School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1372230

FRAGMENTS FROM HELLENISTIC JEWISH AUTHORS

Volume II: Poets

CARL R. HOLLADAY

The Library
of the
School of Theology
at Claremont

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711

FRAGMENTS FROM HELLENISTIC JEWISH AUTHORS

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS
PSEUDEPIGRAPHA SERIES

edited by
James C. VanderKam

Texts and Translations 30
Pseudepigrapha Series 12

Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors
Volume II
Poets

BS
1197
F68
1983
v.2

Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors

Volume II

Poets

The Epic Poets Theodotus and Philo
and Ezekiel the Tragedian

Carl R. Holladay

Scholars Press
Atlanta, Georgia

Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors
Volume II
Poets

Carl R. Holladay

Cover photo reproduced from Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, vol. I, E. H. Gifford, Oxford University Press, 1903.

© 1989
Society of Biblical Literature

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish authors.

(Texts and translations, 0145-3203 ; no. 20-, 30)
(Pseudepigrapha series, 0145-3238 ; no. 10, 12)
English and Greek.
Includes bibliographies.
Contents: v. 1. Historians-- v. 2. Poets.
1. Bible. O.T.--History of Biblical events.
2. Greek literature--Jewish authors.
3. Greek literature--Translations into English.
4. English literature--Translations from Greek.
I. Holladay, Carl R. II. Series: Texts and translations; no. 20, etc. III. Series: Texts and translations.
Pseudepigrapha series ; no. 12.

BS1197.F68 1983 880'.9'8924 79-18090
ISBN 0-89130-349-9 (pbk. : v. 1)
ISBN 1-55540-317-4 (v. 2. : alk. paper)
ISBN 1-55540-318-2 (pbk. : v. 2 : alk. paper)

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

For Krister, Ben, and Andrew

Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Volume II - Poets
Carl R. Holladay

Correction

p. 108, critical apparatus, end of line 7, read "cj.";
end of line 8, read: "| 6 'Εμὼρ";
end of line 9, read "Gais.: ἀτηρέε"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
Manuscripts	2
Symbols Used in Apparatus Criticus	4
Abbreviations Used in Apparatus Criticus	6
Bibliography - Sources for the Fragments	8
Bibliography - General	25
Bibliography - Abbreviations	44
Other Abbreviations	49
THEODOTUS	51
PHILO THE EPIC POET	205
EZEKIEL THE TRAGEDIAN	301

PREFACE

This second volume of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* contains the extant fragments from the epic poets Theodotus and Philo and the tragedian Ezekiel. At an earlier stage, I had intended to include Aristobulus and Pseudo-Phocylides (*FHJA* 1.7). My earlier editor, Harold W. Attridge, also encouraged me to include the pseudo-Greek poets and the Orphic texts. As the size of this manuscript clearly attests, the inclusion of these additional texts proved not to be feasible. My hope is to include these in a third volume, which will also contain indices to all three volumes.

I wish to acknowledge the work of several persons who have assisted me in this work at various stages. In seminars at Yale, John Fitzgerald, Ernest Bursey, Hillel Zaremba, John Riggs, and David Rensberger assisted in the initial stages of translation, particularly of Philo Epicus. Besides the student assistants mentioned in the preface to the first volume, Mary Stamps has also rendered invaluable editorial assistance. My Emory colleagues Arthur Wainwright and Max Miller have assisted me with a number of details. Channing Jeschke and his staff at Pitts Theology Library at Emory have offered their

typical cheerful assistance in making available to me the considerable resources of the rare book collection. Gary Hauk, Reference Librarian at Pitts, has been especially helpful. From an early date Professor Nikolaus Walter, now of the University of Jena, has encouraged me in the project and has always been willing to offer generous assistance with various technical matters. I am especially indebted to Professor P. W. van der Horst of the University of Utrecht for his many helpful suggestions.

The bulk of this manuscript was completed during a period of leave in 1987-88 made possible by a research grant from the University Research Committee of Emory University. I owe special thanks to Jim L. Waits, Dean of the Candler School of Theology at Emory University, who has supported this research in both word and deed.

This book is dedicated to my three sons whose respective birthplaces locate some of the intellectual traditions that have informed this work: Abilene, Princeton, New Haven.

Atlanta

November 24, 1988

INTRODUCTION

The introduction to the first volume of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* still serves to set these fragments in their historical context. It also treats the history of the transmission of the texts, in particular the textual history of Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica*, in which most of these fragments are preserved. Other text-critical matters are also dealt with there.

Since the publication of the first volume in 1983, numerous items have appeared relating to these fragments. Especially commendable is the "General Introduction" to these authors by John Strugnell in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985) 2.777-79. More extensive treatment of these, and their literary kin, set within the historical and cultural milieux in which they are to be understood, is to be found in J. J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Jewish Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983). Also useful is the compact survey of N. Walter, "Jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur vor Philon von Alexandrien (unter Ausschluß der Historiker)," *ANRW* (Part II: Principate; Volume 20.1;

Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1987) 68-120.

The following sections describing the manuscripts, text-critical sigla, and text-critical abbreviations have been adapted from the first volume to fit the contents of this volume. The bibliographies from the first volume, both the "Sources for Hellenistic Jewish Fragments" and the "General Bibliography," have been repeated here, but modified, supplemented, and updated. The abbreviation lists have been modified only slightly, but expanded to include additional items and authors referred to in this volume, especially in the apparatus criticus.

Manuscripts

With few exceptions, the fragments in this volume come from Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Portions of Ezekiel the Tragedian, Frgs. 1 & 2, also occur in Clement *Stromata*, and the disputed Frg. 18 of Ezekiel the Tragedian is supplied by Epiphanius *Panarion*. The pertinent manuscript evidence for these authors is listed below.

1. Clement *Stromata*

L Laurentianus V 3, 11th cent.
L^1 The original scribe who corrected many mistakes

L^2-L^3 Two younger hands who corrected many mistakes

Ath Cod. Athous (Codex Lawra B 113), 11th cent.

(Cf. Stählin-Früchtel, *GCS* [52 (15)], vol. 2, pp. vii-xv and xvii.)

2. Epiphanius *Panarion*

V Vaticanus 503
M Marcianus 125
U Urbinas 17/18

(cf. K. Holl, *GCS* [31], vol. 2, p. v.)

3. Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica*

A Codex Parisinus graecus 451, 914 C.E.
B Codex Parisinus graecus 465, 13th cent. (3rd quarter)
C Codex Parisinus graecus 466, 16th cent.
D Codex Parisinus graecus 467, 16th cent. (older than E)
E Codex Parisinus graecus 468, 16th cent.
F Codex Laurentianus Plut. VI 6, 15th cent.
G Codex Laurentianus VI 9, 1344 C.E.
H Codex Marcianus graecus 343, 11th cent.
I Codex Marcianus graecus 341, 15th cent.
j Codex Marcianus graecus 342, 1470 C.E.
N Neapolitanus graecus II AA 16, 15th cent.
O Codex Bononiensis Univ. 3643, end of 13th cent.
V Codex Batopedianus 180, 1335 C.E.

(cf. Mras, *GCS* [43.1 (8)], vol. 1, pp. XIII-LVIII, esp. p. LIX.)

Symbols Used in Apparatus Criticus

< >	Conjectural addition (omitted in all MSS)
{ }	Conjectural deletion
[ ]	Lacuna(e) resulting from physical damage (full stops may be used to represent letter-spaces)
⟦ ⟧	Scribal deletion or erasure
` ´	Scribal correction
⌞ ⌟	Non-conjectural lacuna(e), that is, lacuna(e) whose content is known or can be supplied from another source (full stops may be used to represent letter-spaces)
†	Editorial indication of corruption in the text (corrupt phrase enclosed by † †; corrupt word preceded immediately by †)
α̣β̣γ̣δ̣	Letters deciphered with uncertainty
x	Stands in letter-space left by erasure
:	Separates variants within a variation unit
|	Separates variation units
?	Indicates editorial uncertainty
(!)	= (sic)
( )	Encloses parenthetical remarks

1 2 3 Designates first, second, third correctors (i.e., B^1, B^2 = B corrected by the original scribe, by the second hand, etc.)

. Letter absent in MS(S)

* Beside MS = original MS or MS before correction

(Cf. M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* [Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973] 80-81.)

Abbreviations Used in Apparatus Criticus

abbrev.	=	*abbreviavit*
ac	=	*ante correctionem*
add.	=	*addidit*
aspir.	=	*aspiratus*
cf.	=	*confer*
cj.	=	*conjecit*
corr.	=	*correxit*
del.	=	*delevit*
ditt.	=	dittography
ed(d).	=	*editio/-nes; editor/-es*
emend.	=	*emendavit*
et al.	=	*et alii*
fort.	=	*fortasse*
frg(s).	=	fragment(s)
κ.τ.λ.	=	*καὶ τὰ λοιπά*
lac.	=	*lacuna*
lin.	=	line(s)
mg./marg.	=	*in margine*
MS(S)	=	manuscript(s)

mut. = *mutavit* or *mutilatus*

n/not. = note(s)

om. = *omisit*

p(p). = page(s)

par. = paragraph(s)

pc = *post correctionem*

rest. = *restituit*

sq(q). = *sequens(-entes)*

superscr. = *superscripsit*

transp. = *transposuit*

x = *rasura*

v.l. = *varia lectio*

(Cf. Association Internationale des Études Byzantines, *Bulletin d'Information et de Coordination* 4 [1968] 24-31; also K. Aland, et al. *Novum Testamentum Graece* [26th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979] 776-79; also H. P. Rüger, *An English Key to the Latin Words and Abbreviations and the Symbols of BIBLIA HEBRAICA SUTTGARTENSIA* [Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1981]).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources for Hellenistic Jewish Fragments

I. Collections of the Fragments.

A. Texts.

Müller, C. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum collegit, disposuit, notis et prolegomenis illustravit, indicibus instruxit.* Paris, 1841-72. 5 vols. (= Müll., *FHG*)

Fragments of Alexander Polyhistor contained in vol. 3 (1849), pp. 206-244. Fragments "concerning the Jews," Nos. 3-24, arranged in the order in which they occur in *P.E.*, Bk. 9. Reprints Greek text and Latin translation from Gaisford.

