerleman].”</td>
<td>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: date of origin in the Maccabean period.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Aitken and Coppi, 342–43): “Early second century BCE. [Cook], in the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor (181–145 BCE.) [d’Hamouville].”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>BGS, 97: “Probably beginning of the second century BCE [Munnich]; first century BCE [van der Kooij].”</td>
<td>Polybius, <em>Histories</em>: first part composed between 167 and 151 BCE; second part composed after 146 BCE.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schaper 1995, 150: “The Psalter was almost certainly translated in the last third of the second century BC.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Aitken, 321): “Second century BCE. [Munnich, Williams]; end of the second or beginning of the first century BCE. [Schaper, van der Kooij].”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Easterling and Knox 1985, 570.
6 *GAT*, 50.
7 *EANS*, 654.
8 *FGH* 2A, 1.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>BGS, 97:</th>
<th>After the Psalms but before Isaiah.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olice 2209, 15: “Around 150 BCE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>CCS (Hossip, 532): “Second century B.C.E. . . . after the composition of the Psalms and before Isaiah.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>“150 BCE [Garleman].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Cox, 388): “As early as the mid-second century B.C.E., but probably it is somewhat later.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Minor Prophets</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>“Translation posterior to the Psalms [Mannich] but anterior to Isaiah [Seeligmann]. First half of the second century B.C.E.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Dines, 441): “The XII belong plausibly to the second century B.C.E. . . . Most scholars suggest the middle of the century.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>Between 170 and 132 BCE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Nganga 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. 142 B.C.E. [van der Koot].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>First half of the second century B.C.E. ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Shadad, 472–73): “OG text: before 116 B.C.E.; revised text: early part of the period 116 B.C.E.—50 B.C.E. [Tor].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>“1:1–5:8 translated at the same time as Jeremiah [Tor]; 3:9–end, around 80 CE [Thackeray].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Ryan, 488–92): “Terminus ante quem: ca. 165 B.C.E. [Dancy, Burke, Martinez], first century B.C.E. [Watson]; 116 B.C.E. for Bar 1:1–5:8, if the translator/redactor of Bar 1:1–5:8 is the same as the translator of LXX Jer 29–52.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle of Jeremiah</td>
<td>BGS, 85:</td>
<td>“Before 100 BCE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Wright, 521): “A second-century B.C.E. date seems most probable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Esdras</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>“1–2 Esdras. Before 150 BCE. 1 Esdras might be slightly anterior to 2 Esdras [Hamart].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Patmore, 183): “Sometime in the mid-second century B.C.E.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>Second century B.C.E. [Festugière].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Stuckenbruck and Weeks, 241–42): Early date on the basis of orthographic evidence (forms with θείος/θεῖος/θεικός, which become rare in documentary texts after the second century B.C.E.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)</td>
<td>BGS, 88, 97:</td>
<td>Between 132 and 117 BCE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Wright, 412–13): “Slightly before or after 117 B.C.E.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td>BGS, 85:</td>
<td>“Perhaps 124 BCE [Momigliano], in any case before Pompey (=63 BCE [rev. Schürer]).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter of Aristob: “A date ranging from the 150s BCE to the last decade of the second century BCE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Maccabees</td>
<td>BGS, 97:</td>
<td>“Last third of the second century BCE or beginning of the first century BCE [rev. Schürer].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Williams, 263–65): “Between 124 and 63 BCE; ca. 130 BC [Schwartz]; the book appeared in two editions, the first ca. 130 BCE and the (expanded) second ca. 150 BCE [Williams].”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


13 Wright 2015, 28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>CCS (Atiken, 336): “Sometime before the first century B.C.E.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer of Manasseh</td>
<td>CCS (Croy, 2006, 3iii): “Somewhere within the range of 100 B.C.E to 50 C.E.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (Old Greek</td>
<td>CCS (McLay, 546–47): OG: around the beginning of the first century B.C.E. [Montgomery, Hartman and Dr Lella], +7: first century B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Theodotion)</td>
<td>The Additions to Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Additions to</td>
<td>CCS (Eschay, 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.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Additions to</td>
<td>CCS (Bosworth, 2004, 2): Before and/or after Pompey’s siege of Jerusalem (63 B.C.E); final reduction possibly in the Herodian period [Wright].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms of Solomon</td>
<td>CCS (Evanselo, 426–29): Before and/or after Pompey’s siege of Jerusalem (63 B.C.E); final reduction possibly in the Herodian period [Wright].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maccabees</td>
<td>CCS (Rapo Johnson, 295): “Sometime in the last century of Ptolemaic rule (c.a. 102–35 B.C.E.) or the early decades of Roman rule (50 B.C.E.–70 C.E.).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>CCS (Youngblood, 504): “LXX Lamentations fits comfortably between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geras 2014, 44: “Circa 150 B.C.E., give or take a decade or two on either end.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Corley, 224–25): Between 161 and 63 B.C.E. [Moore]; between 124 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 Alexandre Salome (who reigned 76–67 B.C.E.), if the character of Judith was modelled after this queen [Boccaccini].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gティス, 97: “OG shortly before 145 B.C.E [Greeth]; 94: between 50 and 50 C.E.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BGS, 97: “OG: shortly before 145 B.C.E [Greeth]; 94: between 50 and 50 C.E.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Cameron 1993, 56.
15 Malitz 1983, 30–32.
16 Gigante 2002, 29, 38–47.
17 GAT, 201.
18 GAT, 216.
19 PGH 2A, 2.
20 GAT, 566.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Translation Source</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom of Solomon</td>
<td>BGS, 85</td>
<td>“Last third of the first century BCE [Larcher].”</td>
<td>Philo Against Flaccus: 42/41 CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Aitken, 402–4)</td>
<td>“Early period of Roman rule of Egypt, 31–10 BCE; [Larcher: first century BCE], before Philo [Engberg-Pedersen]; reign of Caligula, 37–41 BCE [Winston].”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canticles (Song of Songs)</td>
<td>BGS, 97</td>
<td>“Translated by the kaige group in the first half of the first century CE [Barthélemy].”</td>
<td>Josephus, Jewish Wars: 79–81 CE; Jewish Antiquities: 93/94 CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Auwers, 373)</td>
<td>“Probably in the first century C.E. or at the earliest during the first century B.C.E.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>BGS, 96</td>
<td>“Translated by the kaige group in the first half of the first century CE [Barthélemy].”</td>
<td>Group kaige and Theodotion: 32–50 CE. Gospels and Acts: 70–100 CE. Hebrews: ca. 100 CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Bons, 119)</td>
<td>First century CE (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maccabees</td>
<td>BGS, 85</td>
<td>“Between 35 CE [Bickerman] and 100 CE [Dupont-Sommer].”</td>
<td>Plutarch, Lives: after 96 CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Hiebert, 328–9)</td>
<td>“First or second century CE; terminus ante quem: 72 C.E.”</td>
<td>1–2 Clement: ca. 102–150 CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>BGS, 97</td>
<td>“Perhaps the work of young Aquila.”</td>
<td>Revision of Aquila: 128–129 CE or later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCS (Aitken, 358)</td>
<td>“At the earliest it should be placed in the first century C.E., with a terminus ad quem of Aquila in the early second.”</td>
<td>Antuan, Theodicy: ca. 135 CE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).\(^1\) 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. נֶפֶרְבַּר, נֶפֶרְבַּא [1:36]) and proper names. Included are words such as Κυπριάρχης and Μαρσυφάρχης, 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\(^2\) 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.\(^3\)

The list also provides information on whether a neologism is an (absolute or non-absolute) hapax, a dis or a tris legomenon;\(^4\) 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neologism</th>
<th>2 Maccabees</th>
<th>Hapax/dis/tris legomenon</th>
<th>Next occurrence in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁμογράμμως</td>
<td>2:28</td>
<td>TAM V, I 688.12 (Louisa Gordon, 1st c. CE); NT 1 Pet 2:21; 1 Clem. 5.7.5, passim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεμάτος</td>
<td>3:31</td>
<td>Herenn. Phil. FGH 3c, 790 fr. 2.52; Sen. Suss. 1.12; Pto. Dom. 8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φικασμός</td>
<td>3:17</td>
<td>6.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) It should be specified here that only the neologisms 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. ἄνθρωποςelixon [12:43 ἄνθρωποςelixen], ἀντιθέτος [9:8 ἀντιθέτος], διχάζω [8:7 διχάζω; see 3.5.1, footnote 158], εὐγενεσία [10:13 εὐγενεσία], εὐθαρσεις [7:10 εὐθαρσεις], προσφυγεις [15:9 προσφυγεις], all attested in Codex Alexandrinus) have not been considered.

\(^2\) The military title Μυσάρχης, “commander of the Myians,” was used by some ecclesiastical writers (cf. Thdr. Stud. ep. 421.12) as a punning, derogatory epithet, having μύσας, “dilemma,” rather than Μυσάς, “Myian,” as its first component. See LSJ and Revised Supplement, and LBG, s.v.

\(^3\) E.g. 4:13 ἀγνακείαν αυχεῖαν Ἄ (671) 381-534 771, ἠγοναι 19-62 46-52 106; 5:3 θαρακαμοῦς τεθυρακισμονις Β, τεθυρακισμονις 19-62 LaÌ6Ì6; 5:18 προσεκέθασι προσεκέθασι Α΄ 29-71-107-120 (προσεκέθασι 671); 5:26 συνεκείσας συνεκείσας Β Β 46-52 55 311; 6:20 προπιπάσι προπιπάσι Β, προπιπάσι Β (πτωσ. 19) 55 58 311, προπιπάσι 106 (πτωσ. [see Katz 1961]; 13:25 διαστάλοις διαστάλοις Β 52 106 311; 14:18 ὕπευργεῖα ὕπευργεῖα Β 71 55 311, ἀποδιδόμενος 771; 14:20 ὑμείς ὄμοιος ομοίος Β 71 55 311, ὄμοιος ομοίος 381-4, 74 106; 15:11 προσεκέθασις προσεκέθασις Α΄, Rahil in his Septuaginta and Habicht (1976, 284-85) have shown preference for some of these variants: the first for προπιπάσι instead of προπιπάσι, the second for προπιπάσι instead of προπιπάσι, and both for ὁμοίος instead of ὄμοйοιος.

\(^4\) On the definitions of these terms, see 1.7b.
πρόοπτωσις 3:21, 13:12, Crateus fr. 8.6 Wellmann [1st. c. BCE]; Asol. Text. 5.1.6, 12 [1st. c. BCE]

ὑπονοθεύυω 4:7, 26, Mylau 133.2 [38 BCE–14 CE]; D.H. 11.18.2.2, Cat.Cod.Aust. 1.98.13, 24 [1st. c. BCE]

δεξιάζω 4:34, 14:24, Ph. Leg. 2.81.7; Apollon. Lex. 153.11 [1st–2nd c. CE]

διεµπίπληµα 4:40, h.l.

ἀκατάγνωστος 4:47, IG X,2 1623, D.1 [Macedonia, 48 CE]; SEG 58–1759.B.3 [Jerusalem, 1st c. CE]; NT Titus 2:8, See LBG, s.v.

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

βράζω 4:22, Priene, Pri. 51.167 [ca. 120 BCE; CIRB 130.9 [ca. 50 BCE–50 CE]


προενέχοαι 5:18, D.H. 6.21.3 (ơυχεοκοντατήσις); Ign. op. 3.3.3 Diekamp and Funk [1st–2nd c. CE]

εποξύνω 9:7, Them. in PN 5,6.10.30 Wendland [4th c. CE]

ἀποστρεβλόω 9:7, h.l.

πολεµοτροφέω 10:14, 15:14, 14:6, abs. h.l.
αρρενωδῶς 10:35 abs. h.l.  
χρονίσκος 11:1 abs. h.l.  
ἀργυρολόόγης 11:3 abs. h.l.  
λεοντηδόόν 11:11 h.l.  
Κυπριάάρχης 12:2 abs. h.l.  
προοδηγόός 12:36 dis legomenon Sib. Or. 8:24 [2nd c. CE]  
διάάσταλσις 13:25 abs. h.l.  
κρουνηδόόν 14:45 Ph. Legat. 197  
ἑγιασθενός 14:20 abs. h.l.  
αὐλαῖος (adj.) 14:41 h.l.  
κατευθικτέέω 14:43 abs. h.l.  
ὁ ῥοιόόψηφος 14:20 abs. h.l.  
αὐλαῖος 14:41 h.l.  
κατευθικτέέω 14:43 abs. h.l.  
προσεξηγέέο 15:11 Ph. Legat. 197  
Μαρδοχαϊκόός 15:36 dis legomenon Or. or. 13.2.12 Koetschau [2nd–3rd c. CE]  
εὐθίίκτως 15:38 Hdn. 4.7.2.5 Stavenhagen [2nd–3rd c. CE]  

Appendix 3: List of the doubtful neologisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neologisms</th>
<th>2 Maccabees</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Extra-LXX instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ἐφηβίία</td>
<td>4:9</td>
<td>IG II 1008.29–32 [118/7 BCE]; IG II 1028.42 [100–99 BCE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ἐπιλυπέέω</td>
<td>4:37, 8:32</td>
<td>3 Macr 2:9</td>
<td>IG Kinos 1 158.21 [2nd–1st c. BCE]; S.E. M. 11.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ἐντινάάσσω</td>
<td>4:41, 11:11</td>
<td>1 Macr 2:36</td>
<td>1 En. 89:63; Panareato 2.7 [ca. 39 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ἀλαβάνθις</td>
<td>6:11, 8:1</td>
<td>3 Macr 166.34; Demeetr. Elisc. 297, D.S. (5a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. πετρογέφης</td>
<td>8:21</td>
<td>Ocell. 1.14 Horder; Plu. 1139B, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. διεξίίπτα</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>abs. h.l.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ἄραμμα</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>J. AJ 1.119, 322; Beau-Miford, Journeys 1964–68 214,11 [ca. 72 CE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ἀστυπάθες</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td>1 Macr 12:9; Let. Aris. 211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. φιλοπολίίτης</td>
<td>14:37</td>
<td>Ephesos 116.5 [Hellenistic]; Aphrodisius 156.1 [41/34 CE]; Aphrodisius 296.2 [mid 1st c. CE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. παρεπιδεύειν</td>
<td>15:10</td>
<td>Aristotel (7) iud. Phil. Vit. p. 39 Jensen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ἐπικυρία</td>
<td>15:17</td>
<td>A.R. 1.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 ἀὐλαῖος, as a substantive meaning perhaps “doorkeeper,” is attested in an undated inscription from Thebes (Syringes 199.2). For the instances of ἀὐλαῖος 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neologisms</th>
<th>2 Maccabees</th>
<th>Other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books</th>
<th>Extra-LXX instances&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. κατασφαλίζοµαι</td>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>3 Macc 4:9</td>
<td>Πρωτεύς 12:26 [84/81 BCE]; Memn. FHG 3.36.21; Ἐφεσος 2538.3 [Roman]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ἵππωμεν</td>
<td>2:21; 8:1; 14:38</td>
<td>4 Macc 4:26</td>
<td>NT Gad 1:14; BCH 56 (1932) 291.8–9 [163/164 CE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ἀκαθάρτις&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3:33</td>
<td>3 Macc 1:16</td>
<td>Posidon. fr. 22 Theler (&lt;apud Str. 3.3.7.24); Memn. FHG 3.59.28; Ph. Mos. 2.146, 152; NT Acts 1:16; BCH 7.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ἀσκληπείον&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4:37; 8:32</td>
<td>3 Macc 7:9</td>
<td>IK Reale 154.21 [2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;–1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; c. BCE]; S.E. M. 11.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ἀνναυσία&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4:41; 11:11</td>
<td>1 Macc 2:36</td>
<td>1 En. 89.43; Panhæa 2.7 [ca. 39 BCE]; Act. Tact. 19.2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ἀλευντεταυμάκον&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7:4</td>
<td>4 Macc 10:19, 12:13</td>
<td>Hermipp. Hist. &lt;apud Plut. Mor. 849C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ἀπαλλαθμόν</td>
<td>8:13</td>
<td>4 Macc 10:14, 13:10</td>
<td>A. Paul. et Thecl. 25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. τρικαλλόθυμος</td>
<td>8:34; 15:3</td>
<td>Add Ekh Ekh&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt; 7(E); 27(15)</td>
<td>Phellon. fac. 2.1a.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. χλωτόβρατος</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>3 Macc 6:34</td>
<td>Philo. M. 32.1; Str. 15.3.20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. δυσήθριον</td>
<td>12:3</td>
<td>1 Esd 1:49</td>
<td>Scymn. GGM 1.684; D.H. 7.44.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. γραμμοντία</td>
<td>15:6</td>
<td>3 Macc 3:19</td>
<td>Critiodom. Cat.Cod.Astr. 5.2.52.34; D.H. 7.46.2.6; Ph. (10x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>39</sup> This column cites only the earliest extra-Septuagintal instances of the words listed in the table.