Freudenthal, J. *Hellenistische Studien. Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke.* Breslau, 1874-75. 2 vols. (= Freu.)

Bulk of the work (vol. 2) devoted to detailed analysis and discussion based on Freudenthal's pioneering research on these authors. Miscellaneous notes, especially text critical, pp. 199-218. Freudenthal's text, with critical apparatus, contained in pp. 219-36.

Stearns, W. N. *Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers.* Chicago, 1908. (= Stearns)

Includes texts of most of the authors; reprints Heinichen's text; no translation. Introduction and fairly extensive notes of limited value.

Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.* Leiden, 1954-69. 3 vols. in 16 parts. (= Jac., *FGrH*)

The Jewish "historical texts" are contained in Teil III C, Band 2 (1958, repr. 1969), Nos. 722-737, pp. 666-713. Extensive critical apparatus at bottom of each page. For texts taken from *P.E.*, Jacoby uses Mras's text as a basis, but makes a few changes based on Freudenthal.

Denis, A. M. *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis* (published with M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*). Leiden, 1970. (= Denis, *Frag.*)

The most comprehensive collection of fragmentary Hellenistic Jewish authors to date. Useful introduction, texts (pp. 61-228), minimal critical apparatus, indices of biblical references, ancient and modern authors. Useful introductory material and extensive bibliography of each author provided in Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'ancien testament* (Leiden, 1970) (= Denis, *Intro.*)

Bombelli, L. *I frammenti degli storici guidaico-ellenistici.* Genova: Universita di Genova, dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni, 1986.

B. Translations.

English:

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-85. (= Charlesworth, *OTP*)

German:

Riessler, P. *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel*. Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle, 1928; 2. Aufl. (unaltered), 1966. (= Riessler)

First comprehensive collection of pseudepigrapha in German. Arranged alphabetically by author and/or title. Notes, pp. 1266-1339.

Walter, N. "Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Historiker," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 1, "Historische und legendarische Erzählungen," Lfg. 2 (Gütersloh, 1976) 91-163. (= Walter, *JSHRZ [1.2]*)

Walter, N. "Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Exegeten: Aristobulos, Demetrios, Aristeas," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 3, "Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form," Lfg. 2 (Gütersloh, 1980) 257-299. (= Walter, *JSHRZ [3.2]*)

Vogt, E. "Tragiker Ezechiel," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus*

hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd. 4, "Poetische Schriften," Lfg. 3 (Gütersloh, 1983) 113-33. (= Vogt, *JSHRZ [4.3]*)

Walter, N. "Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Epik: Philon, Theodotos," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 4, "Poetische Schriften," Lfg. 3 (Gütersloh, 1983) 135-171. (= Walter, *JSHRZ [4.3]*)

Walter, N. "Pseudepigraphische jüdisch-hellenistische Dichtung: Pseudo-Phokylides, Pseudo-Orpheus, Gefälschte Verse auf Namen griechischer Dichter," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 4, "Poetische Schriften," Lfg. 3 (Gütersloh, 1983) 173-278. (= Walter, *JSHRZ [4.3]*)

II. Individual Authors.

A. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

Texts.

Stephanus, R. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis libri XV*. Paris, 1544. (= Estienne, Étienne, Stephens, Steph.)

The earliest edition of the Greek text of *P.E.* Based on MSS D & E. The page numbers of this edition appear in the margins of some subsequent editions.

Vigerus, F. *Eusebii Pamphili Caesareae Palaestinae episcopi Praeparatio Evangelica*. Paris, 1628. (= Viger, Vigier, Viguier, Vig.)

Contains text expertly revised by Viger, also his fresh Latin translation and annotations. His re-division of the chapters was adopted by later editions, especially Mras. The page numbers of this edition, with the additional a-d division, appeared in the margins of most subsequent editions, and became the most widely used system of reference.

Heinichen, F. A. *Eusebii Pamphili Praeparationis Evangelicae libri XV.* Leipzig, 1842-43. 2 vols. (= Hein.)

Reprints Greek text based on Stephanus and Viger. Underneath the text are printed Viger's critical notes, including textual notes, parallel references, explanations. Indices of authors, topics, and Greek words.

Gaisford, T. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV.* Oxford, 1843. 4 vols. (= Gais.)

Contains text revised by Gaisford, with full critical apparatus and Viger's Latin translation on each page. Vol. 4 contains Viger's notes (pp. 148-338), two appendices, one on Aristobulus by L. C. Valckenaer (pp. 339-451), another on the Orphic fragments by P. Wesseling (pp. 452-58), as well as indices of authors, biblical passages, names and subjects.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologia Graeca (21): Eusebius Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopus (3): Praeparatio Evangelica.* Paris, 1857. (= *PG*)

Prints Viger's Greek text, notes, and Latin translation on each page. Greek and Latin in parallel columns. Appendices (cols. 1457-1666) contain notes by Seguier whose French translation of *P.E.* appeared in 1846. Indices of authors, names, and subjects.

Dindorf, W. *Eusebii Caesariensis Opera.* [Teubner] Leipzig, 1867. 2 vols. (= Dind.)

Greek text based on previous editions, but advances earlier work. No critical apparatus and no annotations as announced in preface (pp. iv and xxiv-xxv). Indices of authors, biblical passages, and Viger's index of names and subjects.

Gifford, E. H. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationes. Libri XV.* Oxford, 1903. 4 vols. in 5 parts. (= Giff.)

Greek text based on entirely new collation of MSS; used MS O for the first time. Significant advance over previous work. Vols. 1 & 2 contain Greek text with critical apparatus at bottom of each page; vol. 2 contains index of authors, biblical references, names and subjects based on Greek text. Vol. 3 (in two parts) contains English translation. Part 2 contains index based on English translation. Vol. 4 contains notes in English and index of Greek words.

Mras, K. *Die Praeparatio Evangelica.* Bd. 8, *Eusebius Werke* [Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller (= *GCS*), 43]. Berlin, 1954-56. 2 vols. (= Mras)

Standard Greek text of *P.E.* now in use. Based on collation of all available MSS and takes into account all previous editions. Corrects previous work. Introduction in vol. 1 (pp. xiii-lx) provides description of textual history, manuscript witnesses, editions, and introductory material to *P.E.* Extensive critical apparatus at bottom of each page. Extensive indices, including biblical passages, Christian and non-Christian authors, other works of Eusebius, names and subjects. Especially helpful Greek index including Greek terms as well as matters of Greek grammar and style.

des Places, É., J. Sirinelli, G. Schroeder, et al. *Eusèbe de Césarée. La Préparation évangélique.* [*Sources chrétiennes* (= *SC*), ed. C. Mondésert] Paris, 1974 -.

Seven volumes have appeared to date: Book 1 (No. 206), Books 2-3 (No. 228), Books 4-5.17 (No. 262), Books 5.18-6 (No. 266), Book 7 (No. 215), Book 11 (No. 292), and Books 12-13 (No. 307). Various translators and contributors. Reprints Mras's text with facing French translation. Abbreviated critical apparatus at bottom of each page prepared by des Places. Vol. 1 contains useful introduction to *P.E.* and extensive commentary on Book 1 (pp. 212-323). Other volumes contain introductory material and notes.

Translations.

English:

Gifford, E. H. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationes.* Oxford, 1903. Vol. 3 (Parts 1 & 2). Cf. entry above.

French:

Seguier de Saint-Brisson (Marquis Nicolas-Maximilien-Sidoine). *Eusèbe Pamphile. La préparation évangélique ... avec des notes critiques, historiques, et philologiques.* Paris, 1846. 2 vols.

des Places, E., et al. *Eusèbe de Césarée. La préparation évangélique.* [*Sources chrétiennes*, 206, 215, 228, 262, 266, 292, 307] Paris, 1974 -. Books 1-7, 11-13. Cf. entry above.

Latin:

Trapezunt, G. von. *Eusebium Pamphili de evangelica praeparatione latinum ex graeco beatissime pater iussu tuo effecti ...* Venice, 1470. Subsequent editions in 1473, 1480, 1497, 1500, 1501, 1522. (= George of Trebizond/Trepizond)

The first Latin translation of *P.E.*, based primarily on MS I.

Vigerus, F. *Eusebii Pamphili Caesareae Palaestinae episcopi Praeparatio Evangelica.* Paris, 1628. Cf. entry above.

Viger's Latin translation appears in Gaisford, Müller, *FHG*, and Migne (*PG*).

B. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica.*

Texts.

Stephanus, R. *Ecclesiasticae historiae Eusebii Pamphili libri X. Eiusdem de Vita Constantini libri V. Socratis libri VII. Theodoriti episcopi Cyrensis libri V. Collectaneorum ex Historia eccles. Theodori Lectoris libri II. Hermii Sozomeni libri IX. Evagrii libri VI.* Paris, 1544.

Valesius, Henricus. *Eusebii Pamphili Ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem. Eiusdem de Vita imp. Constantini libri IV, quibus subjicitur Oratio Constantini ad sanctos et Panegyricus Eusebii. Henricus Valesius graecum textum collatis IV mss. codicibus emendavit, latine vertit et adnotationibus illustravit.* Paris, 1659. (= Henri de Valois)

Subsequent editions of Valesius' edition of Eusebius, *Historia* were published in 1672 and 1677, but the most notable in Cambridge in 1720; also contained his edition of Socrates, Sozomen, and the other Greek historians.

Heinichen, F. A. *Eusebii Pamphili Historiae ecclesiasticae libri x, ex nova recognitione cum aliorum ac suis prolegomenis, integro Henrici Valesii commentario, selectis Readingi, Strothii aliorumque virorum doctissimorum observationibus edidit, suas animadversiones et excursus, indices ...* Leipzig, 1827-28. 3 vols.

Burton, Edward. *Eusebii Pamphili Historiae ecclesiasticae libri decem, ad codices manuscriptos recensuit Eduardus Burton ...* Oxford, 1838. 2 vols.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologia Graeca (20): Eusebius Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopus Historia Ecclesiastica.* Paris, 1857. cols. 45-906.

Reprints Valesius' 1720 edition.

Schwartz, E. *Eusebius Werke, Bd. 9: Die Kirchengeschichte.* [Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, 9] Leipzig, 1903-1909. 3 vols. Vols. 1 & 2: texts; Vol. 3: introductions and indices.

Also contains Latin translation of Rufinus, edited by T. Mommsen.

Schwartz, E. *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte.* Kleine Ausgabe. 5. Aufl., unveränderter Nachdruck der 2. durchgesehenen Aufl. Leipzig, 1955.

Grapin, E. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique. Texte grec et trad. française.* Paris, 1905-1913. 3 vols.

Lake, K. *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History.* [*Loeb Classical Library* (= *LCL*)] London, 1926, 1932. 2 vols. Reprints GCS text.

Bardy, G. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique.* [*Sources chrétiennes*, 31 (1952), 41 (1955), 55 (1958)] Paris, 1952-58. 3 vols.

Translations.

English:

Crusé, C. F. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus.* Translated from Greek with notes selected from the edi[illegible] Valesius. London, 1889.

McGiffert, A. C. *Later Post-Nicene Fathers.* [Series 2] London, 1890. 1.73-387.

Lawlor, H. J., and J. E. L. Oulton. *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History.* London, 1927-28. 2 vols.

Lake, K. *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History.* [= *LCL*] London, 1926, 1932. 2 vols.

Vol. 2 reprints Oulton's translation.

French:

Seissel, C. *L'histoire ecclesiastique.* Paris, 1532.

Grapin, E. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique.* Paris, 1905-1913. 3 vols. Cf. entry above.

Bardy, G. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique.* [*Sources chrétiennes*, 31, 41, 55] Paris, 1952, 1955, 1958. 3 vols. Cf. entry above.

German:

Hedio, Caspar. *Chronica, das ist: wahrhaftige Beschreibunge aller alten christlichen Kirchen; zum ersten, die hist. eccles. Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis, Eilff Bücher;* et al. Frankfort-Main, 1582.

Stigloher, M. *Des Eusebius Pamphili zehn Bücher der Kirchengeschichte, nach dem Urtexte übersetzt.* [*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. 21, Hft. 2] Leipzig, 1901.

Häuser, P. *Des Eusebius Pamphili ... Kirchengeschichte aus dem Griechischen übersetzt.* [BKV^2, 1] München, 1932.

Latin:

Rufinus, Tyrannius. *Ecclesiastica historia.*

According to Fabricius, Rufinus' Latin translation was first published in 1476 at Rome. *Bibliothèque Nationale*, however, lists other editions: Strassburg, ca. 1475-80; also Utrecht, 1474; Rome, 1476; Mantua, 1479; Strassburg, 1500.

Valesius, Henricus. *Eusebii Pamphili Ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem.* . . . Paris, 1659. Cf. entry above.

Important subsequent edition in 1720.

Mommsen, T. *Eusebius Pamphili. Werke, Bd. 9: Die Kirchengeschichte. Die latinische Übersetzung des Rufinus.* Leipzig, 1903-1909. 3 vols. Vol. 1 & 2: text; Vol. 3: introductions and indices.

C. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, *Paedagogus*, and *Stromata*.

Texts.

Sylburg, F. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera Quae Exstant*. Hieronymus Commelinus, 1592.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologia Graeca: Clemens Alexandrinus* (8-9). Paris, 1857. *Protrepticus*, 1.49-246; *Paedagogus*, 1.247-684; *Stromata I-IV*, 1.685-1382; *Stromata V-VIII*, 2.9-602.

Dindorf. W. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera*. Oxford, 1869. 4 vols. *Protrepticus*, 1.1-123; *Paedagogus*, 1.124-409; *Stromata I-IV*, 2.1-417; *Stromata V-VIII*, 3.1-378; Annotations, 4.1-461.

Stählin, O., L. Früchtel, and U. Treu. *Clemens Alexandrinus* [*GCS*] 3 Bde. Berlin, 1909-72. (Bd. I: *GCS* 12 (= 56), 3. Aufl., hrsg. U. Treu, 1972; Bd. II: *GCS* 15 (= 52), 3. Aufl., hrsg. L. Früchtel, 1960; Bd. III: *GCS* 17 (= 17^2), 2. Aufl., hrsg. L. Früchtel & U. Treu, 1970). *Protrepticus*, 1.3-86; *Paedagogus*, 1.90-292; *Stromata I-VI*, 2.3-518; *Stromata VII-VIII*, 3.3-102.

Mondésert, C., et al. *Clément d'Alexandrie* [*SC*] 7 vols. Paris, 1944-81. C. Mondésert & A. Plassart, *Protreptique* (No. 2, 2^e ed., 1944); C. Mondésert & M. Caster, *Les Stromates I* (No. 30, 1951); P. T. Camelot & C. Mondésert, *Les Stromates II* (No. 38, 1954); H. I. Marrou & M. Harl, *Le Pédagogue I* (No. 70, 1960); C. Mondésert & H. I. Marrou, *Le Pédagogue II* (No. 108, 1965); A. Le Boulluec & P. Voulet, *Les Stromates V* (et commentaire) (Nos. 278-79, 1981).

Translations.

English:

Wilson, William. *Ante-Nicene Fathers.* Edinburgh, 1867-97. American edition: Grand Rapids, 1962 (repr.) 2.165-605.

French:

Mondésert, C., et al. *Clement d'Alexandrie* [*SC*]. Cf. entry above.

German:

Stählin, O. *Des Clemens von Alexandreia ausgewählte Schriften aus dem Griechischen übersetzt* [Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, 2. Reihe, Nos. 7, 8, 17, 19, 20] München, 1934-38. 5 Bde.

D. Josephus.

Texts.

Niese, B. *Flavii Josephi Opera.* Editio maior. Berlin, 1885-95. 7 vols. in 5.

Naber, S. A. *Flavii Josephi Opera Omnia.* [Teubner] Leipzig, 1888-96. 6 vols.

Thackeray, H. St. J., R. Marcus, W. Wikgren, and L. Feldman. *Josephus, with an English translation.* [*LCL*] London, 1926-65. 9 vols.

Translations.

English:

Whiston, William. *The Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus the Jewish Historian.* London, 1737 -.

Thackeray, H. St. J., et al. *Josephus.* [*LCL*] Cf. above entry.

French:

Reinach, Th. *Oeuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe.* Paris, 1900-32. 7 vols.

German:

Martin, R. *Die jüdischen Alterthümer des Flavius Josephus übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen.* Köln, 1852. 2 vols.

Clementz, Heinrich. *Antiquitates judaicae. Des Flavius Josephus Jüdische Altertümer, übersetzt und mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen versehen von H. Clementz.* Berlin/Vienna, 1923. 2 vols.

E. Epiphanius.

Texts.

D. Epiphanii episcopi Constantiae Cypri, Contra octoaginta haereses opus, Panarium, sive arcula, art capsula, medica appelatum, continens libros tres, & tomos sive sectiones ex toto septem: Iano Cornario interprete. Item eiusdem D. Epiphanii Epistola sive Liber ancoratus appellatus,

docens de vera side Christiana. Eiusdem D. Epiphanii Anacephaeolis, sive summa totius opera Panari; appellati & contra octoaginta haereses conscripti, Eiusdem D. Epiphanii Libellos de mensuris ac ponderibus ... Basel, 1542.

... contra octoginta haereses opus, Panarium, sive Arcula, aut capsula medica appelatum, continens libros tres, & tomos sive sectiones ex toto septem. Iano cornario interprete. Una cum aliis eiusdem De Epiphanii operibus, partim nunc demum ultra superiorem editionem adiectis, partim etiam multo quam antea emendatioribus ... Paris, 1564.

Opera omnia [Greek and Latin] *Dion Petavius recensuit ... ed. Nova juxta Parisinam 1622 ... qui accessit vita D. Petavii ... et appendices.* Coloneae, 1682.