<sup>40</sup> The question mark indicates a doubtful neologism.

<sup>41</sup> See 3.2.4.

<sup>42</sup> See 3.2.3.

<sup>43</sup> See footnote 129 at 3.4.2.
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Appendix 5: Combinations of words shared exclusively between 2 Maccabees and at least one deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book

1) 2 Mac 3:2 τὸ ἵερν ἀποστολάς ταῖς κρατισταῖς δεξαζεῖν
   1 Mac 2:18 καὶ σὺ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ σου διδασκῆσεσθε ἄφγωρῳ καὶ χρυσῷ καὶ ἀποστολάς πουλαῖς
2) 2 Mac 3:8 ἢς τὰς κατὰ Κύλχων Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκης πόλεις ἐφοδεύσαι
   1 Mac 16:14 Σύμων δὲ ἦν ἐφοδευσὼν τὰς πόλεις
3) 2 Mac 3:14 δοῦν τοῖς δεξιῶν; 11:26 δοῦν τοῖς δεξιῶν; 12:11 ἔξισσων δοῦν τὸν Ἰουδαν ἰδιῶν; 13:22 δεξιῶν ἐθωκεν, ἐκαβεν; 14:19 δοῦν καὶ λαβεῖν δεξιῶν
   1 Mac 6:58 δοῦσαι δεξιῶν; 11:50 δοῦες ἦμεν δεξιῶν; 11:62 ἐθωκεν αὐτοῖς δεξιῶν; 11:66 ἔξισσων αὐτὸν τοῦ δεξιῶν λαβεῖν, καὶ ἐθωκεν αὐτοῖς; 13:45 ἐξετύντες Σύμωνα δεξιῶς αὐτοῖς δοῦναι; 13:50 ἐβόδησαν πρὸς Σύμωνα δεξιῶς λαβεῖν, καὶ ἐθωκεν αὐτοῖς
4) 2 Mac 6:10 δῶν γάρ γυναίκες ἀνήχεσαν πεπετυμαυεια τὰ τέκνα . . . ἐκ τῶν μαστῶν κρεμαντας τὰ βρέφη
   1 Mac 1:60 τὰς γυναίκας τὰς πεπετυμαυεια τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν; 1:61 καὶ ἐκρύσασαν τὰ βρέφη ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν
5) 2 Mac 8:20 διὰ τὴν γενομένην αὐτῶν ἂπ' οὐρανοῦ βοήθειαν
   1 Mac 12:15 ἔχουμεν γάρ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοῦ βοήθειαν βοηθοῦσαν ἡμῖν; 16:3 οὐ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βοήθεια ἦτα μεθ' υμῶν
6) 2 Mac 10:5–6 συνέβη . . . τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ γενέσθαι τοῦ ναοῦ, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδε τοῦ αὐτοῦ μνησις, ὥστε Χασαελακ. καὶ μετ' εὐφροσύνης ἤγον ἡμέρας ὥκτω
   1 Mac 4:59 ἧν ἤγονται καὶ ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐγκαινισμοῦ . . . ἠμέρας ὥκτω ἀπὸ τῆς πέμπτης καὶ εἰκάδος τοῦ μνησις Χασαελκακ μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ χαράς
7) 2 Mac 11:16 ἥσαν γάρ γεγραμέναι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐπιστολαί . . . περιέχουσι τὸν τρόπον τούτον
   1 Mac 15:2 καὶ ἠσαν [sc. αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ] περιέχουσα τὸν τρόπον τούτον
8) 2 Mac 12:3 σ啬ς γυναξι καὶ τέκνος
   1 Mac 5:23 σαν ταῖς γυναξι καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις; 13:45 σαν γυναξι καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις
   3 Mac 3:25 σάν γυναξι καὶ τέκνος
   Add Esth Btś σαν γυναξι καὶ τέκνος

44 The extra-Septuagintal attestations of the expression σαν γυναξι καὶ τέκνοι 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]; Aphrodisia 28.11–12 [88 BCE]; OGIS 194.21 [42 BCE]; BGU 4.1185.6 [ca. 60 BCE]; P.Tebi. 2.352.29 [71–72 CE]. There is a single second-century BCE attestation in Magnesia 3.20. Polybius uses the expressions οὐκο γυναξι καὶ τέκνος (21.35.2) and μετὰ γυναν καὶ τέκνων (9x).
9) 2 Macc 3:8 τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν ἐπιτελεῖν
   3 Macc 2:26 ἀπενιθήσατος εἰς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν; 5:29 βασιλεὺς, κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἔκτενη πρόθεσιν

10) 2 Macc 3:19 αἱ δὲ κατάκλισιν τῶν παρθένων
   3 Macc 1:18 αἱ τα κατάκλισιν παρθένοι

11) 2 Macc 3:24 ἀ... πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης
   3 Macc 5:51 τὸν τῆς ἐπιστής δυνάμεως δυνάστην

12) 2 Macc 3:30 τῶν κύριων εὐλόγων τὸν παραδοξόζοντα τὸν ἐκείνου τόπων
   3 Macc 2:9 ἤγεισά τοὺς τόπους τούτους... καὶ παραδοξόζεσαν ἐν ἑπιφανείᾳ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ

13) 2 Macc 3:31 τὸ ζην χειρίσασθαι; 3:33 σοι κεχάρισται τὸ ζην ὁ κύριος
   3 Macc 7:6 τῷ ζῆν αὐτῶν χαρισάμενοι

14) 2 Macc 3:39 ἀ... τὴν κατοικίαν ἐπουράνιον ἔχων ἐπόπτης ἐστὶ καὶ βοηθῶς; 7:35 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπόπτου θεοῦ κρίσιν
   3 Macc 2:21 ὁ πάντων ἐπόπτης θεοῦ
   Add Esth D:2 ἐπικαλεσαμένη τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτην τὸν καὶ σωτῆρα
   Cf. Let. Aρισ. 16 τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεοῦ

15) 2 Macc 4:16 καθ’ ἢ ἣτοι θεοῦ ἀνταύξησαρι; 15:30 ὁ καθ’ ἢ ἣταν σώματι καὶ φυσικῇ πρωταγωνίστῃς
   3 Macc 3:29 κατά πάν τοῦ ἄχρηστος [καθ’ ἢ ἣταν ἄχρηστος (Rahlfs)]

16) 2 Macc 5:27 θηρίων τρόπου διεζή; 10:6 θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεκροὶ και
   3 Macc 4:9 κατήθηκαν δὲ θηρίων τρόπον

17) 2 Macc 6:1 τοῖς θεοῖς νόμων μὴ πολιτεύσατε
   3 Macc 3:4 περιόμενοι δὲ τὸν θεοῦ καὶ τῷ τούτου νόμῳ πολιτευόμενοι
   4 Macc 5:16 θεωὶ πολεμεύσαμεν νόμῳ πολιτευώσατε

18) 2 Macc 7:20 μὲς ὑπὸ κακῶν ἡμέρας
   3 Macc 4:14 μὲς ὑπὸ κακῶν ἡμέρας

19) 2 Macc 8:17 πρὸ ὀρθαλμῶν λαβόντας
   3 Macc 4:4 λαμβάνοντας πρὸ τῶν ὀρθαλμῶν

20) 2 Macc 8:19 τὰς ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων γενομένας ἀντιλήψεις
   3 Macc 5:50 τὰς ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν γεγενημένας ἀντιλήψεις

21) 2 Macc 9:6 ἐξενιθήσασι συμφοραῖς
   3 Macc 7:3 ἐξενιθήσασι... τιμωρίαις
   Cf. Add Esth B:5 διαγωγήν... ἐξενιθοῦσαν

22) 2 Macc 9:16 καλλίστοις ἀναθήμασι κοσμήσεσθαι
   3 Macc 3:17 καλλίστοις ἀναθήμασιν τιμήσατε

23) 2 Macc 9:17 πάντα τοῦ ὀλικτοῦ ἐπελεύσεσθαι
   3 Macc 4:3 τις τὸ σύνολον ὀλικτός τόπος

24) 2 Macc 11:13 τοῦ δυναμενοῦ θεοῦ συμμαχοῦντος αὐτῶς
   3 Macc 7:6 τὸν ἐπουράνιον θεον... διὰ πάντως συμμαχοῦντα
25) 2 Macc 13:4 ὃ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων ἔξηγε μὲ τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ Αντιόχου  
3 Macc 5:35 τὸν ἐπιφανῆ θεόν κύριον βασιλέα τῶν βασιλέων ἥγουν

26) 2 Macc 13:16 τὴν παρεμβολὴν δέους καὶ ταραχῆς ἐπιλήσασαν  
3 Macc 6:19 τῶν ὁποιαντῶν ἐπιλήσωσαν ταραχῆς καὶ δειλίας

27) 2 Macc 14:35 σὺ κύριε, τῶν ὄλων ἀπροσθενὴς ὑπάρχων  
3 Macc 5:9 εἰς ὅνομα σου τῶν ἀπάντων ἀπροσθεδεῖ

28) 2 Macc 15:7 ἐν ἄδικαιτίᾳ πεποιθός μετὰ πάσης ἐξίπηδος ἀντιληψέως τεύξαθαι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου  
3 Macc 2:33 εὐκλείπτες δὲ καθευστήκεισι τοιούτης τεύξαθαι

29) 2 Macc 15:28 μετὰ χαράς ἀναλύοντες  
3 Macc 5:21 μετὰ χαράς οἱ παρόντες ἕμων συναινέσαντες εἰς τὸν ἰδίων οἶκον ἔκκατον ἀνέλυσαν; 7:13 μετὰ χαράς ἀνέλυσαν

30) 2 Macc 15:34 εὐλογήσαν τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον  
3 Macc 5:35 τὸν ἐπιφανῆ θεόν κύριον βασιλέα τῶν βασιλέων ἥγουν

31) 2 Macc 3:3 ὡστε καὶ Σέλευκον τὸν τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλέα  
4 Macc 3:20 ὡστε καὶ τὸν τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλέα Σέλευκον

32) 2 Macc 3:6 τὸ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωι γαζοφυλάκιον  
4 Macc 4:3 ἐν τοῖς Ἰεροσολύμωι γαζοφυλάκιοι

33) 2 Macc 4:25 ὡμοί τυράννοι; 7:27 τῶν ὃμων τύραννον  
4 Macc 9:30 πάντων ὁμοίατε τύραννε

34) 2 Macc 6:23 ὃ δὲ λογισμὸν ἄστειον ἀναλάβων καὶ ἄξιον τῆς ἡλικίας  
4 Macc 5:11 οὐκ ... ἀποκαθάσθαι τῶν λογισμῶν σου τοῦ κύρου καὶ ἄξιον τῆς ἡλικίας ἀναλάβων νοῦ

35) 2 Macc 7:2 ἔτι ποτέ γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκειν ἐσμέν ἦ παραβαίνειν τοὺς πατρίους νόμους  
4 Macc 9:1 ἔτι ποτέ γὰρ ἐσμὲν ἀποθνῄσκειν ἦ παραβαίνειν τὰς πατρίους ἡμῶν ἐντολάς

36) 2 Macc 7:3 τήγανα καὶ λέβητας  
4 Macc 8:13 λέβητας, τήγανα τε

37) 2 Macc 7:18 μέλλων ἀποθνῄσκειν  
4 Macc 10:9 μέλλων δὲ ἀποθνῄσκειν; 12:15 ἀποθνῄσκειν μέλλων

38) 2 Macc 7:23 ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστῃς; 13:14 τῶν κτίστῃ τοῦ κόσμου; cf. 1:24 ὑπὸ πάντων κτίστῃς  
4 Macc 5:25 ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστῃς; 11:5 τῶν πάντων κτίστῃν

39) 2 Macc 7:37 ἐπικαλοῦμενοι τὸν θεόν ἱερας ταχὺ τῷ ζηνει γενέσθαι  
4 Macc 12:17 ἐπικαλοῦμαι δὲ τὸν πατρὸμν θεόν ὡς ἱερας γενέσθαι τῷ ζηνει ἱμῶν

---

45 In the Septuagint, the title βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων (on which see Griffiths 1953, Schafer 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 κύριοι τῶν κυρίων καὶ βασιλεύς τῶν βασιλέων, whereas the 1999 edition, revised by Munnich, reads κύριοι τῶν κυρίων καὶ κύριοι τῶν βασιλέων, and relegates to the critical apparatus the reading βασιλεύς τῶν βασιλέων, which is attested in the Syrohexaplar and in MS 88.
40) 2 Mac 11:13 συννοώσας ἀνικήτους εἶναι τοὺς 'Ἑβραῖους
4 Mac 9:18 μόνον παιδεῖς Εβραίων ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς εἶσιν ἀνικήτους
41) 2 Mac 4:9 εἰ ταῖς ἀλληλείαις ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα τυγχάνει; 7:6 ο θεὸς ἐφορᾷ καὶ ταῖς ἀλληλείαις ἐν' ἥμιν παρακαλεῖται
Add Esth E:10 ταῖς ἀλληλείαις ἀλλότριος τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν άιματος
Esth[AT] 7(E):25(10) ταῖς ἀλληλείαις ἀλλότριος τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν φρονήματος
42) 2 Mac 11:23 βουλόμεθα τοὺς ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας ἀπαράχους ὡντες
Add Esth E:8 τὴν βασιλείαν ἀπάραχον τοῖς πάσιν ἀνθρώποις μετ’ εἰρήνης παρεξήγηθα
Esth[AT] 7(E):24(8) τὴν βασιλείαν ἀπάραχον παρέχει τοῖς θεοῦς
43) 2 Mac 14:6 οὐκ ἐκάντες τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυγχάνειν
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 Mac 3:2 τιμᾶν τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν . . . δοξάζειν
1 Esd 8:64 ἐδόξασαν τὸ ἔθνος καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ κυρίου; 8:78 δοξάσας τὸ ἱερὸν ἡμῶν
1 Mac 15:9 δοξάσας μεν καὶ τὸ θεόν σου καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν δόξῃ μεγάλῃ
45) 2 Mac 3:15 ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς
1 Esd 4:54 τὴν ἱερατικὴν στολὴν; 5:44 στολὰς ἱερατικές
46) 2 Mac 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 Mac 5:15 ἀγίωτατον ἱερὸν; 13:11 ἱερὸν ἁγίου; 14:31 ἐπὶ τὸ μέγιστον καὶ ἄγιον ἱερὸν
1 Esd 1:50 περικυκλῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτῶν ἱεροῦ
48) 2 Mac 9:18 ἐγράφη πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τὴν ὑπογραμμιμένην ἐπιστολὴν
1 Esd 2:15 κατέγραφεν αὐτὸν . . . τὴν ὑπογραμμιμένην ἐπιστολὴν
3 Mac 6:41 ἅ βασιλεὺς ἐγράψας αὐτοὶ τὴν ὑπογραμμιμένην ἐπιστολὴν
Cf. Esth[AT] 3(B):14(1) καὶ ὑπέγραψε τὴν ὑποτεταγμένην ἐπιστολὴν; 7(E):22(1) καὶ ἐγράφη τὴν ὑποτεταγμένην ἐπιστολὴν
49) 2 Mac 10:38 τὸ νῖκος αὐτοῖς διδόταν
1 Esd 3:9 αὐτῶν δοθήσεται τὸ νῖκος
50) 2 Mac 11:15 ὅπως . . . ἐπέθεσεν τῷ Λυσία διὰ γραπτῶν περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
1 Esd 2:2 καὶ ἐκήρυξαν ἐν όλῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτῶς καὶ ἅμα διὰ γραπτῶν λέγων
Cf. Let. Aris. 56 ὅπως δ᾽ ἂν δ᾽ ἐγράφα μα αὐτοῖς . . . ὅπως δὲ διὰ γραπτῶν
51) 2 Mac 14:38 ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις
1 Esd 1:22 ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις
52) 2 Mac 6:26 τάς τού παντοκράτορος χείρας οὕτω ζῶν οὕτω ἄποθανὼν ἀκρεύξωμαι; 7:31 σὺ δὲ . . . οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃς τὰς χείρας τοῦ θεοῦ
Tob 13:2 οὐκ ἦστιν ὃς ἐκφεύγετο τὴν χείραν αὐτοῦ [εκ. τοῦ θεοῦ]; Tob[ILL] 13:2 οὐκ ἦστιν οὕθων, δ᾽ ἐκφεύγεται τὴν χείραν αὐτοῦ
Cf. Wis 16:15 τὴν δὲ σὴν χείρα φυγεῖν ἀδιάκοπον ἦστιν
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Appendix 6: List of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neologisms</th>
<th>2 Maccabees</th>
<th>Alpha Text Esther</th>
<th>Next earliest extra LXX instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. δικαιοκρίτης</td>
<td>12:41</td>
<td>Esth²⁺⁺ 7(6):23(4)</td>
<td>Sib. Or. 3.3504; P.Ryl. 2.113.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. εὐθυμοι</td>
<td>7:3, 39, 14:27</td>
<td>Esth²⁺⁺ 7(9)(7)</td>
<td>J. A.J. 19.25; Plu. Aem. 12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 7: List of the neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neologisms</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>2 Maccabees</th>
<th>Extra-LXX instances prior to the NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ἄγιας</td>
<td>196a</td>
<td>1:25</td>
<td>Aristob., Jub., Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ἁγιασμός</td>
<td>Judges 17:3; Ezek 45:4; Amos 2:11; 3 Macc 2:18; Sir 7:31a, 17:10a; Ps. Sol. 17:50c</td>
<td>2:17, 14:36</td>
<td>T. 12 Par., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ἁγιασμός</td>
<td>Ps 29:5b, 95:6b, 96:12b, 144:5a</td>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>T. 12 Par., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ἁλαλασίας</td>
<td>Prov 17:15b</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ἁβεβηλάομαι</td>
<td>Exod 1x; Lev 17x; Num 3x; Ps 6x; Isa 3x; Jer 2x; Lam 1x; Ezek 29x; Dan 3x; Amos 1x; Mal 3x; 2 Esd 2x; Jdt 2x; 1 Macc 9x; 3 Macc 1x; Sir 2x; Pss. Sol. 2x</td>
<td>8:2, 10:5</td>
<td>T. 12 Par., Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ἁγιασθήματα</td>
<td>Num 7:10, 11, 84; 2 Chr 7:9; Ps 29:1a; OG Dan 3:2, 5; Prov; Dan 3:3; 1 Esd 7:7; 1 Macc 4:56, 59</td>
<td>2:9, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ἅλαλλον</td>
<td>Gen 8:5, 5, 18; 28; Lev 25:16; 3 Kgds 17:16; Prov 14:34b; Sir 19:16b; 7:27</td>
<td>12:11, 13:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ἰπαθος</td>
<td>Ps 37:8a; Ezek 22:4; 3 Macc 5:22; Sir 27:28a; Wis 12:5</td>
<td>7:7</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ἵπατος</td>
<td>Exod 30:10; Lev 23:28; 1 Chr 28:11; Ezek 7:25, 45:3; 45:19; 1 Esd 9:20; Sir 5:5a, 16:11d, 17:29b, 18:12b, 22b, 32:5b; Wis 18:21</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ἰχουθήματα</td>
<td>1 Kgds 8:7, 10:19; Prov 1:74; Jer 6:14; Amos 6:1; OG Dan 4:28; Sir 22:13c; Wis 3:11, 4:18</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>1 En., Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ἵπτελος</td>
<td>OG Daniel 11:40</td>
<td>7:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ζοογόνος</td>
<td>121x</td>
<td>1:17, 15:34</td>
<td>Alex.Polyh., 1 En., Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. θεοπαστήριον</td>
<td>437a</td>
<td>12x</td>
<td>Let. Aris., Alex.Polyh., Jub., Ph., LAE, J., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ἱεράτης</td>
<td>Exod 19:6, 23:22 (Rabbi)</td>
<td>2:17</td>
<td>Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ἱεράτης</td>
<td>Lev 25:9; Num 5:8; Ps 129:4; Ezek 44:27; Ezechiel 76; Dan 3:9; Amos 8:14</td>
<td>3:33</td>
<td>Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. καθαρισμός</td>
<td>Exod 30:12; Lev 23:37, 28, 1 Chr 28:11; Ezek 7:25, 45:23, 45:19; 1 Esd 9:20; Sir 5:5a, 16:11d, 17:29b, 18:12b, 22b, 32:5b; Wis 18:21</td>
<td>1:18, 36, 19:16, 19, 10:5</td>
<td>T. 12 Par., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. κεκρισμένος</td>
<td>Job 7:26; Prov 19:11a; Bar 4:25; Sir 2:48b; 18:11a, 29:8a, 32:22a</td>
<td>6:14</td>
<td>T. 12 Par., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. κεντακέτας</td>
<td>181x</td>
<td>11x</td>
<td>Let. Aris., Aristob., Stb. Ox., Ph., NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. καταβιβάζω</td>
<td>Exod 16:32; Lev 23:32, 26:34, 35; 2 Chr 36:21; 1 Esd 1:55</td>
<td>6:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. σαβατόρια</td>
<td>Job 2:9a, 7:5a, 8:16b, 17:14b, 21:26b, 25:6a; Joel 2:20; Ps. Sol. 14:7a, 16:14a</td>
<td>9:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. τρωγλοφορία</td>
<td>Deut 1:31</td>
<td>7:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

1) Gen 24:7 αὐτὸς ἀποστειλεὶ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ἐμπροσθὲν σου; 32:3 ἀπέστειλεν δὲ Ἰακώβ ἄγγελον ἐμπροσθὲν αὐτοῦ
2 Mac 15:23 ἀπόσταλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθὸν ἐμπροσθὲν ἡμῶν

2) Gen 39:3 ὥσα ἄν τοῖς, κύριος εὐδοκεῖ ἐν ταῖς χεραίν αὐτοῦ (Rahlfs); 39:23 ὥσα αὐτὸς ἐποίει, κύριος εὐδοκεῖ ἐν ταῖς χεραίν αὐτοῦ
OG Dan 8:25 εὐδοκεῖσθαι τῷ θεῷ ἐν ταῖς χεραίν αὐτοῦ
1 End 6:9 εὐδοκοῦμεν τὸ ἔργον ἐν ταῖς χεραίν αὐτῶν
2 End 5:8 τὸ ἔργον . . . εὐδοκεῖ εν χεραίν αὐτῶν
1 Mac 2:47 κατευθύνει τὸ ἔργον ἐν χερι αὐτῶν; 3:6 εὐδόκησε σωτηρία ἐν χερὶ αὐτοῦ; 14:36 εὐδοκεῖ ἐν ταῖς χεραίν αὐτοῦ; 16:2 εὐδοκεῖ ἐν ταῖς χεραίν ἡμῶν
Wis 11:1 εὐδοκεῖσθαι τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἐν χερὶ προφήτου ἄγνου
2 Mac 10:23 τοῖς δὲ ὅπλοις τὰ πάντα ἐν ταῖς χεραίν εὐδοκοῦμενος

3) Gen 49:24 καὶ συνετρίβη μετὰ κράτους τὰ τόξα κυτῶν
Ps 75:4α ἐκεῖ συνέτριψεν τὰ κράτη τῶν τόξων
2 Mac 12:28 τὸν μετὰ κράτους συνετρίβοντα τὰς τῶν πολεμιῶν ἁλκᾶς

4) Exod 1:11 καὶ ἐπέστησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπιστάτας τῶν ἔργων, ἵνα κακώσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις
2 Mac 5:22 κατέλιπε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστάτας τοῦ κακοῦν τὸ γένος

5) Exod 15:6 ὁ δὲ εξέκοσμος τιμήθη ἐρευνήθη, ἔθραυσεν ἐχθροί; 15:7 καὶ τῷ πλῆθε τῆς δόξης σου συνέτριψες τοὺς ὑπεναντίους
Jdt 13:14 ἀλλ’ ἔθραυσεν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν διὰ χειρός μου
2 Mac 15:16 λάβε τὴν ἀγίαν ἐμφανίαν . . . δι’ ἥς θραύσεις τοὺς ὑπεναντίους

6) Exod 15:9 μερίῳ σκύλῳ
 Isa 53:12 μερίῃ σκύλα
Judg: 5:30 διαμερίζοντα σκύλα; Zech 14:1 διαμερισθήσεται τὰ σκύλα σου
2 Mac 8:28 τοὺς ἡκεμερίους καὶ ταῖς χρήσεις καὶ ὀρφανοὺς μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοῖ καὶ τὰ παιδία διαμερίσαντο

7) Exod 15:16 ἐπιπέσει ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς φόβος καὶ τρόμος, μεγάλη βραχυκόλος σου ἀπολθωθήσεται
2 Mac 15:23 ἀπόσταλον ἄγγελον ἁγαθὸν ἐμπροσθὲν ἡμῶν εἰς δέος καὶ τρόμον; 15:24 μεγάλη βραχυκόλος σου καταπλαγήσασθαι ποιεῖ καὶ βλασφημήσαις παραγνόμενον ἐπὶ τὸν ἄγιον σου λαὸν

46 The two prefixed letters, which are a mosaic of Septuagint phraseology, have not been considered here.
8) Exod 17:15 Κύριε μου καταφυγή
Ps 9:10a καὶ ἐγένετο κύριος καταφυγή τῷ πένητι; 17:3a κύριος στερέωμα μου καὶ καταφυγή μου; 89:1b Κύριε, καταφυγή ἐγενήθης ἡμῖν; 90:2a ἐρεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ Ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἰ καὶ καταφυγή μου; 93:22a καὶ ἐγένετο μοι κύριος εἰς καταφυγὴν
Jer 16:19 Κύριε ἵσχυς μου καὶ βοήθεια μου καὶ καταφυγή μου
2 Macc 10:28 τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν κύριον καταφυγὴν

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 φύλαξε τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων; 5:15 ὡστε 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 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων; 24:1, 9:34, 43 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων
2 Macc 15:3 άγιοι τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέραν

10) Exod 23:22 ἐχθρεύσας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου, καὶ ἀντικείσαιτις ταῖς ἀντικείμενοις σοι
2 Macc 10:26 ἐχθρεύα τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀντικείσαται τοῖς ἀντικείμενοις

11) Exod 29:37 καὶ ἐσταὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἀγίον τοῦ ἁγίου; 40:9 καὶ ἐσταὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἀγίου τῶν ἁγίων
Sir 50:11c ἐν ἀναβάσει θυσιαστήριου ἀγίου
2 Macc 14:3 πρὸς τὸ ἄγιον θυσιαστήριον

12) Exod 34:22 καὶ ἑορτήν ἐβδομάδων ποιήσας μοι
Deut 16:10 καὶ ποιήσεσ ἑορτὴν ἐβδομάδων; 16:16 ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν ἐβδομάδων
2 Chr 8:13 ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν ἐβδομάδων
2 Macc 12:31 τῆς τῶν ἐβδομάδων ἑορτῆς

13) Exod 34:29 ἀπόκειται ἡ ψῆφος τοῦ χρωτός τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ; 34:30 καὶ ἡ ἀπόκεισθαι ἡ ψῆφος τοῦ χρωτός τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
Dan 3:19 καὶ ἡ ψῆφος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἡλιοσθενείσθη
2 Macc 6:18 τὴν πρόσφυντον τοῦ προσώπου κάλλιοτος
Cf. Symmachus in Hab 3:9 ἡ πρόσφυσις τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν ἁγιωμάτων

14) Exod 35:2 ἕξ ἡμέρας ποιήσεσ ἔργα, τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδομάδῃ κατάπαυσις
2 Macc 15:1 τῇ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρᾳ

1 Kgdms 21:7 τοῖς ἁρτοῖς τῆς προθήσεως
1 Chr 9:32 ἐπὶ τῶν ἁρτῶν τῆς προθήσεως; 23:29 εἰς τοὺς ἁρτοῖς τῆς προθήσεως
2 Chr 4:19 ἁρτοὶ προθήσεως; 13:11 προθήσεως ἁρτοί
2 Macc 10:3 τῶν ἁρτῶν τῆς προθήσεως ἐποιήσατο

16) Lev 23:34 ἑορτὴ σκηνῶν
Deut 16:13 ἑορτὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ποιήσεσ σεαυτῷ
2 Chr 8:13 ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν σκηνῶν
2 Esl 3:4 ἐποίησαν τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν σκηνῶν
In all these v
24) κατέέσκαψεν το Judg καταλλαγ καταλλαγής
2 Macc 7:6 καταλλαγής
Deut 32:36 Deut 31:21
2 Macc 8:5 Deut 13:17
2 Macc 15:24 Το ν τον θυσιαστήριον σου λαόν
2 Macc 5:19 τόν τόπον ὃ κύριος ἔξελεξεν
22) Deut 13:17 ἔνα ἀποστραφῆ κύριος ἀπὸ θυμοῦ τῆς ἁρχῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ δώσει σοι ἔκειος 2 Macc 8:5 τῆς ἁρχῆς τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἔλεον τραπείσης
23) Deut 31:21 καὶ ἀντικαταστάθηται ἡ ὁδὴ αὕτη κατὰ πρόσεων μαρτυροῦσα 2 Macc 7:6 ἦν τῆς κατὰ πρόσεων ἀντιμαρτυροῦσας ὁδῆς
24) Deut 32:36 καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δουλοῖς αὐτοῦ παρακλήθησεν
Ps 89:13b καὶ παρακλήθητι ἐπὶ τοῖς δουλοῖς σου; 134:14b καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δουλοῖς αὐτοῦ παρακλήθησεν 2 Macc 7:6 καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δουλοῖς αὐτοῦ παρακλήθησεν; cf. 7:33 καὶ πάλιν καταλαγήσηται τοῖς ἐκατοχρο ἐκάλοις 8:29 τὸν ἐκήμονα κύριον ἥξιον . . . καταλαγήσῃ τοῖς αὐτοῦ δούλοις
25) Judges 2:2 καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν κατασκάψετε; 6:28 καὶ ἔδω κατασκαμμένον τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Βασιλείου; 6:30 κατάσκαψαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Βασιλείου; 6:31, 32 κατάσκαψαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ
3 Καθαρισμοί 18:32 τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ κατασκαμμένον; 19:10 τὰ θυσιαστήρια σου κατάσκαψαν

47 In all these verses, in lieu of κατασκάπτω Codex Vaticanus has καθαρισμός.
καὶ τὰ σπήλαια ἐν τὰς τρύτοις

Codex Venetus reads τὴν θυρίδαν διέκυπτον

Codex Vaticanus reads τὴν θυρίδαν διέκυπτον.