Dindorf, W. *Epiphanii episcopi Constantiae Opera*. [Bibliotheca patrum graecorum et latinorum] Leipzig, 1859-62. 5 vols. in 3. Vols. 1 & 2 contain *Panarion*.

Oehler, Franciscus. *Panaria eorumque Anacephalaeois, Ad veteres libros recensuit et cum latina Dion. Petavii interpretatione et integris eius Animadversionibus, ed. Franciscus Oehler*. Berlin, 1859-61. 4 vols. in 2 (Corporis haeresologici t. 2-3). Vol. 2, pt. 2: *Panarion*.

Holl, Karl. *Epiphanius Werke. Ancoratus und Panarion.* [*GCS*] Berlin, 1915-33. 3 vols.

Vol. 1: *Ancoratus* und *Panarion haer.* 1-33
Vol. 2: *Panarion haer.* 34-64.
Vol. 3: *Panarion haer.* 65-80. *De fide.* (ed. H. Lietzmann).

Translations:

English:

Williams, Frank. Translation of *Panarion* in preparation.

German:

Wolfsgruber, C. *Ausgewählte Schriften des heiligen Epiphanius, Erzbischofs von Salamis und Kirchenlehrers aus dem Urtexte übersetzt von Dr. Cölestin Wolfsgruber.* [*BKV*, 64] Kempten, 1880.

Hörmann, Joseph. *Das heiligen Epiphanius von Salamis Ausgewählte Schriften, aus dem griechischen übersetzt von dr. Joseph Hörmann.* [*BKV*, 38] Kempten/München, 1919.

F. Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum*, Syncellus, John Malala, Tertullian, Diogenes Laertius -- cf. Index to Editions and Translations in each section.

General Bibliography

This bibliography serves as general bibliography for this volume, corresponding to the bibliography in *FHJA* 1. 8-46. While many of the entries are the same, new items have been added. Some of the entries from volume 1 have been revised.

Adler, W. *George Syncellus and His Predecessors: Ante-Diluvian History in the Chronicle of Syncellus and His Acknowledged Authorities*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania, 1982.
(= Adler, *Syncellus*).

Attridge, H. W., and R. A. Oden, Jr. *Philo of Byblos. The Phoenician History. Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Notes*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 9. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
(= Attridge-Oden, *Philo of Byblos*).

Baron, S. W. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. 2nd ed., revised and enlarged. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1952.
(= Baron, *History*).

Beloch, K. J. *Griechische Geschichte*. 4 vols. in 8. 2nd ed. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1912-27.
(= Beloch, *Geschichte*).

Bernfeld, S. *Bibel, Apokryphen und jüdisch-hellenistisches Schrifttum*. Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1921.
(= Bernfeld, *Bibel*).

Bernhardy, G. *Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur.* 3 parts in 2 vols. 3rd and 4th ed. Halle: E. Anton, 1876-80 (Vol. 1, 4th ed., 1876; Vol. 2.1, 3rd ed., 1877; Vol. 2.2, 3rd ed., 1880). 1.498-577, "Von Alexander dem Grossen bis zur Römischen Kaiserherrschaft." (= Bernhardy, *Grundriss*).

Bickerman, E. *The God of the Maccabees. Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt.* Studies in Judaism and Late Antiquity, ed. J. Neusner, vol. 32; trans. H. R. Moehring, from 1937 Ger. ed. Leiden: Brill, 1979. (= Bickerman, *Maccabees*).

Bombelli, L. *I frammenti degli storici guidaico-ellenistici.* Genova: Universita di Genova, dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni, 1986. (= Bombelli, *frammenti*).

Bousset, W., and H. Gressmann. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter.* 4th ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 21. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966 (The text of the 4th ed. is identical to the 1926 3rd ed. which was newly revised by Gressmann; the 4th ed. does contain an appendix with additional literature.). (= Bousset-Gressmann, *RJ*).

Braun, M. *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938. (= Braun, *History and Romance*).

Büchler, A. *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden im II. Makkabäerbuche und in der verwandten jüdisch-hellenistischen Litteratur.* Wien: Hölder, 1899; repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1975. (= Büchler, *Tobiaden*).

Cardauns, B. "Juden und Spartaner, Zur hellenistisch-jüdischer Literatur," *Hermes* 95 (1967) 317-24.
(= Cardauns, "Juden und Spartaner").

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1983-85). Vol. 1: "Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments" (1983); Vol. 2: "Expansions of the 'Old Testament' and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works" (1985).
(= Charlesworth, *OTP*).

_____. *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 7. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976. With a Supplement. Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 7S. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
(= Charlesworth, *PAMR* and *PAMRS*).

Collins, J. J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
(= Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*).

Conzelmann, H. *Heiden, Juden, Christen: Auseinandersetzungen in der Literatur der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 62. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1981.
(= Conzelmann, *HJC*).

Couat, A. *Alexandrian Poetry under the First Three Ptolemies - 324-222 B.C. with a supplementary chapter by E. Cahen*. Trans. J. Loeb. London/ New York: William Heinemann Ltd./G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931.
(= Couat, *Alexandrian Poetry*).

Dähne, A. F. *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie.* 2 vols. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1834. 1.1-97; 2.73-112, 199-203, 220-22. (= Dähne, *Geschichtliche*).

Dalbert, P. *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missions-Literatur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus.* Hamburg-Volksdorf: Herbert Reich, 1954. (= Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*).

Delitzsch, F. *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poësie fom Abschluss der heiligen Schriften Alten Bundes bis auf die neueste Zeit.* Leipzig: K. Tauchnitz, 1836. (= Delitzsch, *Geschichte*).

Delling, G., ed. *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur, 1900-1970.* 2nd ed. Texte und Untersuchungen, 106^2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975. (= Delling, *Bibliographie*).

_____. "Perspektiven der Erforschung des hellenistischen Judentums," *HUCA* 45 (1974) 133-89. (= Delling, "Perspektiven").

Denis, A.-M. *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament.* Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1970. (= Denis, *Introduction*).

Dihle, A. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte.* Stuttgart: Kröner, 1967. 410-19. (= Dihle, *Griechische*).

Dittenberger, W. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 4th ed. repr. of 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1915-14. 3 vols. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1960. (= *SIG*).

Ewald, H. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3rd ed. 8 vols. (including Anhang to vols. 1-2). Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung, 1864-68. 4.331-40, "Der judäische Hellenismos." (= Ewald, *Geschichte*).

_____. *The History of Israel*. Edited and translated by R. Martineau, J. E. Carpenter, and J. F. Smith. 8 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878-86. 5.223-492, "The Hagiocracy under the Greeks and Maccabees, down to the Omnipotence of Rome." (= Ewald, *History*).

Fraser, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. 1.52-87, 280-301, 674-716. (= Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*).

Freudenthal, J. *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste judäischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Hellenistische Studien, Heft 1 & 2. Breslau: H. Skutsch Verlag, 1874-75. (= Freu./Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*).

Friedländer, M. *Geschichte der jüdischen Apologetik als Vorgeschichte des Christentums*. Zürich: C. Schmidt, 1903. (= Friedländer, *Geschichte*).

Gager, J. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. JBL Monograph Series, No. 16. New York: Abingdon Press, 1972. (= Gager, *Moses*).

Geffcken, J. *Zwei griechische Apologeten*. Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner, 1907. Repr. Hildesheim/New York: G. Olms, 1974. (= Geffcken, *Apologeten*).

Gelzer, H. *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*. 2 vols. (Vol. 1: Die Chronographie des Julius Africanus; Vol. 2: Nachfolger des Julius Africanus). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1880-85. (= Gelzer, *Sextus*).

Georgi, D. *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief. Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, No. 11. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964. English translation: *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986. (= Georgi, *Gegner/Opponents*).

Ginzberg, L. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1913-38. (= Ginzberg, *Legends*).

Goodenough, E. R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman World*. 13 vols. New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1953-68. (= Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*).

Gordon, C. H. "Homer and the Bible: The Origin and Character of East Mediterranean Literature," *HUCA* 26 (1955) 43-108. (= Gordon, "Homer and Bible").

Graetz, H. *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. Vol. 3: *Geschichte der Judäer von dem Tode Juda Makkabi's bis zum*

Untergange des judäischen Staates. 3rd ed. Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1878. Esp. 26-54, 390-451, 621-34.
(= Graetz, *Geschichte*).

_____. *History of the Jews* (6 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891-98; repr. 1946. This English edition is a translation of the 11 vol. Ger. ed., but omits footnotes.
(= Graetz, *History*).

Gutman, Y. *The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1958-63.
(= Gutman, *Beginnings*).

Gutschmid, A. *Kleine Schriften.* Edited by F. Rühl. 5 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1889-94.
(= Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*).

Hadas, M. *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion.* New York: Norton, 1959.
(= Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*).

Harnack, A. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.
(= Harnack, *Mission*).

Hegermann, H. "Das hellenistische Judentum." In *Umwelt des Urchristentums.* 3 vols. Edited by J. Leipoldt and W. Grundmann. Berlin: Evangelische Verlags-anstalt, 1967-72. 1.292-345.
(= Hegermann, *Umwelt*).

Hengel, M. "Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und 'Literarische Fälschung' in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur," *Pseudepigrapha I.* Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, 18.

Vandoeuvres-Gèneve: Fondation Hardt, 1972. 213-329. (= Hengel, "Anonymität").