26) Judg 6:2 ἐν τοῖς ὀρεσιν καὶ τοῖς σπηλαίοις καὶ τοῖς ἄχυρωμασιν.50

27) Judg 9:51 πύργος ἔν ἀχυρῷ 51

1 Mac 1:33 πύργους ἄχυρους; 6:40 πύργους ἄχυρους; 6:37 πύργοι... ἄχυροι

2 Mac 10:18 πύργους ἄχυρους

28) 1 Kgdms 15:12 τὰ πρῶτα τῶν σκύλων, ὃν ἤγεγκαν ἐξ Ἀμαληκ

2 Kgdms 3:22 σκύλα πολλὰ ἔφερον μετ’ αὐτῶν

2 Chr 15:11 ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων, ὃν ἤγεγκα, 28:8 καὶ ἤγεγκαν τὰ σκύλα εἰς Σαμάρειαν

2 Mac 8:31 τὴ δὲ λείπα τῶν σκύλων ἤγεγκαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

29) 2 Kgdms 7:15; 1 Chr 17:13 τὸ ἔλεος μου ὁλὶ ἀποστῆῃ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ

Ps 65:20α ἐλογικοῦ ὁ θεὸς, ὃς ὁλὶ ἀπέστησαν τὴν προσευχήν μου καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ

OG Dan 3:35 καὶ μὴ ἀποστῆῃ τὸ ἔλεος σου ἀπ’ ἡμῶν

Jdt 13:14 αἰνεῖτε τὸν θεόν, ὃς ὁλὶ ἀπέστησαν τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδων Ἰσραήλ

Pss. Sol. 9:8c καὶ μὴ ἀποστῆῃ ἔλεος σου ἀπ’ ἡμῶν; 16:6a μὴ ἀποστῆῃ τὸ ἔλεος σου ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ

2 Mac 6:16 οὐδέποτε μὲν τὸν ἔλεον ἀρ’ ἡμῶν ἀρίστησαι

30) 4 Kgdms 19:15 σὺ εἰ ὁ θεὸς μόνος; 19:19 σὺ κύριος ὁ θεὸς μόνος

Isa 37:16 σὺ θεὸς μόνος εἰ; 37:20 σὺ εἰ ὁ θεὸς μόνος

Ps 85:10b σὺ εἰ ὁ θεὸς μόνος ὁ μέγας

Sir 24:24c κύριος παντοκράτωρ θεὸς μόνος ἐστίν

OG Dan 3:45 σὺ εἰ μόνος κύριος ὁ θεός (Rahlfs)

2 Mac 7:37 μόνος αὐτός θεὸς ἐστίν

1 Chr 29:9 Δαυίδ ὁ βασιλεὺς εὐφράνθη μεγάλως

1 Esd 9:54 εὐφρανθήσῃ μεγάλως

2 Esd 22:43 ὁ θεὸς εὐφρανεὶν αὐτοὺς μεγάλως

2 Mac 15:27 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλως εὐφράνθησεν ἐπιφανεῖς

---

48 Codex Vaticanus reads παρέκυψεν.

49 Codex Venetus reads διέκυπτον.

50 Codex Vaticanus reads τὰς τρυφαλικὰς τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὀρεσιν καὶ τὰ σπήλαια τὰ κρεμαστά.

51 Codex Vaticanus reads ἄγυρος.
2 Macc 3:34 διάγγελλε πάσι τὸ μεγαλεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος; 7:17 θεώρει τὸ μεγαλεῖον αὐτοῦ κράτος; 9:17 καταγγέλλοντα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος; 11:4 οὐδεμιὸς ἐπιλογίζομενος τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος

41) Ps 75:9α ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἱκονίσασας κρίσιν
2 Macc 9:4 τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δή κρίσεως σωνούσης αὐτῶ

42) Ps 120:5b κύριος σκέπη σου ἐπὶ χείρα δεξίαν σου
2 Macc 13:17 διὰ τὴν ἐπερήγουσαν αὐτοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ σκέπην

43) Prov 4:3b υἱὸς . . . ἐγκατώμενος ἐν προσώπῳ μητρός; 8:30 εὐφραίνωμην ἐν προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ; 25:7 ταπεινώσακε σε ἐν προσώπῳ δυνάστου
Jer 52:25 ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν μεταρρυθμίας ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ βασιλέως
Sir 32:6α μὴ ὁ φθόνος ἐν προσώπῳ κυρίου κενὸς
2 Macc 14:24 εἴχε τὸν Θεοῦ διὰ παντὸς ἐν προσώπῳ

44) Job 2:12α καταπασάνοι γῆν
Mic 1:10 ἐκατοπάσαθε
2 Macc 10:25 γῇ τὰς κεφαλὰς καταπάσαντες; 14:15 καταπασάμενοι γῆν

45) Joel 2:12 καὶ ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ἐν κλαυθμῷ καὶ ἐν κοπτείᾳ
2 Macc 13:12 μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ νηστείᾳ καὶ προστίθεσις

46) Joel 2:17 ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς κρηπίδος καὶ τοῦ θυσιασμένου κλασομέτοις οἱ ἱερεῖς
2 Macc 10:26 ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπάντησιν τοῦ θυσιαστήριον κρηπίδα προσπεπένθες

47) Isa 14:6 πατάξασκε θεοῦ ἐθνοῦς πλήγμα ἀνιάτω
2 Macc 9:5 ἐπάταξεν αὐτοῦ ἀνιάτω καὶ ἄρατο πλήγμα

48) Isa 26:21 ἵνα γὰρ κύριος ἀπό τοῦ ἄγιου ἔπαγε τὴν ἄργην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνοικιοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; 42:25 καὶ ἐπήγαγεν ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ ἄργην θεοῦ κυρίου
Jer 25:17 καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐπὶ αὐτῶς κακά, τὴν ἄργην τοῦ θυμοῦ μου
Ps 7:12b δ ὁ θεος κρινὼς δίκαιος . . . μὴ ἁγνὴν ἐπάγαν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν
Sir 23:16b δὸς εἰδή πληθυνούνσιν ἁμαρτίας, καὶ το τρίτον ἐπάξη ἄργην; 47:20c ἐπήγαγεν ἄργην ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου
2 Macc 7:38 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἄργην τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἡμῶν γένος δικαίως ἐπηγαμάνην

49) Isa 32:11 περισύσκαθε σάκκους τὰς ὁσίασ τέντη ταῖς ὁσίασ τάς ὁσίασ τὸς ὁσίας αὐτῶν
3 Kgdms 20:27 καὶ διώκατο σάκκου ἐπὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ; 21:32 περισύσκαντο σάκκους ἐπὶ τὰς ὁσίας αὐτῶν
Jdt 4:14 σάκκους περισύσκαμενοι τὰς ὁσίας αὐτῶν
2 Macc 10:25 σάκκους σάκκους ζώσαντες

50) Isa 37:36 καὶ ἔξηθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἀνείλεν ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἐκατον ὁγδοχκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας
4 Kgdms 19:35 καὶ ἔξηθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἐκατον ὁγδοχκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας
1 Macc 7:41 ἔξηθεν ἄγγελος σου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐκατον ὁγδοχκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας
2 Μακκ 15:22 ἀπέστειλας τὸν ἀγγελόν σου ... καὶ ἀνείλεν ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς Ἀνάπτυσσαμε ἐν ψαλτοῦ ἀγαθωκοντά πέντε χιλιάδας
51) Isa 40:12 τίς ἔστησε τὰ όρη σταθμῷ καὶ τάς νάπας ζωγῷ;
   2 Μακκ 9:8 πλέστηγι τά τῶν ἄρεων οἴλμους ὑψῆ στῆσεν
52) Isa 48:2 τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἀγίας; 52:1 Ιερουσαλήμ πόλις ἡ ἀγία; 66:20 εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν πόλιν Ιερουσαλήμ
   OG Dan 3:28 ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν σου τὴν ἀγίαν
   Joel 4:17 καὶ ἔστη Ιερουσαλήμ πόλις ἀγία (Rahlfs)
   Tob 13:9 Ἰερουσάλημ πόλεις ἀγία
   2 Σελ 21:1 ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ τῇ πόλει τῇ ἀγίᾳ
   1 Μακκ 2:7 τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας
   3 Μακκ 6:5 ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγίαν σου πόλιν
   2 Μακκ 3:12 ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει; 3:1 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως; 9:14 τὴν ἀγίαν πόλιν; 15:14 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως
53) Isa 65:4 οί ἐσθοντες κρέας ζωεί; 66:17 ἐσθοντες κρέας ζεων
   4 Μακκ 5:2 κρεον ωιειν ... ἀναγᾶκεν ἀπογυνεσθαι
   2 Μακκ 6:18 ἐναγακάζητο φαγεὶν ωιειν κρέας; 7:1 ἀπὸ τῶν ἀθεμίτων ωιειν κρεον ἐρπετυεσθαι
54) Ezek 26:20 μηδὲ ἀναστάθης ἐπὶ γῆς ζωῆς
   OG Dan 12:2 πολλοὶ τῶν καθαυδότων ἐν τῷ πλάτει τῆς γῆς ἀναστῆσονται, οἱ μὲν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ εἰς ὑνεσιςμόν
   Ps. Sol. 3:12b οἱ δὲ φυλουμενοι τὸν κύριον ἀναστήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
   2 Μακκ 7:9 εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβιώσον ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει; 7:14 σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀναστασίας εἰς ζωὴν ὃς ἔσται
55) OG Dan 4:26 μετὰ πάσης τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ περιπάτει
   1 Μακκ 14:5 καὶ μετὰ πάσης τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἠλαξε τὴν Ἰώπην εἰς λιμένα
   2 Μακκ 5:20 μετὰ πάσης δόξης ἐπανορθώθη
56) OG Dan 10:1 τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ἱσχυρὸν
   1 Μακκ 3:17 πολεμήσαι πρὸς πλῆθος τοσότῳ ἱσχυρὸν
   2 Μακκ 14:1 μετὰ πλῆθους ἱσχυρὸν καὶ στόλου
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Appendix 9: Words with a single attestation prior to 2 Maccabees

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ἐπιπᾶλω</td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>S. fr. 62° Radt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. κατάλευκυς</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Call. Epigr. fr. 401 Pleiöfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. δυσπροποθεύω</td>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>Pib. (5x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ἱδακττος</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>UPZ 1.69.7-8 [152 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. σαπεχθὸν</td>
<td>5:2; 12:20</td>
<td>Pib. 5.4.9; 11.11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ἀπορθόδομαι</td>
<td>5:17</td>
<td>Men. Sem. 683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. κρηνίζω</td>
<td>6:10</td>
<td>Arc.Byz. Epit. 2.581 Lamprea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. τγγνίζο</td>
<td>7:5</td>
<td>Posidipp. fr. 5 Kock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ὀμπραγίντεις</td>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>JK Pessinoi 7.7 [158–156 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. διαρρήζο</td>
<td>7:22</td>
<td>IG P 475.72 [409/8 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. μομφροτέω</td>
<td>8:26</td>
<td>Ph.Mech. Bel. 68.13 Themenet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ἀναμαρθήσαμε</td>
<td>9:4</td>
<td>Pib. 22.13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. πρωταρχεις</td>
<td>10:11</td>
<td>A. Ap. 1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. συγκνιζο</td>
<td>10:13</td>
<td>Philem. fr. 182.2 Kock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. πρωταπταλλε</td>
<td>11:14</td>
<td>Th. 4.108.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ἀναταγίνω</td>
<td>12:14</td>
<td>Madox fr. 16.322 Gow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. πρωταπταλλε</td>
<td>12:21</td>
<td>Pib. 3.86.3; 18.19.5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. εὐεραγίντεις</td>
<td>14:9</td>
<td>IG IV 1.26 [158–144 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. διαρχάρχη</td>
<td>14:12</td>
<td>Phylarch. FG 2a. 81, fr. 31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. δίαρχε</td>
<td>14:21</td>
<td>Theoc. 14.29.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. παρακατάλευκυς</td>
<td>14:41</td>
<td>Philippid. fr. 24 Kock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. πρωτασμομάκακα</td>
<td>15:9</td>
<td>Pib. 22.18.7; 18.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ἐπαθῆρε</td>
<td>15:17</td>
<td>A.R. 1.874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Habich (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 εὐεραγίντεις occurs in IGBulg P 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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. συγκεραυνόω</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>Archil. fr. 120.2 West; Cratin. fr. 187.4 Kock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ἀντίλαά µπω</td>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>A. Ag. 294; Anaxag. D.-K. fr. 19; X. Cyn. 5.18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ἀντρώώδης</td>
<td>2:5</td>
<td>X. An. 4.3.11; Arist. Pr. 932’2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. καταπολάαι</td>
<td>2:24</td>
<td>Ar. V. 1475; Th. 265; Mem. Dynocr. 758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ἐξαργαστεύω</td>
<td>2:31</td>
<td>X. Mem. 4.1.4; Chryssipp. Stoic. fr. 264.27; Plb. 15.37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. κατατολάαι</td>
<td>5:24, 5:15</td>
<td>Plb. (8x); UPZ 1.42.20 [162 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. προηγορέέω</td>
<td>4:48</td>
<td>X. An. 5.5.7; HG 1.1.27, 2.2.22; IGUR 1.2.5 [late 2nd/early 1st c. BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. µισοπονηρέέω</td>
<td>4:49, 8:4</td>
<td>Lys. 32.35; Plb. 9.39.6; UPZ 1.2.25 [163 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ἁρατηλάατης</td>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>A. fr. 236 Rahl (=Ar. Ru. 1287’); S. fr. 591.4 Rahl; Demad. fr. 60 de Faus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. προήγορος</td>
<td>7:2, 4</td>
<td>Ephesos 572.1 [4th c. BCE]; IG XII.6 1.11.20–21 [after 243/2 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. περισύύρω</td>
<td>7:7</td>
<td>Hyp. fr. 264 Jensen; Plb. (2x); LXX Gen 30:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. προποίει</td>
<td>7:27</td>
<td>Ar. V. 608; Pl. Euthd. 275a; R. 449b; Thphr. Char. 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. πανυφα</td>
<td>8:9, 12:27</td>
<td>Ar. Av. 1563; Pl. Ph. 291a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ἠρμακτλάθης</td>
<td>9:4</td>
<td>Pi. P. 5.115; S. El. 720; X. (5x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ἀντρώπος</td>
<td>10:34, 12:14</td>
<td>X. Cyn. 6.1.23; Arat. Pala. 1332’37, 41; Plb. (3x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. δυσερερία</td>
<td>12:21</td>
<td>X. HG 4.8.5; Plb. 5.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. δυσερερία</td>
<td>12:21</td>
<td>E. IA 345; Hyp. Devent. 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. δυσερερία</td>
<td>12:21</td>
<td>E. IA 345; Hyp. Devent. 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. καταπειράζω</td>
<td>13:18</td>
<td>Lys. 30.34; Plb. (29x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ἀκόηθε</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td>Thphr. CP 6.12.6; Plb. 4.21.1; MDAI(A) 33 (1958) 381.3.16 [after 133 BCE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. σκήήνωσις</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td>Ar. Byz. Epit. 2.46.17; Agatharch. GGM 1.47.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. II. 8.367 εὐτέ μιν εἰς Ἀλδαα πυλάρται προϋπεμψεν
   2 Macc 6:23 προπέμπειν εἰς τὸν θην
   Ph. Mos. 1.195 εἰς θην προπέμπειν

2) Hom. II. 5.394 τότε καὶ μὴ ἄνσκεστον λάβεν ἄλγος
   2 Macc 9:5 ἔλαβεν διὸν ἄνσκεστος τών σπλάγχων ἄλγηδων
   Ph. Leg. 3.216 μετ' ἀδύνας καὶ ἀλγήδωνοι ἄνσκεσεν

3) Hom. II. 3.277 Ἡλίδος θ', ὡς πάντ' ἐφορᾶς; Od. 11.109, 12.323 μῆλα Ἡλίδος, ὡς πάντ' ἐφορᾶς.
   S. El. 175 Ζεύς, ὡς ἐφορᾶ τάντα
   X. Cyn. 8.7.22 θεοῦς γε τούς... πάντ' ἐφοράντας
   2 Macc 12:22 τó τά πάντα ἐφορώντος; 15:2 ὁ πό τό πάντα ἐφορώντος
   Cf. LXX Job 28:24a αὐτοῖς γάρ τήν ὑπ' οὐράνων πάσαν ἐφοράζ; 34:23b ὁ γάρ κύριος πάντας ἐφοράζ; Zech 9:1 κύριος ἐφοράκαν ἀνθρώποις καὶ πάσας φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

4) Hom. Od. 4.242, 271; 20.393; 8.139 καρπέτος ἄνηρ
   Pi. P. 4.239 καρπέτον ἄνδρα
   Mosch. 102 οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ καρπέται, οἱ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες
   2 Macc 12:35 ἐφιππός ἄνηρ καὶ καρπέτος
   D.Chr. 1.56 ἄνδρα καρπέτος

5) A. Pr. 682 ἑστραπελῆς ὡς ἐγὼ / μάστιγι θεία γὰν πρὸ τῆς ἐλαυνομαι
   2 Macc 9:11 ἔχεστο... εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἔρχεσθαι θείας μάστιγις κατά στυγμής ἐπιστεύνομεν ταῖς ἀλγηδοῖς; 77

6) A. Supp. 705–6 πατρώαις... τιμᾶς
   E. Herod. 810 τιμᾶς πατρῶους
   2 Macc 4:15 τάς πατρώους τιμᾶς
   Nic. Dam. FHG 3:101.149, 715 τάς πατρώους τιμᾶς; 101.966 τάς πατρώους τιμᾶς; 101.1007 τάς πατρώους τιμᾶς

7) S. Ph. 890–91 τούτων ὡς ἔκσαι, μὴ βαρυνθωάν κακῆ / ἁμαρτία; fr. 697 Radt ὁμοία μόνον
   ὀπας... μὴ βαρυνθώσεσθε μου
   2 Macc 9:9 ὑπὲ δὲ τῇ ὁμηρίᾳ αὐτοῦ πάν τὸ στρατόπεδον βαρύνεσθαι τὴν σαφρίνα

8) E. fr. 1059.7 Nauck δημιουργῆς ὡς κακῶν
   Pl. R. 552d πάντων τῶν τοιούτων κακῶν δημιουργοῦ
   2 Macc 4:1 τῶν κακῶν δημιουργῆς καθεστηκώς
   Ph. Sobe. 2 ἡμῶν δημιουργῆς κακῶν καὶ μέθη; Decal. 5 τύφος καὶ πολλῶν άλλων κακῶν δημιουργῆς ἐστίν

57 The very rare combination οὐρανῶν ἄπτεμ, which occurs in the preceding verse (9:10), is also most likely borrowed from Aeschylus’ Prometheus Bound (l. 1049).
17) Hdt. 2.33 ὅ μὲν δὴ τοῦ Ἀμμενίων Ἑπέαρχου λόγος ἐς τοσοῦτο μοι δεδηλώσθω
     2 Macc 7:42 τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τοὺς σπλαγχνισμούς καὶ τὰς ὑπερβαλλούσας αἰκίας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δεδηλώσθη.
     J. AJ 3.187 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον μοι δεδηλώσθω.
     Paus. 5.27.7 τάδε μὲν ἐς τοσοῦτο ἦμεν δεδηλώσθω.