_____. *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians. Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980. (= Hengel, *Aspects*).

_____. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period.* 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974. (= Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*).

Herzfeld, L. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel von Vollendung des zweiten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mackabäers Schimon zum hohen Priester und Fürsten.* 2 vols. Leipzig: Carl Wilsserodt, 1863. (= Herzfeld, *Geschichte*).

Hody, H. *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, Versionibus Graecis, & Latina Vulgata.* Libri IV. Oxford, 1705. 97-110. (= Hody, *Bibliorum*).

Holladay, C. R. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Volume I: Historians.* Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations, No. 20; Pseudepigrapha, No. 10. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983. (= Holladay, *FHJA*).

_____. *THEIOS ANER in Hellenistic Judaism. A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology.* SBL Dissertation Series, 40. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977. (= Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*).

Horst, P. W. van der. *Joods-hellenistische poëzie: de fragmenten der gedichten van Ezechiël Tragicus, Philo Epicus en Theodotus, en de vervalste dichtercitaten.* Na de Schriften. Na-bijbelse joodse en christelijke geschriften in Nederlandse vertaling. Ed. T. Baarda, et al. No. 3. Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1987.
(= van der Horst, *JHP*).

_____. "The Interpretation of the Bible by the Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors." *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity.* Ed. M. J. Mulder. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. Pp. 519-46.
(= van der Horst, "Interpretation").

Jackson, F. J. Foakes, and K. Lake. *The Beginnings of Christianity.* 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1920-33.
(= Jackson-Lake, *Beginnings*).

Jacobson, H. *The EXAGOGE of Ezekiel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
(= Jacobson, *Ezekiel*).

Jeremias, J. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period.* London: SCM Press, 1969.
(= Jeremias, *Jerusalem*).

Jones, A. H. M. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces.* 2nd ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971.
(= Jones, *Cities*).

Juster, J. *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain, leur condition juridique, économique et sociale.* 2 vols. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1914. (= Juster, *Juifs*).

Karpeles, G. *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur.* 4th ed. 2 vols. (Repr. of 3rd ed. Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1920-21). Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt, 1963. 1.109-204. (= Karpeles, *Geschichte*).

Kippenberg, H. G. *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode.* Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 30. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971. (= Kippenberg, *Garizim*).

Kirk, G. S., J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. (= Kirk, Raven, and Schofield, *Presocratic*).

Knaack, G. "Alexandrinische Litteratur," *PW* 1 (1894) cols. 1399-1407. (= Knaack, "Alexandrinische Litteratur").

Laqueur, R. "Griechische Urkunden in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur," *Historische Zeitschrift* 136 (1927) 229-52. (= Laqueur, "Urkunden").

Lesky, A. *A History of Greek Literature.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1966. 799-806. (= Lesky, *History*).

Lieberman, S. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary, 18. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962. (= Lieberman, *Hellenism*).

Lloyd-Jones, H., and P. Parsons, eds. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Indices by H.-G. Nesselrath. Texte und Kommentare, ed. O. Gigon, et al., Bd. 11. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1983. (= Lloyd-Jones & Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* or *SH*).

Lumbroso, G. *L'Egitto dei Greci e dei Romani*. 2nd ed. Rome: Ermanno Loescher, 1895. (= Lumbroso, *L'Egitto*).

Mahaffy, J. P. *Greek Life and Thought from the Age of Alexander to the Roman Conquest*. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1896. Repr. New York: Arno Press, 1976. (= Mahaffy, *Greek Life*).

Marcus, R. "Hellenistic Jewish Literature." In *The Jewish People - Past and Present*. Edited by S. W. Baron, et al. 4 vols. New York: Jewish Encyclopedia Handbooks-Central Yiddish Culture Organization, 1946-55 (Vol. 3: 1952) 3.40-53. (= Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature [1952]").

_____. "Hellenistic Jewish Literature." In *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Edited by L. Finkelstein. New York: Harper, 1960. 2.1077-1115. (= Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature [1960]").

Meeks, W. A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 14. Leiden: Brill, 1965. (= Meeks, *Prophet-King*).

Mendels, D. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature. Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land.* Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 15. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987. (= Mendels, *Land of Israel*).

Momigliano, A. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975. (= Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom*).

Müller, J. G. *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift Gegen den Apion. Text und Erklärung.* Basel: Bahnmaier's Verlag (C. Detloff), 1877. (= Müller, *Apion*).

Nicholai, R. *Geschichte der neugriechischen Literatur.* Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1876. (= Nicholai, *Geschichte*).

_____. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte in neuer Bearbeitung.* 3 vols. Magdeburg: Heinrichshofensche Buchhandlung, 1873-78. 2.80-81. (= Nicholai, *Griechische*).

Nock, A. D. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World.* 2 vols. Edited by Z. Stewart. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972. (= Nock, *Essays*).

Pfeiffer, R. H. *History of New Testament Times With An Introduction to the Apocrypha.* London: A. & C. Black, 1963. 197-230. (= Pfeiffer, *History*).

Philippson, L. M. *Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Älteren Jerusalem*. Berlin: J. A. List, 1830. (= Philippson, *Ezechiel/Philo*).

Powell, J. U. *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925. (= Powell, *Coll. Alex.* or *CA*).

Reinach, T. *Flavius Josèphe. Contre Apion*. Text and annotations by Reinach; translation by L. Blum. Collection des Universités de France. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1930. (= Reinach, *Josèphe, Apion*).

_____. *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaisme*. Publications de la société des études juives. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1895. (= Reinach, *Textes*).

Routh, M. J. *Reliquiae Sacrae: Sive Auctorum Fere Jam Perditorum Secundi Tertiique Saeculi Post Christum Natum Quae Supersunt*. 5 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1846-48. (= Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*).

Safrai, S., and M. Stern, with D. Flusser and W. C. van Unnik. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. 2 vols. (= Section 1 of Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum). Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974. (= Safrai and Stern, *Jewish People*).

Schalit, A., ed. *The World History of the Jewish People*. First Series. *Ancient Times*. Vol. VI: *The Hellenistic Age: Political History of Jewish Palestine from 332 B.C.E. to 67 B.C.E.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, 1972. (= Schalit, *Hellenistic Age*).

Schlatter, A. *Geschichte Israels von Alexander dem Grossen bis Hadrian.* 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1925. Repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
(= Schlatter, *Geschichte*).

Schmid, W., and O. Stählin. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur.* Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 7.2.1; 6th ed. München: C. H. Beck, 1920; repr. 1959.
(= Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*).

Schürer, E. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.* 3 vols. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1960. Repr. of Vol. 1: 1901 (3rd and 4th ed.); Vol. 2: 1907 (4th ed.); Vol. 3: 1909 (4th ed.).
(= Schürer, *Geschichte*).

_____. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ.* Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, P. Vermes, and M. Goodman. 3 vols., with vol. 3 in 2 parts. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973-1987.
Vol. 1: 1973; Vol. 2: 1979; Vol. 3(1): 1986; Vol. 3(2): 1987.
(= Schürer, *History*).

_____. *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus.* New York: Schocken Books, 1972.
(= Schürer, *Literature*).

Siegfried, C. "Der jüdische Hellenismus: Ein Rückblick auf seine geschichtliche Entwickelung mit Beziehung auf die neuesten Forschungen innerhalb seines Gebietes," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 18 (1875) 465-89.
(= Siegfried, "Der jüdische Hellenismus").

Smallwood, E. M. *The Jews Under Roman Rule From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: Brill, 1976. (= Smallwood, *Jews*).

Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956. (= Smyth, *Greek Grammar*).

Snell, B. *Scenes from Greek Drama*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press/London: Cambridge University Press, 1964; *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971 (with additional material not included in English edition). (= Snell, *Scenes/Szenen*).

Snell, B., ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: Vol. 1. Didascaliae tragicae; Catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum; Testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1986. (= Snell, *TrGF*).

Snell, B., and R. Kannicht, eds. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: Vol. 2. Fragmenta adespota; testimonia volumini 1 addenda; indices ad volumina 1 et 2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1981. (= Snell and Kannicht, *TrGF*).

Stählin, O. "Die hellenistisch-jüdische Litteratur." In *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. 6th ed. 2 vols. Edited by W. Schmid and O. Stählin. München: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1920; repr. 1959. 2,1.535-656. (= Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*).

Stearns, W. N. *Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908. (= Stearns, *Fragments*).

Stein, E. "Alttestamentliche Bibelkritik in der spät-hellenistischen Literatur," *Collectanea Theologica* 16 (1935) 38-83.
(= Stein, "Bibelkritik").

Stern, M. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism.* 3 vols. Vol. 1: *From Herodotus to Plutarch;* Vol. 2: *From Tacitus to Simplicius*; Vol. 3: *Index.* Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-84.
(= Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, or *GLAJJ*).

Stone, M. E., ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus.* Vol. 2 of Section 2 "The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud" of *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum.* Assen/Philadelphia: VanGorcum/Fortress, 1984.
(= Stone, *Jewish Writings*).

Susemihl, F. *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit.* 2 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1891-92.
(= Susemihl, *Geschichte*).

Swete, H. B. *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902. Repr. New York: KTAV, 1968.
(= Swete, *Introduction*).

Tcherikover, V. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews.* Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1966.
(= Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*).

_____. "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered." *Eos* 48:3 (1956) 169-93. (= Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature").

Thraede, K. "Erfinder II (geistesgeschichtlich)," *RAC* 5 (1962) 1191-1278. (= Thraede, "Erfinder").

_____. "Das Lob des Erfinders. Bemerkungen zur Analyse der Heuremata-Kataloge." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F. 105 (1962) 158-86. (= Thraede, "Das Lob").

Tiede, D. L. *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*. SBL Dissertation Series, 1. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972. (= Tiede, *Charismatic Figure*).

Vaillant, V. *De historiciis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere, nempe Aristea, Demetrio, Hecataeo Abderita, Cleodemo, Artapano, Justo Tiberiensi, Cornelio Alexandro Polyhistore, disputationem proponebat facultati litterorum Pariensi*. Paris: Firmin Didot Fratres, 1851. (= Vaillant, *Historiciis*).

Valckenaer, L. C. *Diatribe de Aristobulo Judaeo, Philosopho Peripatetica Alexandrino, Scriptore Commentarii in Legem Moysis* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1806); repr. in T. Gaisford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV* (Oxford, 1843) 4.148-338 (with original pagination in margin). (= Valckenaer, *Aristobulo* or *Diatribe de Aristobulo*).

Volkmann, R. "Alexandriner," *PW* 1 (1842-64) 743-53. (= Volkmann, "Alexandriner").

Wacholder, B. Z. "Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles," *HTR* 61 (1968) 451-81.
(= Wacholder, "Biblical Chronology").

_____. *Eupolemus. A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature.* Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 3. Cincinnati and New York: Hebrew Union College and Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974.
(= Wacholder, *Eupolemus*).

_____. "How Long Did Abram Stay in Egypt? A Study in Hellenistic, Qumran, and Rabbinic Chronography," *HUCA* 35 (1964) 43-56.
(= Wacholder, "Abram").

_____. "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham," *HUCA* 34 (1963) 83-113.
(= Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments").

Walter, N. *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos. Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur.* Texte und Untersuchungen, 86. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964.
(= Walter, *Aristobulos*).

_____. *Untersuchungen zu den Fragmenten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Historiker.* Unpublished Habilitationsschrift, Halle, 1967-68.
(= Walter, *Untersuchungen*).

_____. "Jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur vor Philon von Alexandrien (unter Ausschluß der Historiker)." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der*

römischen Welt. Teil II: Principat. Bd. 20.1. Ed. W. Haase and H. Temporini. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1987. Pp. 67-120.
(= Walter, "Literatur").

Wendland, P. *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und Christentum.* 4th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1972 (= 1912[3]).
(= Wendland, *HRK*).

Willrich, H. *Judaica. Forschungen zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Geschichte und Litteratur.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1900.
(= Willrich, *Judaica*).

_____. *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.
(= Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*).

_____. *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 38 (= N.F. 21). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924.
(= Willrich, *Urkundenfälschung*).

Ziegler, K. *Das hellenistische Epos. Ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1966.
(= Ziegler, *Epos*).

Bibliography Abbreviations

ANET J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*

ANF *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*

ANRW W. Haase and H. Temporini, eds., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*

AnthGr *Anthologia Graeca*

APOT R. H. Charles, ed., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*

BAG Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*

BDB Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*

BHH B. Reicke and L. Rost, eds., *Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch*

BJRL *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*

BKV O. Stählin, et al., eds., *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*

CA /
Coll. Alex. J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*

CAH *Cambridge Ancient History*

CIJ *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*

CPJ V. Tcherikover and A. Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*

CSHB *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*

DB *Dictionnaire de la Bible*

EHBS Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδαίων = *Annuaire de l'Association d'Etudes Byzantines*

EncJud *Encyclopaedia Judaica*

ETL *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*

FGrH *F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*

FHG C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*

GCS *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*

GLAJJ M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*

HAW *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in Systematischer Darstellung*

HDB J. Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible*

HERE J. Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*

HJC H. Conzelmann, *Heiden, Juden, Christen*

HRK P. Wendland, *Die Hellenistische-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und Christentum*

HUCA *Hebrew Union College Annual*

IDB *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*

JAOS *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JE *Jewish Encyclopedia*

JEA *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*

JHP P. W. van der Horst, *Joods-hellenistische poëzie*

JSHRZ W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*

JSJ *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period*

JTS *Journal of Theological Studies*

KP *Der Kleine Pauly*

LAW *Lexikon der Alten Welt* (Zurich/ Stuttgart: Artemis, 1965)

LCL *Loeb Classical Library*

LSJ Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon with Supplement*

LTK *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*

MGWJ *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*

OCD *Oxford Classical Dictionary*

ODCC *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*

OGIS W. Dittenberger, ed., *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*

OTP J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*

PAMR / PAMRS J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research (1976) with Supplement (1981)*

PG J. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*

PL J. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*

PW Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertums-wissenscahft*

RAC *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*

RGG *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*

RHR *Revue de l'histoire des religions*

RJ W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter*

SC *Sources chrétiennes*

SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*

SH / Supp. Hell. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, eds., *Supplementum Hellenisticum*

SIG W. Dittenberger, ed., *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*

TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*

ThEE A. Martinos, ed., *Threskeutike kai Ethike Enkuklopaideia.* 12 vols. Athens, 1962-68.

TrGF B. Snell and R. Kannicht, eds., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*

TU *Texte und Untersuchungen*

VT *Vetus Testamentum*

ZNW *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Other Abbreviations

Abbreviations throughout the work, for the most part, conform to those suggested in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* "Instructions for Contributors." (Cf. Society of Biblical Literature *Member's Handbook*, 1980). One major difference is that I have chosen to italicize the names of series. For the classical authors and sources, abbreviations in Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon with Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) and Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1879; repr. 1969) have been used, with some minor modifications, for the sake of clarity. The most frequently cited sources are abbreviated as follows:

Ag.Ap.	Josephus, *Against Apion*
Ant.	Josephus, *Antiquities*
H.E./ *Hist. eccl.*	Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*
J.W.	Josephus, *Jewish War*
P.E.	Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*
Strom.	Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*

The names of persons frequently referred to, usually editors, are abbreviated as follows:

Denis	A.-M. Denis
Dind.	Dindorf (of whom there are several; cf. Bibliography of Sources for the Collection)
Dübner	F. Dübner
Freu.	J. Freudenthal
Gais.	T. Gaisford

Giff.	E. H. Gifford
Hein.	F. A. Heinichen
Horst	P. W. van der Horst
Jac.	F. Jacoby
Jacobson	H. Jacobson
Kuiper	K. Kuiper
Lloyd-Jones	H. Lloyd-Jones
Ludwich	A. Ludwich
Mras	K. Mras
Müll.	C. Müller (= K. Müller)
Parsons	P. Parsons
Phil./ Philippson	L. M. Philippson
Riessler	P. Riessler
Snell	B. Snell
Stearns	W. N. Stearns
Steph.	R. Stephanus/Estienne/Etienne/ Stephens/Stephani
Strugnell	J. Strugnell
SylburgF.	Sylburg
Vig.	F. Viger/Vigerus/Vigier/Viguier
Walter	N. Walter
Wieneke	J. Wieneke

THEODOTUS

Eight separate fragments of epic poetry, totaling forty-seven lines of hexameter verse, are attributed to Theodotus.[1] They are preserved in a single section of *P.E.* (Book 9, Chapter 22), where Eusebius quotes directly from Alexander Polyhistor concerning Jacob. In fact, the entirety of *P.E.* 9.22 is comprised of these poetic fragments, which are introduced and connected by Polyhistor's own summaries of other portions of the poem that are not directly quoted.

These excerpts from Theodotus occur as part of a longer section in which Eusebius quotes from Polyhistor (with some brief interruptions), where the latter summarizes and cites various (pagan) authors who have treated aspects of Jewish history, including Abraham (chs. 17-20), Jacob (chs. 21-22), Joseph (chs. 23-24), Job (ch. 25), Moses (chs. 26-29), David and Solomon (chs. 30-34), Jerusalem (chs. 35-37), and Jeremiah (ch. 39).

Contents. Broadly speaking, the Theodotus fragments treat the patriarch Jacob, but only in the most general sense.[2] No concerted effort is made to rehearse or even summarize systematically

his life and deeds as recorded in Gen 25-35. Instead, Frgs. 1 and 2 focus on the city (and region) of Shechem, its founding, topography, and inhabitants, most notably Hamor, his son Shechem, and later Jacob. Frg. 3 offers a brief, though highly selective, summary of Jacob's life, based largely on Gen 29-30: his flight from Esau to Mesopotamia, his reception by Laban, his marriage to Leah and Rachel, the birth of his eleven sons and his only daughter Dinah. There is an explicit interest, however, in explaining how and why Jacob eventually arrived in Shechem (Gen 33:18-20), the note on which Frg. 4 begins. This fragment, which consists largely of Polyhistor's own summary of Theodotus' account of the rape of Dinah (Gen 34), underscores especially the necessity of circumcision and explains why intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews is impermissible. As a natural follow-up, though something of an interlude, Frg. 5 then rehearses the covenant of circumcision God made with Abraham (Gen 17:9-27), and hence explains its continued necessity. Frg. 6 resumes the story of Dinah's rape, in particular the circumstances which finally led Simeon and Levi to slay Hamor and Shechem, along with all the males of the city (Gen 34:18-25). Its most remarkable feature is the way

it defends their action as the fulfillment of a divine oracle and the doing of God's will, a motif further reinforced in the introduction to Frg. 7. The most distinctive feature of Frg. 7, however, is its thoroughly negative portrayal of the Shechemites as "impious." The final fragment, Frg. 8, resumes the story from Gen 34:25-29 as it depicts, in highly dramatic fashion reminiscent of Homer, Simeon and Levi's slaughter of Hamor and Shechem, and their rescue of Dinah.