18) Hdt. 1.76 μάχης δὲ καρτερῆς γενομένης; 3.11 μάχης δὲ γενομένης καρτερῆς
     Th. 4.43.3 ἢ μάχη καρτερᾶ; 8.61.3 καρτερᾶς γενομένης καμαχίας
     2 Macc 10:29; 12:11 γενομένης δὲ καρτερᾶς μάχης
     3 Mac 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;
     Orig. 3.27 μάχης δὲ γενομένης καρτερᾶς

19) Hdt. 7.40 ἦν Νησαίοι καλέσμενοι ἦποι δέκα, προκειμένου οὐκ ἔκλειτα.
     2 Macc 3:39 ὥρθη τις ὑπὸ τοὺς κῦροι . . . καλλίστα σαφὴ διακεκομισμένος

20) Hdt. 1.117 τοιούτῳ μέρῳ ἔχρηστο ὁ παῖς; 1.167 οὗτοι μὲν τῶν Φωκαίων τοιούτῳ μόρῳ δειχρήσαντο.
     2 Macc 13:7 τοιούτῳ μέρῳ τὸν παράνομον συνείχανθαν.

21) X. Cypr. 10.7 ὅπως ἐν εἰς τὸν κόπτων διὰ τῶν βρόχων αἱ αὐγαὶ τοῦ φέγγους ὡς καλλιστα ἐνέχεστιν
     2 Macc 12:9 ὥρθη τον λιμένα . . . ὡστε φαίνεσθαι τὰς αὐγὰς τοῦ φέγγους εἰς τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα.
     Ph. Spec. 1.298 τοῦ τοιοτάτου φέγγους ἐν τοῖς ἄδικοις κύρῳ.

22) X. Cypr. 2.1.13 καὶ τούς ἀμφί τὸ στράτευμα δὲ ὑπηρέτας ἰσομοίρους πάντων ἔδει ἐποίησεν; 2.2.18 ἰσομοίρους πάντας ποιῆσαι; 4.6.12 ἰσομοίρουν δὲ ἐποίησαν καὶ τὸν παρὰ Κυκεράρου ἄγγελον
     2 Macc 8:30 ἰσομοίρους πάντως καὶ τοὺς ἡκασμένους καὶ ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας . . . ποιῆσαντες.
     D.H. 8.72.2 ἰσομοίρους ἦμεν Ἑρνικάς τε καὶ Λατίνους ποιῶν.

23) X. Cypr. 4.2.11 φανερῶς καὶ προθύμως ἐξωρισάτο
     Plb. 3.35.6 ὅπως προθύμεις ἐξωρισᾶτο.
     2 Macc 11.7 προθύμως ἐξωρισμα歼.

24) X. Cypr. 5.2.9; 5.2.10 τείχῳ ἐρυμῶν
     Arist. Pol. 1330ε 37 διὰ τῆς τῶν τειχῶν ἐρμονήσεως; 1330δ 17 ἐρμονήσε τῶν τειχῶν
     2 Macc 12:14 πεπουληθές τῇ τῶν τειχῶν ἐρμονήσει.
     Ph. Prob. 151 ἐρμονήσατον τείχος.

25) X. An. 1.9.6 μακαριστῶν ἐποίησε; Cypr. 7.2.6 μακαριστῶς ποιῆσαι
     2 Macc 7:24 μακαριστῶν ποιῆσαι.
26) Πλ. Phlb. 42d λύπαται τα και ἀληθώνες καὶ ἄθικοι; Πρτ. 354b ὀδύνατε τὰς ἐσχάτας παρέχει καὶ ἀληθώνες; Πρτ. 525b δ' ἀληθάδων καὶ ὀδύνας; R. 413b ὀδύνης τῆς ἀληθήνες
2 Μακκ 9:9 ἐν ὀδύνας καὶ ἀληθέσι
Ph. Leg. 3.216 μετ' ὀδύνας καὶ ἀληθάδων ἀνηγάστων
27) Πλ. Phld. 58c ὡς ἀθεός καὶ γεναιός ἐπελύσατα [εἰς τούτο οὐκἡσαν] Σωκράτης]
2 Μακκ 7:5 ἀλλήλους παρεκάλουσαν σὺν τῇ μητρὶ γεναίες τελευτά
28) Πσ.-Πλ. Hipparch. 228ε γεύμα λαμβάνοντες αὐτοῦ τῆς σοφίας
2 Μακκ 13:18 ὅ δέ βασιλεὺς εἰληφώς γεύμα τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων εὐτολμίας
29) Λυκ. 1.35 προδότης ἐστὶν τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν νόμων
2 Μακκ 5:15 τοῦ και τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος προδότης γεγονότα
30) D. 4.34 ἀμφύττα χρήματα
2 Μακκ 3:6 χρηματίων ἀμφύττων
D.Chr. 40.14 χρήματα ἄμφυττα
31) D. 4.41 καὶ στρατηγεῖσθ' ὑπ' ἐκείνου [εἰς τοῦ Φιλίππου]
Pbl. 3.71.1 Ἀννίβας . . . ἐγένετο πρὸς τὸ στρατηγεῖν τοὺς ὑπενναντίους; 9.25.6 ἄξιοι μάλλον ἐκτοὺς ἃ τοὺς πολεμίους στρατηγεῖν; 29.7.3 λοιπὸν ἢν ἦξέπαταν καὶ στρατηγεῖν ἄλληλος
2 Μακκ 14:31 γεναιός ἢτα τάνδρος ἐστρατήγηται
32) Ισο. 19.28 τὰ χαλεπώτατα . . . καὶ δυσχερέστατα
D. 60.24 δυσχερῆς καὶ χαλεπῆς ἀπα . . . ὁ βίος
2 Μακκ 6:3 χαλεπὴ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλοις ἢ δυσχερῆς ἢ ἐπίστασας τῆς κακίας
33) Ισο. 15.173 διακριβοῦσκα ἐπεὶ ἐκάστου
2 Μακκ 2:28 τὸ διακριβὸν ἐπεὶ ἐκάστων
34) Ισο. 14.40 τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ὑπετέραν ἀνυπόστατον δοκοῦσαν εἰναι; 15.25 ἀνυπόστατον τὴν ἄτομο δύναμιν ἀπασχολεῖ εἰναι δύσειν
2 Μακκ 1:13 ἢ ἐπεὶ ἄτομον ἀνυπόστατον δοκοῦσα εἰναι δύναμις
35) Λυσ. 6.35 ἀπαλλάξας δὲς καὶ ταραχής τῆς τότε
Ισο. 15.169 ἐπισπάσαν τοῦ δέουσα καὶ τῆς ταραχῆς ταύτης
2 Μακκ 3:30 τὸ μικρὸ πρότερον δέουσα καὶ ταραχῆς γέμων ἱερῶν; 13:16 τὴν παρεμβολὴν δέουσα καὶ ταραχῆς ἐπήλθασαν
D.H. 10.15.1 μέγα δέους καὶ πολλὴν ταραχὴν Ρωμαίοις παραστύλοντα
J. Αν 6.24 εἰς ταραχὴν ἔκανε καὶ δέους; 9.87 εἰς τὸ δέους καὶ τὴν ταραχὴν ἐκείνην ἐνέβαλεν; B.I 5.92 πάλιν ἐμπίπτει ταραχὴ καὶ δέους
Plt. Rom. 29.3 μετὰ δέους καὶ ταραχη; Sull. 18.2 ἀνέπλησαν δέους καὶ ταραχῆς τὸ πλήθος τῶν μέρων; Cat. 67.1 κατάπλησε ταραχῆς καὶ δέους ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν ἀνθρώπου Cat. Mi. 28.5 ὡς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Μέσσαλον ἐμπεσοῦν ταραχὴν καὶ δέους
36) Phylarch. FGH 2a, 81, fr. 45.53 οὐδὲ οὕτως ἐλήγαν τῆς ὑπερηφανίας
2 Μακκ 9:7 ἢ δ' ὦδαμος τῆς ἀγαλματίας ἔληγεν; 9:11 ἥρετο τὸ πολὺ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας λήγαν
Appendix 12: Combinations of words shared by Polybius, 2 Maccabees, and a few subsequent authors

1) Plb. 7.2.2 τούτοις μὲν εἰς Ἱερολόν ἀπέστειλε, δοὺς ἐντολάς; 29.3.4 τούτοις ἀπεστειλε, δοὺς ἐντολάς; 29.3.9 προκειμένας Παρμενίων καὶ Μόρκην ἀπεστείλε, δοὺς ἐντολάς; 31.7.3 ἄξιοματικὰς δὲ δοὺς ἐντολάς ἀπεστείλε τοὺς πρέσβεις; 33.7.4 παραχρῆμα ἀπεστείλεν, ἐντολάς αὐτοῖς δοῦσα
2 Macc 3:7 προκειμένον Ἰλιόδωρον ... ἀπέστειλε δοὺς ἐντολάς; 14:12 προκειμένοις δὲ ένθα τῷ Νικανόρῳ ... ἀπεστείλεν δοὺς ἐπιστολάς
D.S. 17.2.5 προκειμένον Ἑκατέρων ἀπεστείλεν ... δοὺς ἐντολάς; 23.10.1 ἀπεστείλεν τινὰς τῶν ἁλκῶν εἰς Καρχηδόνα δοὺς ἐντολάς

2) Plb. 3.52.5 ἀδαπαφοῦντι ὅτι πάρεισι διὰ τοῦτα
2 Macc 3:9 τίνος ἐνκενον πάρεστι διαπάρθησαν

3) Plb. 3.102.4 εἰς τούτα ἥξθυν καταφρονήσωσι; 4.35.4 διὰ τὴν ἀμύντητα τῶν τολμῶντων εἰς τούτα ἥξθυσα καταφρονήσωσι [καὶ τὸ ιερὸν]
UPZ 1.8.27–28 [161 BCE] ἀνεπιπλήκτων αὐτῶν ἄνω τῶν εἰς μείζονα καταφρόνησιν [με] ἐξῆθιν
2 Macc 3:18 διὰ τὸ μέλλειν εἰς καταφρόνησιν ἐρχεσθαι τὸν τόπον [καὶ τὸ Ιερού Τεμελίου]
J. AJ 9.257 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δ’ ἄλγεις καὶ καταφρονήσεως ἥξθον [καὶ ὡς βασιλεὺς Ἀχαϊκῶν]

4) Plb. 1.26.9 θεώμενος ὑπὸ τὴν ὅψιν; 4.41.9 θεωροῦντας ὑπὸ τὴν ὅψιν; 8.21.1 τοῦ πράγματος ὑπὸ τὴν ὅψιν θεωρούμενον; 10.18.13 θεωροῦν ὑπὸ τὴν ὅψιν; 38.20.3 ὑπὸ τῶν ὅψιν θεωρούμενος τὸν λάβοι; 2 Macc 3:36 ἐξεμπύρητος δὲ πάσην, ἄπερ ἡν ὑπ’ ὅψιν τεθεμένος ἑργα τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ; cf. 12.42 ὑπ’ ὅψιν 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 ἐντολάς.
5) Plb. 4.73.2 ὅ ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἃς θάττον ἤκε
2 Mac 4:31 θάττον οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἤκε
Ph. Mos. 1.237 τοῦ μὴ θάττον ἢκειν
J. AJ 15.78 θάττον ἢκειν; Vit. 218, 373 ἢκειν θάττον
6) Plb. 5.58.1 ὅ ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς σφῶς ἐκεκάκα τοῦτον ἐπεγνωκός; 6.9.11 τοῦτα τίς σφῶς ἐπεγνωκός
JC I xxiv 2.20–21 [2nd c. BCE] ἡμᾶς ἐπεγνωκότεν σφῶς τὰν Σαμίων εὐνοιαν
2 Mac 4:33 σφῶς ἐπεγνωκὸς ὁ Οὐλίας; 14:9 ἐκεκακὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἐπεγνωκὸς σὺ, βασιλεὺ
7) Plb. 1.39.11, 3.78.8, 20.10.15 διαδοθείσης (τῆς) φήμης; 31.28.7 φήμης περὶ αὐτοῦ (διαδοθείσης)
2 Mac 4:39 διαδοθείσης ἐξω 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 διαδοθείσης περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμης; 32.7.1 τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμης διαδοθείσης; 13.61.2 διεδόθη δὲ καὶ φήμη τῆς; 31.25.1 φήμη διαδοθὴ
Ph. Contempl. 64 τὴν διαδοθείσαν φήμην
4 Mac 4:22 φήμης διαδοθείσης
8) Plb. 34.1.9 σχεδὸν ἔρ’ ἡμέρας τετσαράκοντα
2 Mac 5:2 σχεδὸν ἔρ’ ἡμέρας τετσαράκοντα
D.S. 19.19.2 σχεδὸν ἔρ’ ἡμέρας τετσαράκοντα
9) Plb. 30.25.14 τὰ δ’ [ἐδιωκα] ἡμιφιμενῆ στολαῖς διαχρύσωσις
2 Mac 5:2 ἵππεις διαχρύσωσις στολᾶς ἐχοντας
EsthνTV 5(D):4–6) ὁ βασιλεὺς . . . πᾶσαν στολὴν ἐπιφανεῖας ἐνδυθέω, ὅλος διάχρυσος
J. AJ 11.331 τὸν δὲ ἄρχησεν ἐν τῇ ἱκανότητα καὶ διαχρύσωσιν στολὴ
10) Plb. 6.39.5 τοῖς δὲ πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης πρῶτος ἐπὶ τὸ τείχως ἀναβάσις; 9.25.6 πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης
2 Mac 5:5 τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ τείχος συνελασθέντων καὶ τέλος ἔδη καταλαμβανομένης τῆς πόλεως
D.S. 13.57.1 τῆς πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης; 17.13.1 τῆς δὲ πόλεως τούτον τὸν τρόπον καταλαμβανομένης
Plu. Brut. 8.7 ἔδη τῆς πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης
11) Plb. 30.11.5 ἀποτεθηκιμενοὶ τὰς ψυχὰς
2 Mac 5:11 τεθηκιμενοὶ τῷ ψυχή
D.S. 17.9.6 ἀποθηκιμεθεὶς τὴν ψυχήν
12) Plb. 39.1.4 δὲ τοῦ προσώπου παρεκάλει τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας
2 Mac 6:12 παρεκάλει ὡς τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τῇ δὲ τῇ βίβλῳ καὶ συστάλλεσθαι διὰ τὰς συμφορὰς
J. AJ 1.15 τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τοὺς βιβλίοις παρεκάλει; Αρτ. 2.147 παρεκάλει δὲ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τῇ γραφή μὴ μετὰ φθόνον ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν
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Dac. 1 Pr 5 παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ σὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐντευχομένους τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι μὴ τὴν ἐν λόγοις δύναμιν ἡμῶν σκοπεῖν

13) Plb. 4.74.8 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν τῷ Ἡλείῳ ὑπομνήσεως εἰρήθω χάριν

2 Macc 6:17 ἐως ὑπομνήσεως ταῦθ’ ἡμῖν εἰρήθω

D.H. Comp. 3.68 ἐμοὶ δ’ ὑπομνήσεις ἔνεκα λέγοντι ἁρκεῖ ταῦτα μόνα εἰρήθαι

Str. 11.1.2.6 εἰρήθη δὲ ταῦθ’ ἡμῖν καὶ πρότερον, ἀλλ’ εἰρήθη καὶ νῦν ὑπομνήσεως χάριν

14) Plb. 16.17.8 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὴν παρθένα φιλοστοργίαν

2 Macc 6:20 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν φιλοστοργίαν

D.S. 3.59.1 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ μειράκιον φιλοστοργίαν

J. AJ 4.273 διὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰ οἰκεία φιλοστοργίαν

15) Plb. 1.30.11 οὶ δὲ μισθοφόροι πάνω γενναίως καὶ προθύμως ἐκβοηθήσαντες

2 Macc 6:28 εἰς τὸ προθύμως καὶ γενναίως . . . ἀπευθυναντίζειν

J. AJ 14.95 γενναίως οἱ Ἰουδαίοι καὶ προθύμως ἐγνωσίαμενοι

16) Plb. 8.38b.2 ἀδήλιας ἐπίστα

2 Macc 7:34 ἀδήλιας ἐπίστα

Agatharch. 15.6 ἀδήλιας ἐπίστα

Plu. Mor. 496E ἐπίθες ἐρήμου

17) Plb. 9.19.3 δυνάτοις ἢν οὖν οἷον παραλιπεῖται διὰ τὰ τοιοῦτα τοὺς ἴδιους καιροὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεργοῖς χρήσασθαι; 18.53.4 καὶ χείρα βαρεῖα έχουν συνεργὴν καὶ καιρόν; 18.55.2 λαβὼν γὰρ συνεργῆς τὴν ἁγρυπτὴν τὴν Χαριμόρτου

2 Macc 8:7 τάς νύκτας πρὸς τὰς τοιούτας ἐπίβολας συνεργοὺς ἐλάμβανε; 14:5 καιρῶν δὲ λαβὼν τῆς ἴδιας ἀνείας συνεργὴν

1 Mac 12:1 καὶ εἶδεν Ἰωανάθων ὅτι οἱ καιροὶ αὐτῶν συνεργή

D.H. 2.14.2 ἦσαν δὲ μέσαι την καιρόν νύκταις καὶ πολλῆς καθ’ ἥλιον τὴν πύλην ἐς ἁμαρτία, ὅτι συνεργῆς λαβὼν

IosPE I 352.22 [ca. 107 BCE] Παλάκε[κου] δὲ συνεργεῖ τῶν καιρῶν ἐκείνων νομίζοντο Πλυ. Mor. 660Α καιρῶν λαμβάνοντα πεθούς φιλανθρώπου καὶ χάριτος συνεργῶν

18) Plb. 2.27.3 τὴν παρουσίαν ἀμορτέρων τῶν στρατοπέδων ἀνάγγελλον; 28.12.4 ἐὰν ὁ στρατηγὸς εὐθυκα τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ στρατόπεδο

2 Macc 8:12 μετάδοντος τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ στρατόπεδου

SEB 39:1244 col. II.8 [aft. 120/119 BCE] ἐμ πολέμῳ καὶ παρουσίᾳ στρατοπέδων Ἰουδαίων

19) Plb. 3.115.4 γενναίως διαγωνιζομένων τῶν Ἰουδαίων; 16.5.2 ἀγωνίζεσθαι γενναίως; 21.27.9 γενναίως ἐγνωσίαμενοι

2 Macc 8:16 ἀγωνίσασθαι γενναίως; 13:14 γενναίως ἐγνωσίασθαί

D.S. 11.31.1, 15.34.5, 38/39.15.1 γενναίως ἐγνωσίαμενοι; 14.57.6 γενναίως ἐγωνιζομένων; 14.104.3 γενναίως ἐγνωσίαμενοι; 15.3.6 γενναίως ἐγνωσίαμενοι; 15.12.1 γενναίως ἐγωνιζόμενοι; 17.23.3 γενναίως ἐγνωσίασθαί

D.H. 6.6.3 γενναίως ἐγωνιζομένοι

389
J. AJ 6.368, BJ 1.172, 3.251 γενναίως ἁγωνιζόμενος; AJ 14.95 γενναίως ἁγωνισάμενοι; BJ 1.154, 5.163 γενναίως ἁγωνισμένους; 4.429 γενναίως ἁγωνισάμενοι; 6.142 γενναίως ἁγωνίσατο

20) Plb. 18.7.3 ἔδεῖ τῆς ὧρας συγκλειόσης; 18.9.2 διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν ὧραν εἰς ὃι ὑφή συγκλείσειν; 2.60.4 ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν συγκλειόμενον; fr. 36.2 ἐπεὶ τὸν Φίλιππον ἔκκλεισαν οἱ καιροί.

2 Macc 8:25 ὑπὸ τῆς ὧρας συγκλειόμενοι

D.S. 10.4.6 ἔδεῖ τῆς ὧρας συγκλειόσης; 19.77.7 τῆς χειμερινῆς ὧρας συγκλειόσης; 18.3.1 ἔκκλεισθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν

Cf. Hdt. 1.31.11 ἐκκλησίμων τῇ ὤρῃ; P.Eneteux. 54.4 [218 BCE] συνέβη ὑπὸ τῆς ὧρας ἔκκλεισθέντας

21) Plb. 26.1.5 τὴν βασιλικὴν ἀποθέμενον ἐσθήτα

2 Macc 8:35 τὴν βασιλικὴν ἀποθέμενον ἐσθήτα

D.S. 20.104.4 ἀποθέμενος τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἐσθήτα

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 ποιησάμενος τὴν ἀναζυγήν 10.49.2 ποιεῖται παράγγειλε τὴν ἀναζυγήν

2 Macc 9:2 σπαχήμονα τὴν ἀναζυγήν ποιήσασθαι

J. AJ 17.251 τὴν ἀναζυγήν ἐποιεῖτο

23) Plb. 3.34.7 ἑπαρβεῖ τῷ θυμῷ

2 Macc 9:4 ἑπαρβεῖ τῷ θυμῷ

D.S. 31.43.1 ὅ τῶν Ρωμαίων δήμου ἐπηρμένος τῷ θυμῷ

24) Plb. 38.7.9 οὐκ ἀπελπίζειν τὰ καθ' αὐτός

2 Macc 9:18 ὁ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἀπελπίζει

25) Plb. 18.46.1 διὰ τὴν προσδοκίαν τῶν ἀποθησομένων

2 Macc 9:25 προσδοκώτας τὸ ἀποθησόμενον

26) Plb. 8.13.1 ἐγκρατεῖς γενέσθαι τῶν τόπων τούτων; 8.14.10 ἐγκρατεῖς γενόμενος τῶν προερχόμενων τόπων

2 Macc 10:17 ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο τῶν τόπων

J. Ap. 1.186 ἐγένετο τῶν περὶ Συρίαν τόπων ἐγκρατεῖς

27) Plb. 6.32.4 εἰς τὸν κατεπείγοντα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν τόπον

2 Macc 10:19 εἰς ἐπειγόντας τόπους

Agatharch. GGM 1:32.18 εἰς τὸν ἐπιφανῆ καὶ κατεπείγοντα τόπον

28) Plb. 2.25.8 ἄμα δὲ τῶν συνεγγίζειν τοῖς πολεμίοις; 14.4.2, 14.8.2 συνεγγίζεις δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις

2 Macc 10:27 συνεγγίσαντες δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις

29) Plb. 3.113.1, 11.22.6 ἠρτὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατολῆς ἐπιφανομένης

2 Macc 10:28 ἠρτὶ δὲ τῆς ἀνατολῆς διαχειμένης

60 A number of minuscules read here καθ' αὐτόν.
30) Plb. 1.53.5; 1.60.6; 15.31.1 ὃδε τῆς ἡμέρας ὑποφαίνοντο; 3.105.1 ἄρτι τῆς ἡμέρας διαφανούσης; 5.6.6, 11.11.2 ἄρτι τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιφανούσης; 8.30.10 τῆς 8 ἡμέρας ἐπιφανομένης
   2 Macc 10:35 ὑποφαίνοντος δὲ τῆς πέμπτης ἡμέρας; 13:17 ὑποφαίνοντος δὲ ὃδε τῆς ἡμέρας
   D.S. 16.18.3 διαφανούσης ὃδε τῆς ἡμέρας; 20.6.1 ὑποφαίνοντος τῆς ἡμέρας
   J. AJ 3.51 ἄργημέν, δὲ ὑποφαίνειν τῆς ἡμέρας; 6.111 ὑποφαίνοντος ὃδε τῆς ἡμέρας
   Arr. An. 3.21.3 ἀκούστη ἡμέρα ὑποφαίνοντα
   Cf. Hdt. 7.219.6 ὃδε διαφανούσης ἡμέρης; X. HG 5.1.21 ὃς ὃδε ἡμέρα ὑπέφαινεν; An. 4.2.7; Cyr. 4.5.14 ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡμέρα ὑπέφαινεν; Pl. Prt. 312a ὃδε γὰρ ὑπέφαινεν τι ἡμέρας

31) Plb. 7.18.6 οἱ δὲ τὰς παραμειμένας διέκοπτον τοὺς
   2 Macc 10:36 οἱ δὲ τὰς πύλας διέκοπτον
   D.H. 6.91.3 τὰς πύλας διακόμαντες
   Cf. X. An. 7.1.16 οἱ δὲ δραπαίτωται ἐκοπτον τὰς πύλας

32) Plb. 1.32.2 διακόμασο τὸ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα; 2.19.6 προσφυλοφικήσαντες πρὸς τὸ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα; 3.96.8 προσπεπόντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ γεγονός ἐλαττωμάτος; 5.87.2 διὰ τὸ γεγονός ἐλάττωμα περὶ αὐτὸν
   2 Macc 11:13 ἀντιβάλλων τὸ γεγονός περὶ αὐτῶν ἐλάττωμα
   D.S. 14.23.6 τὸ περὶ τὸν βασιλέα γεγονός ἐλάττωμα; 15.85.8 τὸ γεγονός περὶ τοὺς συμμάχους ἐλάττωμα; 18.58.1 τῶν γεγονότων περὶ αὐτῶν ἐλαττωμάτων

33) Plb. 24.15.6 εὐθέως ἀναζεύξαντες
   2 Macc 11:22 εὐθέως ἀναζεύξασι
   1 Macc 14:16 εὐθέως ἀναζεύξασι
   D.S. 12.65.7 εὐθίς δὲ ἐπαναζεύξεσθαι; 17.64.3 εὐθίς ἀναζεύξε

34) Plb. 2.66.10 ἐποίει δὲ τοῦτο διὰ τὴν στενότητα τῶν τόπων; 5.3.4 ὅρων τὸ τε πολιομάτιον διατελόρκητον ὑπὸ καὶ τὴν χώραν στενήν
   2 Macc 12:21 ἦν γὰρ διατελόρκητον καὶ διασπρόστασαν τὸ χαρίν διὰ τὴν πάνω τῶν τόπων στενότητα
   D.S. 17.40.4 ὅρων κατὰ θέλαττον διατελέσθηκεν διὰ τὴν πόλιν
   D.H. 11.47.3 χωρίον... ὕψολον καὶ διασπρόστατον
   J. AJ 2.249 ἦν δὲ διατελόρκητον σφάδρα τὸ χαρίν
   Cf. X. HG 4.8.5 πεῦπν τε μὲν <άν> ἱσχυρότερον Σκηνοῦ λάβοιτε χωρίον, ποῦν δὲ διασπολορκήσαντον

35) Plb. 8.15.2 τοῦτον ὁ Σωσίδειος διὰ πλειόνων λόγων πιστωσάμενος
   2 Macc 12:25 πιστώσακεν δὲ αὐτοῦ διὰ πλειόνων τῶν ὁρισμῶν

36) Plb. 2.54.14 διεμάχοντο πρὸς τοὺς ἐπικειμένους εὐρώστους
   2 Macc 12:27 εὐρώστους ἀπεμάχοντο
   D.S. 11.22.2 συνεψαντες μάχην εὐρώστως ἤγοινέντοι; 17.96.4 μαχημένων εὐρώστως

37) Plb. 3.102.10 ποιεῖται τὴν στρατοπεδείαν; 4.23.3 ποιεῖται τὴν στρατοπεδείαν
   2 Macc 13:14 ἐποίησατο τὴν στρατοπεδείαν
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38) Plb. 10.12.8 κατ’ ἐκλογήν τῶν ἀρίστων ἄνθρωπον προεκριμένων
2 Macc 13:15 μετὰ νεανίσκων ἀρίστων κεκριμένων
D.S. 37.1.6 τῶν ἰδίων ἀρίστων κεκριμένων
Phu. Ages. 36.1 ἄνδρα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄριστον κεκριμένον
39) Plb. 31.1.5 οἱ καὶ παρεθύντες εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἐνδεχομένως ἔδοξεν πρὸς ἄπαντας τοὺς καταγγοροῦσας ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν
2 Macc 13:26 ἀπελογήσατο ἐνδεχομένως
D.S. 31.7.2 ἐνδεχομένως ἀπολογηθήσαμεν
40) Plb. 13.6.3 τοὺς κατὰ πλέον πλουτὸς διαφέροντας ἡ δόξη προγονική; 20.5.4 ἐγκαταλείποντός της προγονικῆς δόξης
2 Macc 14:7 ἀφελόμενος τὴν προγονικὴν δόξαν
Posidon. fr. 227.1 Theiler [=D.S. 37.17.1] οὗτος γὰρ ὁ προγονικὴν δόξαν οὐδέ’ ἀφορμὴν ἤδειον ἔχων
D.H. 6.27.2 οὐ γὰρ πλουτοὺς ἡ δόξα προγονικὰς εἶχον
ΤΑΜ II 838.δεξι11 (134 CE?) προσκεκλήσαμεν τὰς προγονικὰς ἄρτες καὶ δόξας
41) Plb. 31.19.2 ὡς βασιλεῖς ταύτα διακούσας, εὐθέως προχειρισάμενος Κομανόν καὶ Πτολεμαίον τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐξαπέστειλε πρεσβεύτας
2 Macc 14:12 προχειρισάμενος δὲ εὐθέως Νικάνορα . . . ἐξαπέστειλε
42) Plb. 5.42.1 ἐπίβουλον οὖν καὶ προδότην τῆς βασιλείας
2 Macc 14:26 τὸν ἐπίβουλον τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ Ἰούδαν
J. AJ 6.255.4 ὅτε τῆς ἐμῆς βασιλείας ἐπιβοῦλοι
43) Plb. 33.10.3 ἐπέστειλε δεσμίως
2 Macc 14:27 δέσμιμον ἐξαποστέλλαν
LXX Zech 9.11 ἐξαποστειλαὶς δεσμίως σου
D.S. 18.66.3 ἐπέστειλε δεσμίως
44) Plb. 1.31.8 οὖν ἄνδρωδος ἴστη καὶ γενναίως ὡστε πᾶν ὑπομένειν εὑλτο . . . ἐφ’ ὃς μεθὲν ἄγενες μηδ’ ἀνάξιον τῶν πρὸ τοῦ πράξεων ὑπομείνατι 5.83.6 παρεκάλουν ἄνθρωπος καὶ γενναίοις χρήσασθαι τῷ παρόντι κυνήγουν
2 Macc 14:42–43 εὐγενοὶς θέλων ἀποθανεῖν ἕπερ τοὺς ἀλιτηρίους ὑποικείριος γενέσθαι καὶ τῆς ἱδίας εὐγενείας ἀνάξιος ὑβρισθῆναι . . . ἀναδραμὼν γενναίοις ἐπὶ τὸ τείχος κατεχομένην ἕκτον ἄνθρωπος εἰς τοὺς ἄχους
45) Plb. 8.30.5 πλήρης ἡ πόλις κραυγῆς ἐγένετο καὶ ταραχῆς
2 Macc 15:29 γενναίοις δὲ κραυγῆς καὶ ταραχῆς
D.H. 13.7.4 ταραχὴ τε καὶ κραυγὴ καὶ δρόμοι ἀπάντων ἤν
Appendix 13: Combinations of words shared by 2
Maccabees, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of
Halicarnassus, et al., but not found in Polybius