In summary, the fragments display unusual interest in the city of Shechem and the way in which its history was intertwined with that of Jacob and his family. In particular, they focus attention on Gen 34 as the pivotal episode in that history.

What is not easily determined, however, is whether this was the major focus of Theodotus' poem, or whether Polyhistor has simply provided excerpts from a section of the poem in which this was the main episode. In other words, did Theodotus' epic poem provide more comprehensive coverage of the Jacob story, perhaps even of the other patriarchs as well, or was it more narrowly focused on events relating to his stay in Shechem?

Title. In his introductory summary, Polyhistor

characterizes Theodotus' work as *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* (Frg. 1, line 3; also lines 5-6). Whether this is to be understood as the formal title given to the work by Theodotus himself or as a generic phrase (coined either by Theodotus or Polyhistor) describing its contents depends on the weight given to various considerations and how they are related to each other. How the question is resolved affects other issues, most notably 1) identifying the author's ethnic status, 2) the related question of dating and locating the work, and 3) determining the scope of the work, and in a sense, the literary tradition to which it belongs. The following considerations may be noted:

1. Polyhistor's practice in describing the contents of works that he cites. The phrase *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* is used elsewhere by Polyhistor to characterize the contents of other Hellenistic-Jewish authors/writings, including Pseudo-Eupolemus, Artapanus, Aristeas the Exegete.[3] Consequently, it may be nothing more than Polyhistor's descriptive phrase, therefore to be understood in the broadest possible sense that these writings are "about Jews."

On the other hand, however, there is some evidence to suggest that Polyhistor is neither

careless nor indiscriminate in ascribing titles to works or in characterizing their contents. When citing other poetic works, he consistently reports their distinctive titles: Philo's Περὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ezekiel's Ἐξαγωγή.[4] If he did so for these, might he not have done so as well for Theodotus?

2. The use of the term Ἰουδαῖοι. Even though Polyhistor characterizes the content of the work as περὶ Ἰουδαίων, the term used to describe the Jewish people both in his own summary of the contents (Frg. 2, line 1) and in the lines of poetry directly quoted from Theodotus (Frg. 4, line 18) is not Ἰουδαῖοι but Ἑβραῖοι. If this were the case consistently throughout the work, perhaps a more accurate title would have been περὶ Ἑβραίων.

It should be noted, however, that the term Ἰουδαΐζω is used by Polyhistor in one of his summaries (Frg. 4, line 15), thus perhaps was a term actually used by Theodotus himself. This may suggest that he does not make fine distinctions between "Hebrews" and "Jews," but rather is quite willing to use both terms in summarizing events of biblical history. Moreover, the use of such a term would be quite compatible with the title περὶ Ἰουδαίων, and accordingly might suggest that the author is writing from a Jewish perspective, i.e.,

one that envisions others "becoming Jews" by circumcision.

The critical question here is whether the ethnic terminology used in the "title," as well as within Polyhistor's summaries and in the lines quoted from Theodotus, can be used in determining either the author's ethnic identity or the historical setting of the work (cf. further discussion below).

3. The title supplied by Eusebius ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΙΑΚΩΒ (Frg. 1, line 1) is clearly to be understood as a description of the contents based on his own agenda rather than an attempt to supply Theodotus' own title for the work. This is Eusebius' way of indicating that these excerpts from Theodotus via Polyhistor pertain to the figure Jacob, the subject of this particular section of Eusebius' treatment.[5]

4. Jacoby's suggested title ΣΙΚΙΜΩΝ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ recognizes that Theodotus' epic poem belongs to the tradition of Hellenistic epic poetry in which founding legends played a prominent role.[6]

5. The content of the fragments. A critical question is whether *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* is an appropriate title or descriptive phrase for the work, given its content. The question is most forcefully put by Freudenthal, who insists that the

title does not fit the work because its central subject is not "the Jews" but "Shechem."[7] He argues that whereas the biblical narrative gives primary attention to the Jacob story and only minor attention to Shechem (which, he observes, is mentioned only once [Gen 12:6] prior to Gen 33-34), Theodotus reverses the emphasis. By contrast, Theodotus gives disproportionate, almost exclusive, attention to Shechem, especially to events relating to Gen 34, and treats only cursorily aspects of Jacob's life that are prominent in the biblical narrative (e.g., the birth of his eleven sons). What emerges, Freudenthal insists, is not a work "On the Jews," but a "versified history of Shechem," which highlights this city in a manner analogous to the treatment of Jerusalem by Philo the Epic Poet. According to Freudenthal, then, the title *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* given by Polyhistor is clearly inappropriate.[8]

6. The ethnic identity of Theodotus. As will be noted below, the question of the title can hardly be discussed apart from the question of whether Theodotus was a Jew or Samaritan. Again, the issue is pressed by Freudenthal, who insists that the poem's preoccupation with Shechem, the "sacred city" of the Samaritans (Frg. 1, line 16),

requires us to identify Theodotus as a Samaritan.[9] In no way can Freudenthal imagine a Jewish author so preoccupied with Shechem, or so given to exuberant praise of the city. Nor can he imagine any Samaritan entitling such a poem "On the Jews."[10]

On the whole, it appears that *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* in this particular instance is Polyhistor's general designation of the work rather than Theodotus' actual title. Accordingly, we should be reluctant to use this title in drawing any definite conclusions either with respect to the content of the original poem, its scope and literary tradition, or its author's identity.[11]

Author. The modern debate concerning Theodotus' identity has centered on whether he was a Samaritan or a Jew.[12] An early, well-established tradition of scholarship regards Theodotus as a Samaritan.[13] Although questions have been raised consistently about his Samaritan identity, more recently scholars, most notably J. Collins, have advanced strong arguments for his Jewish identity.[14]

Arguments favoring his Samaritan identity include the following:

1) Shechem as the central focus of Theodotus'

poem. Though the fragments treat certain aspects of patriarchal history, they do so quite cursorily; in fact, their major preoccupation from start to finish is Shechem and events directly relating to its history.[15]

2) The designation of Shechem as a "sacred city" (ἱερὸν ἄστυ; Frg. 1, line 16) suggests a Samaritan allegiance on the part of the author (Josephus *Ant.* 11.8.6 ¶ 340; cf. 13.9.1 ¶¶ 254-55). Involved here is the difficulty in believing that a Jewish author during the Hellenistic period could lavish such praise on an enemy capital city.[16]

3) In light of the above two considerations, the title *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* cannot have been correct. The poem was much more narrowly focussed (one city and its history not the history of the Jewish people), and it could not have been given such a title by a Samaritan author. This title can only be understood as Polyhistor's generic designation.[17]

4) The reference to "ten peoples" being given to Abraham's descendants (Frg. 6, lines 10, 13-14) also points to a Samaritan author. Since Samaritan origins were thought to have been linked to the ten tribes of the northern kingdom, this is to be understood as a promise that found its fulfillment in the Samaritans.[18]

5) Evidence of syncretism in the fragments points to a Samaritan author. Specifically, the claim in the introductory remarks to Frg. 1 that the city of Shechem was founded by "Sikimius, son of Hermes" indicates a willingess to mix Greek mythological elements with the biblical history -- a syncretistic tendency especially characteristic of "Samaritan Hellenism."[19]

6) The careful use of ethnic designations points to Samaritan authorship. Specifically, the use of Ἑβραῖοι both within the poem itself and in Polyhistor's summaries corresponds to the Samaritans' own preference for the terms "Hebrews" and "Israelites" as the most appropriate forms of self-designation.[20]

In response, the following arguments have been adduced not only to counter the claim that Theodotus was a Samaritan, but also to show positively that he was a Jewish author.

1) While it cannot be denied that the extant fragments focus attention on Shechem, it cannot be assumed that the entire poem dealt exclusively with Shechem. The section excerpted by Polyhistor may simply have been one episode from a larger, more comprehensive work that treated the patriarchal story. References in the fragment to Abraham (Frg.

6, lines 9 & 14; also Frg. 5, line 2) may suggest that Theodotus' poem also treated the Abraham saga.[21] That the poem had a wider scope than Shechem is indicated by the title *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*.[22]

2) Referring to Shechem as *ἱερὸν ἄστυ* does not necessarily imply a Samaritan author. In the first place, the term *ἱερόν* is typical Homeric language used to praise cities and need not mean that the author regarded the city as "sacred" in any special sense.[23] Even if so, this does not mean necessarily that the author was a Samaritan, since the importance of Shechem within the biblical tradition generally made it a site highly revered by Jews as well as Samaritans (cf., besides Gen 33-34; 35:4; 37:12-14, also Gen 12:6; Josh 24).

Moreover, there is no convincing evidence that Shechem was regarded by the Samaritans as a "sacred site" in the same way, for example, that Jews regarded Jerusalem. The testimony from Josephus (*Ant.* 11.8.6 ¶ 340) says only that Shechem was "the chief city of the Samaritans" (*Σαμαρεῖται μητρόπολιν τότε τὴν Σίκιμαν ἔχοντες*). While this certainly suggests that Shechem was an important Samaritan center both politically and commerically, it does not say that it was a "holy city" in any specifically religious sense. Nor does the other

passage from Josephus (*Ant.* 13.9.1 ¶¶ 254-55) affirm any more than this.