1) 2 Mac 2:22 τὸ περιβότον καθ’ ἐκλη τὴν οἰκουμένην ἱερὸν
D.S. 17.70.3 τὰ δὲ μεγάλα καὶ κατὰ πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην περιβότον βασίλεια
J. AJ. 20.49 τὰ πάντα Ἀνδρέαποις περιβότον ἱερὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ
2) 2 Mac 2:25 ἐφροντίσαμεν τοῖς μὲν βουλημένοις ἀναγινώσκειν ψυχογιῶν . . . πάσι δὲ τοῖς ἐνυπηχύνοντις ὕψελειαι
Posidon. fr. 85.114 Theller [=D.S. 32.12.1] τὰς περιπετείας τούτης ἀναγραφῆς ἥξισαμεν, οὐ ψυχογιῶς ἅλλ’ ὑψελεῖαι ἔνεκα τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων
D.H. Imit. 31.5.7 εἰς ὑψέλειαν τῶν ἐνυπηχύνων
Ph. Mut. 126 ἐπ’ ὕψελεῖα τῶν ἐνυπηχύμενων
3) 2 Mac 3:18 οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων ἀγεληθὲν ἐξεπήθην
D.S. 15.24.3 πολλοὶ μὲν μετὰ τῶν ὁπλῶν ἐξεπήθησαν ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων; 15.48.3 τινὲς ἐξεπήθησαν ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων; 19.6.6 ἐξεπήθησαν ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων εἰς τὰς ὕδαες; 19.45.7 ἐξεπήθησαν ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων
D.H. 7.26.4 ἐξεπήθησαν ἄπαντες ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων; 11.39.6 ἐξεπήθησαν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων γυναικὲς τε καὶ παρθέναι
4) 2 Mac 3:20 ἐποιοῦντο τὴν λιτανείαν; 10:16 ποιησάμενοι λιτανείαν
D.H. 4.67.1 πολλὰς λιτανείας . . . ποιησάμενη
5) 2 Mac 3:24 πάντας . . . καταπληγέντας τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν εἰς ἐκλογὴν καὶ δειλίαν τραπέζῃ
Lindos I 2 col. D.33 [99 BCE] καταπληγεῖς ὁ βάρβα[ρος] τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν
D.S. 11.14.3 πάντας δὲ καταπληγεύσας τὴν τῶν Θεοῦ εὐρεγείαν φυγαίνει ἐκ τῶν τόπων
6) 2 Mac 3:27 εἰς φορεῖον ἐνθέντες
Nic.Dam. FHO 3:101.583 ἐνθέμενοι τὸν νεκρὸν εἰς φορεῖον
7) 2 Mac 3:29 καὶ ὁ μὲν . . . φόρους . . . ἐφέππε
D.H. 10.7.4 ἀκίνητον τε καὶ ἄρωμα εἰς ἐφερμεμένον
8) 2 Mac 4:10 ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα τοὺς ὁμοφύλους μετέπεσαν
D.H. Pomp. 3.16 ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα σύνησαν διάλεκτος
Hdn. 3.2, p. 404.23 Lentz ὑπὸ ἐστὶν ἀντίκαταντον, τούτων οὐκ ἔχον χαρακτῆρα ἑλληνικὸν
9) 2 Mac 4:16 ὅν ἔχειλαν τὰς ἄγωγας
D.H. Dem. 36.22 τὴν μικτὴν καὶ μέσην ἐξῆλθαν ἄγωγαν
10) 2 Mac 4:31 τῶν ἐν ἀξιωματι κειμένων
D.S. 28.2.1 τῶν ἐν ἀξιωματι κειμένων φίλων
11) 2 Mac 4:42 πολλοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν τραυμάτας ἔποιησαν . . . πάντας δὲ εἰς φυγήν συνήλασαν
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D.S. 16.50.2 τινάς δὲ τραυματικάς ποιήσαντες τοὺς λοιποὺς συνήλασαν εἰς τι λέορο τῆς πόλεως

12) 2 Macc 5:6 ἐποιεῖτο σφαγῆ . . . ἀφειδώς; 5:12 κόπτειν ἀφειδώς τοὺς ἐμπιπτότας
Άττ. Αν. 3.15.2 έκποτόν τε καὶ έκπιπτότο άφειδώς
D.C. 74.13.2 τὰ δὲ ἡ πλοία αὐτῶν ἀφειδώς ἐκποτόν
Cf. Hdt. 1.207 τῶν προβάτων ἀφειδῶς πολλὰ κατακόψαντας; D.S. 17.13.1 ἀφειδῶς ἄνηφρον πάντας τοὺς περιτυγχάνοντας

13) 2 Macc 5:9 ὡς δὲ τὴν συγγένειαν τευχόμενον σκέπης
D.S. 17.82.3 οἱ κατοικκοῦντες πολλῇς σκέπης τυγχάνουσιν

14) 2 Macc 5:10 ὁ πλῆθος ἀτάρων ἐκρίψας
D.S. 3.59.1 τὰ σώματα ἐκρίψαντος ἄταρα; 16.16.4 ἄταρων ἐξερρίψαν
J. BJ 3.377 ἄταρως ἐκρίπτειν
App. Sam. 9.5.3 ἐξερρίψαν ἄταρον; Mith. 210 ἄταρων ἐκρίψας

15) 2 Macc 5:16 ἀνατεθέντα πρὸς αὑξήσιν καὶ δόξαν τοῦ τόπου
D.S. 15.13.5 τὰ συντεινόντα πρὸς αὑξήσιν πόλεως καὶ δόξαν; 16.33.1 μεγάλης αὑξήσεως τε καὶ δόξας
Cf. IMT Skarn/Neberlader 185.23 [Ilion, last third of the 3rd c. BCE] πρὸς τὴν τῆς πανηγύρεως ἐπικυήσειν καὶ δόξαν

16) 2 Macc 6:8 εἰς τὰς ἀστυγείτονας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις
D.S. 14.40.3 δεινὸν εἶναι περιδέας ἀστυγείτονας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις

17) 2 Macc 6:19 ὃ δὲ τὸν μετ’ εὐκλείας θάνατον μάλλον ἢ τὸν μετὰ μόσον βίων ἁναδέξαμεν
D.S. 15.86.3 εὐγενίας ἁναδέξετο τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης θάνατον; 38/39.2.2 τὸν μετ’ ἐλευθερίας θάνατον εὐγενίας ἁναδέξασθαι

18) 2 Macc 6:21 ἀπολαβόντες αὐτὸν κατ᾽ ἰδίαν
D.H. 19.14.1 ἰδίᾳ δὲ τὸν Φαβρίκιον ἀπολαβόν
NT Mark 7:33 ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑψου κατ’ ἱδίαν
J. BJ 2.109 ἀπολαβόμενος οὖν αὐτὸν κατ᾽ ἱδίαν

19) 2 Macc 6:22 διὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν πρὸς αὐτούς φιλίαν
D.H. 6.21.2 τὴν ἀρχαίαν φιλίαν
Memn. FHG 3:6.7 τὴν ἀρχαίαν φιλίαν

20) 2 Macc 6:26 ἐξελοῦμαι τὴν εἰς ἄνθρωπον τιμωρίαν
D.S. 1.83.8 ἐξελοῦσά τις τιμωρίας τὸν ἄνθρωπον

21) 2 Macc 7:14 μετακλάσσοντας ἀπ’ ἄνθρωπον
D.S. 18.56.2 μετακλάσσαστος εἰς ἄνθρωπον
Άττ. Peripl.M.Euq. 23.4 μετακλάζῃ εἰς ἄνθρωπον

22) 2 Macc 7:29 ἐπίδεεσθαι τὸν θάνατον
D.S. 8.27.2 ἐπιδέεσθαι τὸν ἐντιμὸν θάνατον

23) 2 Macc 8:6 πόλεις δὲ καὶ κώμαις ἀπροσδοκητῶς ἐφράμενος ἐνεπέμπετο
D.S. 14.90.5 ἀπροσδοκητῶς δὲ νυκτὶς ἐπιρρανέας τῇ πόλει τὰς πόλεις ἐνέπρησε
24) 2 Mac 8:21 εὐθαρσεῖς αὐτοῦς παραστήσας
3 Mac 1:7 εὐθαρσεῖς τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους κατέστησαν
D.S. 15.54.4 πρὸς τὴν μάχην εὐθαρσεῖς ταῖς ψυχαῖς κατέστησεν; 17.56.4 πρὸς τοὺς ἑπεφευρεμένους κινδύνους εὐθαρσεῖς κατεστάσας; 18.51.6 πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους εὐθαρσεῖς κατέστησαν
25) 2 Mac 8:25 συνδιδαχόμενοι δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐφ᾽ ἰκανόν
D.S. 12.70.2 ἐφ᾽ ἰκανὸν τὸπὸν ἔδωκεν; 13.100.1 οἷς δὲ Ἀθηναίοι διδάχοντες ἐφ᾽ ἰκανόν τοὺς ἄκτιμους
26) 2 Mac 9:2 ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὅπλων βοήθειαν ἐπράτησαν
D.S. 3.23.2 μηδεὶς βοήθειαν ὅπλων ἔχοντες
27) 2 Mac 9:28 ἐπὶ ξένης ἐν τοῖς ὅραις οἴκτιστον μάρυ κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον
D.H. 6.21.3 ἐπὶ ξένης τὸν βίον κατέστρεψαν
28) 2 Mac 9:29 οἰκτίστι μόρο τοῦ κατέστρεψαν τὸν βίον
D.H. 2.68.4 τὸν οἰκτιστὸν μόρον ἀποκαθιστάνει; 5.27.1 τὸν οἰκτιστὸν ἀπολέσθαι μόρον; 6.7.2 τὸν οἰκτιστὸν μόρον ἀποθανόν
J. BJ 2.143 οἰκτίστῳ μόρῳ διαφθείρεται
Cf. Hom. Od. 11.412; 24.34 οἰκτίστῳ θανάτοι; A.R. 4.1296 οἰκτίστῳ θανάτοι; Ph. Leg. 3.203 θανάτος οἰκτιστος; J. BJ 7.203 θανάτον τὸν οἰκτιστὸν
29) 2 Mac 10:3 μετὰ διετὴ χρόνον; 4:23, 14:1 μετὰ δὲ τριετὴ χρόνον
Posidon. fr. 85.90 Thelier (=D.S. 32.11.1) διετῆ μὲν ὧν χρόνον συνεβίοσε σάνθρι
D.S. 2.2.1 χρόνον ἑπτακαδέκατη καταναλώσας; 2.47.6 τὸν ἑνεκαδέκατη χρόνον; 3.17.3 τὰ δ᾽ ὑπὲρ πενταετὴ χρόνον ὄντα; 4.54.1 συμβιώσατα δεκαετῇ χρόνον; 7.52.2 καταγιόν τριετὴ χρόνον; 11.1.5 τριετὴ χρόνον ... ἀγαλληθέντες; 11.2.1 τριετὴ χρόνον παρακεκασάμενον; 11.38.7 ἐπέτειχεν χρόνον ἐβασίλευσεν; 11.55.2 ὑπὸ τῆς πατρίδος ... πενταετῇ χρόνον; 14.92.4 διετὴ χρόνον Ἀργαίοι βασιλεύσαντες; 14.117.8 διετήθην τὰ τριετήν ταχέως χρόνον; 15.9.2 διετὴ χρόνον τὸν ἑπὶ πάση συνεχείς πολεμηθεῖς; 17.80.2 τριετὴ χρόνον ἐν φυλακῇ διετέλεσε; 17.94.1 σχεδὸν ὀκταετή χρόνον; 19.91.2 τετραετὴ χρόνον γεγονός σατράτης; 20.90.2 διετὴ χρόνον ἀναλώσας; 24.14.1 δεκαετὴ χρόνον πολυρχηθήντες; 29.25.1 οὐδὲ διετὴ χρόνον ἐπέβιοσε; 31.9.5 διετὴ χρόνον φιλοψυχήσας
D.H. 1.71.2 ὀκταετή χρόνον ἐβασίλευσεν; 2.67.2 χρόνον τριεκατεστή μένειν ... ἄγνας; 3.38.3 τριετὴ χρόνον ὑπὸ ταῖς Λατίνοις γενομένης; 3.58.1 τριετή χρόνον ἀποτερέσας; 3.69.2 χρόνον ἐπιβίοσας ... τετραετῇ; Amm. 5.10.8 χρόνον εἰκοσάετή διητέρψε σὺν αὐτῷ; 5.15 διητέρψε χρόνον ὀκταετῆ παρ᾽ αὐτῷ; 11.23 θέλειναι ἐπταετὴ χρόνον
MDAI (A) 32 (1907) 243.4 [Pergamon, 75–50 BCE] πολύετε χρόνον; IG V, 1.1145.16 [Gythion, ca. 70 BCE] διετη χρόνον; BGU 8.1827.32 [52/51 BCE] τριετω τετραετ ὑπὲρ τούς; SEG 29.756.7–8 [Teos, ca. 50 BCE] χρόνον δοῦς ... ἐνδεκαετῇ BGU 8.1848.10–11 [48–46 BCE] διετής χρόνος; BGU 4.1120.21 [5 BCE] μετὰ τὸν πενταετὴ χρόνον; IG
XII,5 860.29 [Tenos, 1° c. BCE] εἰς ἄλχον πενταέτης συνεγράφατο χρόνον; EAD XXX 484bis.2 [Delos, 1° c. BCE] [τὸν εἰ]κοστή μή παραβάσσα χρόνον
Ph. Jos. 100 μετὰ γὰρ διετή χρόνον
Str. 5.2.6.8 διετὴ χρόνον ἐπιηλικήτησαν; 9.1.20.21 δεκαετή χρόνον ὁ ἄρχε Μακεδόνων Κασανδρὸς
NT Acts 13:18 τεσσαρευνήσατε χρόνων ἐπτροποφόρησαν αὖτοις ἐν τῇ ἥρμῃ
J. AJ 2.7.4 διετή χρόνον τοῖς δεσμοῖς κακουπαθοῦντα
Plu. Pyth. 26.1 ἥξετε χρόνοιν ἀναλώσας; Mor. 844C τετραετή χρόνον αὐτὸν διεπόνησε
Cr. S. Ph. 715 μὴ δογχώτου πώματος ἠθη δεκαετία χρόνοις; Hdt. 2.2.16 ὡς γὰρ διετὴς χρόνος ἐγενότα
IG XII,3 328.3 [Thera, ca. 260? BCE] τριετοὺς δὲ [χρόνου διαλύονται]

30) 2 Macc 10:34 τῇ ἐρμονήτητι τοῦ τόπου πεποιθότες; 12:14 πεποιθότες τῇ τῶν τειχῶν ἐρμονήτητι
D.S. 12.46.3 ταῖς ύπερχεῖς τῶν τειχῶν πεποιθότες; 17.28.2 τῇ τῶν τόπων ἐρμονήτητι πιστεύων
D.H. 3.50.4 τοῖς τείχοις τῇ ἐχιρώτητι πεποιθότον
J. Vit. 373 πεποιθότες τῇ τῶν τειχῶν ἐχιρώτητι

31) 2 Macc 11:12 οἱ πλείονες δὲ αὐτῶν τραχματικὰ γυμνοὶ διασώθησαν
Arr. An. 1.6.11 γυμνοὶ τῶν ὄπλων διασώθησαν

32) 2 Macc 12.5 τὴν γεγονόταν εἰς τοὺς ὁμοεθνεῖς ὁμότητα
D.S. 13.27.6 μῆς βαρβαροῦ ὁμότητα πρὸς ὁμοεθνεῖς ἀνθρώπους ἐνδειξισθαί

33) 2 Macc 12.6 τῶν λιμένα νῦκτωρ ἐνέπηρεν
Str. 7.4.7 τὸ . . . γεφυρωθέν μέρος νῦκτωρ ἐνεπιμάρασαν
Plu. Alb. 39.9 ἐμπόρησεν τὴν οἰκίαν νῦκτωρ

34) 2 Macc 12.23 ἐποιεῖτο τὸν διωγμὸν εὐτονότερον
D.S. 2.6.3 τῶν διωγμῶν ποιησάμενος; 13.60.7 τῶν διωγμῶν ποιημένοις; 17.37.2 ἐποιεῖτο τῶν διωγμῶν; 20.5.4 ἐποιοῦντο τῶν διωγμῶν

35) 2 Macc 12.29 ἁναζεύξατος δὲ ἔκειθεν; 14.16 ἔκειθεν εὐθέως ἁναζεύξας
D.S. 14.14.5, 14.117.4 ἔκειθεν 8᾽ ἁναζεύξας; 14.15.1 ἔκειθεν 8᾽ ἁναζεύξας; 14.29.2 ἁναζεύξαντες 8᾽ ἔκειθεν
J. BJ 7.96 ἔκειθεν δὲ ἁναζεύξας

36) 2 Macc 13.8 πάνω δικαίως ἐπεὶ γὰρ συνετελέσατο πολλὰ . . . ἀμαρτήματα
D.H. Rh. 8.3 καὶ πάνω δικαίως· εἰ γὰρ ἐξ αἰώνια τὰ τὸ ἐναντίον βούλεται
Ph. Spec. 2.243 πάνω δικαίως· οὐ γὰρ θέμες ἔχειν

37) 2 Macc 13.15 ἐπιβαλὼν νῦκτωρ ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλικὴν αὐλὴν
D.H. 1.79.13 ἐπὶ τὰ μακροερżąα αὐτῶν νῦκτωρ ἐπέβαλον
Str. 8.3.27 θεῖες ἐπιβάλλετο νῦκτωρ

38) 2 Macc 13.19 ἐπὶ Βαθύσσορας φρούριον ὄχρον τῶν Ἰουδαίων
Posidon. fr. 197.17 Theiler [=D.S. 36.7.2] τὸ δὲ φρούριον ὄχρωστατον ὅν
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
   7:23 ὡς νῦν ὑπεροράτε ἔστω τοις αὐτοῦ νόμους
3) 7:18 μὴ πλακώ μάτηρ
   7:34 μὴ μάτην μετεσφίξου
4) 7:18 Ἰμεὶς γὰρ διὰ ἐκείνου ταῦτα πάσχομεν ἀμαρτώντες εἰς τὸν ἐκείνων θεόν
   7:32 Ἰμεὶς γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἐκείνων ἀμαρτίας πάσχομεν

61 7:11 is omitted by three of the six Old Latin translations (LaLBM) 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 LaLXM; 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 ἐπί τὰ ἀδελφοὺς
9:7 συνέβη δὲ καὶ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν cf. 3:2, 5:2, 9:2, 10:5
2) 7:1 ὑμῖν κρέαν ἐφάπτεσθαι
6:18 φαγεῖν ὑμῖν κρέας
3) 7:2 ἔτοιμοι γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν ἔσμεν
8:21 ἔτοιμοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθνήσκειν
4) 7:2 παρακάμψατο τοὺς πατριώτας νόμους; 7:24 μεταθέμενον ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων; 7:37 περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων
6:1 μεταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων νόμων
5) 7:3, 39 ἐκθύμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς
14:27 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐκθύμος γενόμενος
6) 7:5 τῆς δὲ ἀτμίδος ἐφ’ ἱκανόν διαθεδόθησα
8:25 συνεδριάσαντες δὲ αὐτῶς ἐφ’ ἱκανόν
7) 7:5 ἐχρηστὸν δὲ αὐτῶν τοῖς ἀλλοις γενόμενον
6:3 χαλεπὴ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοις ἢν δισχερήσ
8) 7:6 ὁ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐφορᾷ
8:2 τὸν κύριον ἐπιτυχεῖν
9) 7:6 ταῖς ἁληθείαις ἐφ’ ἧμιν παρακαλεῖται
3:9 εἰ ταῖς ἁληθείαις ταῦτα ὑπὸ ἐχοντα τυγχάνει
10) 7:7 μετακλάζαντος δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον
6:31 τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον μετήλλαξεν
14:46 τόνδε τὸν τρόπον μετήλλαξεν
11) 7:8 ἀποκαθίστηκε τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ; 7:21 παρεκάλει τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ; 7:27 έφηλε τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ; 12:37 καταρξῆμεν τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ
15:29 εὐλόγου τὸν δυνάστην τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ
12) 7:9 ἐν ἐσχάτῃ δὲ πυθή γενόμενος
3:31 τῷ παντελῶς ἐν ἐσχάτῃ πυθῇ κειμένῳ
13) 7:9 ἀποθανόντας Ἰμαρὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν κύριων νόμων
8:21 ἔτοιμος ὑπὲρ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθνήσκειν
14) 7:10 τὰς χειρὰς ἐσφαράσως προέτεινε
3:20 πάσιν δὲ προτείνονται τὰς χειρὰς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
14:34 οἱ δὲ ἑρείς προτείναντες τὰς χειρὰς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
15:12 τὰς χειρὰς προτείναντα
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63 As previously noted, the omission of 7:11 in the Old Latin and the Armenian versions may be indicative of an interpolation.
Appendix 16: Combinations of words which occur in chapter 9 and recur in other chapters of the epitome

1) 9:1 peri de tōn kaiρōn ekéiνoν
    5:1 peri de tōn kaiρōn touton
2) 9:2 eis tēn leugmēnēn Perēsōlīn
    10:32 eis Γαζαρα leugmēnōn ὡρυμα
    12:17 prōs tois leugmēnous 'Ιουδαίοις 'Ιουδαίους; 12:21 eis tē leugmēnōn Kάρνην;
    12:32 metā de tēn leugmēnēn penηρκοσθῆν
    14:6 o leugmêneis tōn 'Ιουδαίων Απιδαίοι
3) 9:3 ón tē aútō [sc. tōv bασιλείαi] kai 'Εκβάτανα προσέπεσε tā kατὰ Νικάνουρα . . .
    γεγονότα
    5:11 προσπεσόντων de tōv bασιλεί peri tōn gegovnōtovn
4) 9:3 tā kαtā Νικάνουρα . . . gegovnōta
    15:37 tōn oûn kαtā Νικάνουρα χωρησάντων
5) 9:4 paraγεγονόμενος ἐκεῖ
    15:31 paraγεγονόμενος de ἐκεῖ
6) 9:5 ἀρτί de aúτων καταλῆξαντος tōn lόγων
    7:30 ἀρτι ἀρτι ἂν tē tαύτης καταληγούσης
7) 9:6 πάνω δικαίως
    13:8 πάνω δικαίως
8) 9:7 ἢπι de kai tēs ὑπερθερμανάς
    8:17 ἢπι de tēn tēs προγυνικῆς πολιτείας κατάλυσιν; 8:23 ἢπι de kai Ελεάζαρον; 8:30
    ἢπι de kai πρεσβυντέροις

One may add some more trivial word combinations, e.g. 7:24 oû μόνων διὰ λόγων . . . ἀλλὰ kai de ἔρκεων;
6:31 oû μόνων tōs kēs, ἀλλὰ kai tōs πλαστοῖς tōi θνοὺς; 7:12 tēn bασιλέα kai tōi sūn aútōi, 1:14 ἐ
ττλ' ἀντίγχος kai oû sūn aútōi phíla, 8:1 'Ιουδαίας ἢ de kai Μακκαβαίοις kai oû sūn aútōi, 10:1 Μακκαβαίος
deq de kai oû sūn aūtō, 10:19 Ζαχαρίων kai tōi sūn aūtōi.
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10:2 ἔτι δὲ τεμένη; 10:7 ἔτι δὲ καὶ φοίνικας; 10:19 ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ζαχαρίαν
12:2 ἔτι δὲ Περώνυμος
15:18 ἔτι δὲ ἀδέλφων καὶ συγγενῶν
9) 9:7 συνέβη δ' καὶ πεοείν αὐτόν
    7:1 συνέβη δ' καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἀδέλφους; cf. 3:2, 5:2, 9:2, 10:5
10) 9:8 κατὰ γὴν γενόμενος ἐν φορείῳ παρεκομιζέτο
    3:27 πεσόντα πρὸς τὴν γῆν... εἰς φορείον ἐνθάντες
11) 9:8 τοῦ θεοῦ... τὴν δύναμιν
    3:24 τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν
    3:38 θεοῦ δύναμιν
12) 9:10 τὸν μικρὸν πρότερον
    3:30 τὸ μικρὸν πρότερον
    6:29 τὴν μικρὸν πρότερον
13) 9:11 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἐρχεθαί
    3:18 εἰς καταφρόνησιν ἐρχεθαί
    8:8 εἰς προκοπήν ἐρχόμενον
14) 9:14 τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν
    1:12 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως
    3:11 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 ἱδίων προσόδων
    χωριγόσαν
    3:3 χωριγόσαν ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων προσόδων πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὰς θείας κυρίας τῶν θυσίαν
    ἐπιβάλλοντα δειπνήματα
17) 9:17 καταγγέλλοντα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος
    3:34 διάγγελλε πᾶσι τὸ μεγαλείον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος
    7:17 τὸ μεγαλείον αὐτοῦ κράτος
    11:4 τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος
18) 9:18 ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτεις
    7:36 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτεις
19) 9:18 τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολὴν... περιέχουσαν δὲ οὕτως
    11:16 ἦσαν γὰρ γεγραμμέναι... ἐπιστολῆι... περιέχουσα τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον
    11:22 ἢ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολῆι... περιέχειν οὕτως

401
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,” APOP 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. 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 ὁ πλολογέεω, which is attested only in 2 Maccabees (8:27, 31) and in Philo (Flacc. 92), the very rare compound προσεξηγέεο µαι (2 Macc 15:11, Ph. Legat. 197), the verb ἐπιψάάλλω, 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 ... ἵεροῦ σεμνότητι
   Ph. Legat. 198 λυκηγνάμενος τήν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σεμνότητα
2) 2 Macc 3:19 αἱ δὲ κατάκλειστοι τῶν παρθένων
3 Macc 1:18 αἱ τε κατάκλειστοι παρθένοι ἐν θαλάμεοι
   Ph. Flacc. 89.4 γύναικα κατάκλειστα ... καὶ θαλαμενόμεναι παρθέναι
3) 2 Macc 3:20 πᾶσα δὲ προτείνουσα τὰς χείρας εἰς τὸν ὐφρανόν 14:34 οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς προτείναντες τὰς χείρας εἰς τὸν ὑφρανόν
   Ph. Flacc. 121.2 προτείνοντες τὰς χείρας εἰς υφρανόν
4) 2 Macc 3:38 αἱ τε ἐξεις πολέμων ἐπιβουλοῦν
   Ph. QE isi, fr. 32.2 σύνοικον ἐξει τὸν ἐπιβουλοῦν καὶ πολέμων
      Ph. Spec. 2.253 ἐξεις τῶν σύνοικον καὶ πολέμων
5) 2 Macc 4:2 ζηλωτήν τῶν νόμων
   Ph. Spec. 2.253 ζηλωτὰ τῶν νόμων
   Cf. NT Acts 21:20 ζηλωσταὶ τῶν νόμων

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.”
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.

---

67 Echoing the Homeric τόοτε καὶ μὲν ἀνήήκεστον λάβεν ἄλγος (II. 5.394).
Appendix 18: Final list of the neologisms of 2 Maccabees

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. ἀποστρεψιμος 9:7
8. ἀργυρολόγητος 11:3
9. ἀργεναιαδως 10:35
10. συλλαξις (adj.) 14:41
11. βαρβάρος 15:2
12. διάφορα 4:22
13. διελαδρέω 8:13
14. δυνάμεως 4:35; 13:25
15. δεξιάζω 4:34
16. δευτερολογεόμενοι 13:22
17. διάκαταλικός 13:25
18. διεπιμπληκτής 4:40
19. δικαιοκρίτης 12:41
20. δεξίας 8:35
21. διεπίπτης 5:20
22. ἔκθεμα 7:3, 39; 14:27
23. ἑλευστέον 6:17
24. ἐνερχοντακτής 6:24
25. ἐποξύων 9:7
26. εὐθύκτως 15:38
27. θεοροποιημόνης 5:3
28. ἱεροσμύλημα 4:39
29. Ἰουδαιοκτόνος 2:21; 8:1; 14:38
30. κατασφαλίζομαι 1:19
31. κατευθικτέω 14:43
32. κρουναρίδον 14:45
33. Κυπριάρχης 12:2
34. λευτηρίας 11:11
35. Μαρδοχαίος 15:36
36. μετάφρασις 2:31
37. Μυσαρχής 5:24
38. οἰωνόβρωτος 9:15

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. ὀπλοκογέω 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. προοδηγάς 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. σπλαχνισός 6:7, 21; 7:42
54. συμμιστοπονήρεω 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. ὕψιστονεώ 15:6
65. φρικασός 3:17
66. χορτώδης 5:27
67. χρονίσκος 11:1
68. ψυχικός 4:37; 14:24
Appendix 19: Final list of the doubtful neologisms\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Neologism</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ἀπαρασήμαντος</td>
<td>15:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ἀπροσδέχης</td>
<td>14:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>γλωσσοτομέω</td>
<td>7:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>διεξίπταμαι</td>
<td>10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>δυσσέβημα</td>
<td>12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ἐντινάσσω</td>
<td>4:41; 11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ἐπανδρώ</td>
<td>15:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ἐπιλυπέω</td>
<td>4:37; 8:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ἐσθησις</td>
<td>3:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ἐφηβία</td>
<td>4:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>ἠέρωμα</td>
<td>12:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>λεληθότως</td>
<td>6:11; 8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>παρεπιδείκνυμι</td>
<td>15:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>τετραμερής</td>
<td>8:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>ύπεράγαν</td>
<td>10:34; 13:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>φιλοπολίτης</td>
<td>14:37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) 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
ἀποστείξεις, 176, 177, 206, 207, 366, 406
ἀργυρολόγητος, 113, 116, 118, 121, 169, 366, 404
ἀρρενωδῶς, 81, 112, 122, 123, 169, 170, 212, 366, 404
δειλανδρέεω, 122, 210, 211, 212, 248, 367, 404
δεινάάζω, 91, 112, 123, 124, 169, 170, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 366, 406
δικαιοκρίίτης, 232, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 261, 265, 274, 372, 404
δοξικόός, 125, 126, 169, 170, 268, 365, 404
δυσπέέτη µα, 81, 83, 111, 112, 125, 268, 364, 366, 404
ἐκθύμος, 237, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 261, 265, 274, 372, 404
ἐλαττονόῳ, 280, 281, 303, 373
ἐµπαγµός, 27, 102, 162, 278, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 289, 290, 303, 373
ἐναπετείκµοι, 81, 83, 317, 318, 338, 340, 381
ἐντυάσσω, 178, 206, 210, 366, 406
ἐπανθρώπω, 89, 122, 189, 190, 206, 207, 212, 366, 381, 406
ἐπιλυπέω, 85, 179, 206, 210, 366, 406
ἐποργίζοµαι, 277, 290, 291, 292, 294, 295, 303, 373
ἐσθήταις, 210, 220, 221, 224, 227, 248, 367, 406
ἐρηµία, 190, 206, 366, 406
ἐρώµα, 188, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 206, 216, 366, 406
καθηγάζω, 124, 277, 296, 303, 342, 373
κρουνηδόόν, 111, 112, 129, 130, 170, 366, 404
κρουνηδόόν, 111, 112, 125, 268, 364, 366, 404
λεληθόότως, 144, 145, 180, 181, 182, 183, 206, 207, 366, 406
λεσσαρχήδον, 123, 130, 132, 169, 170, 366, 404
Μαρδοχαϊκόός, 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
παρεισπορεύμαι, 144, 169, 365, 405
παρεπιδείκνυμι, 199, 206, 366, 406
περιμεσυφίζω, 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
προσυπονίμνήσκω, 319, 381
ρύθην, 335, 336
σαββάτιζω, 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
tetramerής, 201, 206, 366, 406
timewrētηs, 111, 112, 159, 160, 162, 170, 279, 365, 405
τριπλεκτήριος, 210, 236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 248, 249, 253, 261, 265, 267, 274, 367, 405
trophioreός, 157, 277, 295, 301, 302, 303, 373
ὑπεράγαν, 123, 201, 206, 366, 406
ὑπονομεύω, 111, 112, 163, 164, 170, 365, 405
ψυχογενέω, 83, 86, 210, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 301, 367, 405
φιλοπολίτης, 81, 184, 185, 186, 188, 206, 207, 353, 366, 406
φρικασόος, 70, 112, 164, 165, 169, 170, 364, 405
χρονίσκος, 166, 167, 168, 169, 366, 405
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