3) As already noted, the title *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* may have been quite an apt title for the poem, coined either by Theodotus himself or by Polyhistor. To be sure, Polyhistor uses the same phrase to describe the contents of other Hellenistic-Jewish writers whom he cites, most notably Artapanus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, and Aristeas the Exegete.[24] Yet, in the two other instances where he cites poetic works, he appears to give their actual title: Philo's *On Jerusalem* and Ezekiel's *Exodus*.[25]

4) It is not at all obvious that the reference to the "ten peoples" (Frg. 6) points to a special Samaritan tradition that exposes the author's Samaritan sympathies. Another, perhaps even more plausible, interpretation is to see this as a reference to God's earlier promise in Gen 15:18-21, used by Theodotus to justify the actions of the sons of Jacob in slaying the Shechemites (therefore giving the "Canaanites" and "Perizzites" into the hands of Abraham's descendants) and thus vindicate their status as the righful heirs of God's promise.[26] So understood, Theodotus would be using the reference to justify the *Jewish* subjugation of

Samaritans rather than establish the Samaritans' own claims as legitimate heirs of Abraham.[27]

5) The argument about Theodotus' alleged syncretism is double edged. First, it is based on a single instance which is textually dubious.[28] Quite conceivably, Theodotus originally wrote "Sikimius, son of Hamor," which Polyhistor mistook as "son of Hermes," an understandable slip for a pagan author.[29] In favor of this is the fact that within the fragments themselves Theodotus consistently uses the same term (Ἐμώρ) to designate Shechem's father, and in no instance associates it etymologically with "Hermes."[30]

But even if one concedes that Theodotus attributed the founding of the city to "Sikimius, son of Hermes," such willingness to integrate features of Greek mythology with the biblical story does not necessarily imply Samaritan identity. To be sure, such syncretism occurs in Samaritan authors, such as Pseudo-Eupolemus, but is by no means confined to them. Similar tendencies are found in Hellenistic Jewish authors who are demonstrably not Samaritan, most notably Artapanus.[31] Thus the presence or absence of syncretistic tendencies within a given author does not necessarily say anything about one's ethnic

status, i.e., whether one is Jewish or Samaritan. Such proclivities cut across ethnic-national lines.

6) The case for Theodotus' making careful distinctions in his use of ethnic self-designations is not as clear-cut as it might appear. While it is true that he uses *Ἑβραῖοι* to refer to the "people" of the biblical tradition (Frg. 2, line 1; Frg. 4, line 18), it is also true that he uses the term *Ἰουδαΐζω* (Frg. 4, line 15; unless this is Polyhistor's term and not Theodotus'). If he were intent on making careful distinctions in referring to his own people (the Samaritans) as "Hebrews" or "Israelites," he could not have said that the inhabitants of Shechem, in deciding to be circumcised, would thereby "become Jews." Moreover, the case for this distinction cannot be made if the title *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* is authentic or accurate. As it turns out, Theodotus may have used both "Hebrews" and "Jews" ("Judaize") in relating the biblical tradition.

In fact, whether the use of the terms "Hebrews," "Israelites," and "Jews" can be regarded as a clue to an author's ethnic identity, or even whether it indicates certain sympathies, must be carefully examined.[32] Theodotus may have used the terms "Hebrews" and "Jews" indiscriminately either

because of the fluidity in the use of these terms during the Hellenistic period or because the historical distinctions between Jews and Samaritans at that time were more blurred than is sometimes imagined.[33]

In addition to these counter-arguments to the Samaritan hypothesis, it has also been argued that far from reflecting a pro-Samaritan bias, the fragments are actually quite neutral in their portrayal of Shechem and its inhabitants, or even explicitly anti-Samaritan. The following considerations have been noted:[34]

1) The negative portrayal of the inhabitants of Shechem. Hamor and Shechem are characterized as a "very stubborn pair" (Frg. 2, line 6), not an altogether complimentary description for Samaritan heroes. The people of Shechem are explicitly called "impious" (ἀσεβεῖς; Frg. 7, line 2; cf. annotations, n. 121), a negative epithet that is further elaborated in Frg. 7, lines 4-7, where the Shechemites are depicted as inhospitable (on the interpretation of these problematic lines, cf. esp. annotations, nn. 125-28), lawless, and deadly. This negative portrayal of the Shechemites resonates with other traditions in which the inhabitants of Shechem emerge as negative paradigms.[35]

Related to these explicit negative features is the absence of any reference to their willingness to be circumcised (Frg. 4, lines 14-22; Frg. 5; possibly implied in Frg. 6, lines 1-3, where at least Hamor is willing). In sharp contrast to the biblical story, in which the Shechemites undergo circumcision (Gen 34:24), Theodotus never actually portrays them as having done so. Accordingly, they remain "outside the fold," and Simeon and Levi are therefore not presented as having acted as duly obedient Israelites.

2) The counterpart to the negative portrayal of the Shechemites is the thoroughly positive portrayal of Jacob and his sons. Theodotus is consistent in portraying the actions of Simeon and Levi as having been divinely motivated and approved: they act at the behest of a divine oracle (Frg. 6, lines 8-9, 12; Frg. 7). Once again, in a conspicuous departure from the biblical account, in which Jacob censures his sons for their deed (Gen 34:30; 49:5-7), Theodotus imputes neither blame nor shame for their deed. Their actions are endorsed wholeheartedly by Theodotus.

This re-interpretation of Gen 34, which defends the actions of Jacob's sons over against the Shechemites as wholly justifiable, indeed as in

full accordance with God's will, is resonant with other traditions of the period, e.g., *T. Levi* 5-7, *Jub.* 30; Jth 9:2.[36]

The tone of the narrative is thus one of enthusiastic approval of the actions taken by Simeon and Judah against Shechem, which suggests that the author's sympathies are much more closely aligned with Jacob and his sons than with the inhabitants of Shechem.[37]

3) The neutral description of Shechem. A number of striking omissions have also been noted. The fragments contain no reference to the temple on Mt. Gerizim, as there is, for example, in the Samaritan author Pseudo-Eupolemus (Frg. 1.5).[38] Even though Theodotus takes the opportunity to depict the "two mountains" of Gerizim and Ebal (Frg. 1, line 11), the description is relatively neutral; it does not reveal any noticeable affinity between the author and the city of Shechem, or Mounts Ebal and Gerizim.[39]

4) When one recognizes that Theodotus' poem belongs to a tradition of epic poetry in which it was commonplace for an author to select a city and treat its various aspects, including its topography, founding, inhabitants, central figures, and certain events of his history, it becomes more

difficult to draw conclusions about the author from the subject matter of his poem. An author could decide to portray a city or country in an epic poem without being a native, or even necessarily sympathetic towards it.[40] Choosing to depict Shechem in an epic poem, even to devote exclusive attention to it, did not make one a Samaritan.

Thus, the view that Theodotus was a Samaritan, which has long been influential since its forceful articulation by Freudenthal, has recently come under closer scrutiny, and consequently is no longer an unchallenged view. Greater consideration must now be given to the likelihood that Theodotus was a Hellenistic Jewish author who not only chose to portray Shechem in an epic poem, but did so with a sharp polemical edge.[41]

Date and Historical Setting. While the most conservative way of dating Theodotus is to assert simply that he flourished prior to Alexander Polyhistor (mid-first century B.C.E.), in whose work he is preserved,[42] there have emerged essentially two options for dating him: 1) an earlier date, from the late third to the mid-second century B.C.E., and 2) a later date, the last third of the second century B.C.E., specifically during the time of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.E.).

1. The earlier date (ca. 200-150 B.C.E.). The case for an earlier date is based on the correlation of archaeological evidence with Theodotus' description of the city of Shechem in Frg. 1, in particular his description of the wall in lines 17-18.[43] Excavation suggests that after the city was destroyed ca. 250 B.C.E., the walls were rebuilt and refortified. However, ca. 200 B.C.E. the wall began to be neglected and fell into disrepair essentially until the mid-second century, which rendered it vulnerable to attacks in the latter part of the century.

The description of the city walls in Frg. 1, however, appears to envision a strongly fortified wall comparable to that which existed ca. 200 B.C.E. Moreover, it is written as if the author had actually seen the wall, which would suggest that he wrote at least prior to the time when the walls fell into complete disrepair sometime ca. 150 B.C.E.[44]

2. The later date (ca. 129-107 B.C.E.). The case for dating Theodotus during the latter third of the second century B.C.E. is based on correlating certain themes in the fragments with the activity of John Hyrcanus.[45] Specifically, it is argued that the strong emphasis on the necessity

of circumcision (Frg. 4, lines 13-22; Frg. 5), the opposition to intermarriage (Frg. 4, lines 18-22), and what is seen as a strong anti-Samaritan polemic, fit the historical circumstances of the late Maccabean period, when John Hyrcanus began his expansionist policies and imposed Judaism on the Jews' neighbors. Moreover, his destruction of the temple on Mt. Gerizim ca. 129 B.C.E. and his final destruction of the city of Shechem ca. 107 B.C.E. would establish even more definite paramaters for dating Theodotus. Since his poem seems to presuppose the existence of the city, it would have to be dated before 107 B.C.E.; since it may well have been used to justify, or at least celebrate, Hyrcanus' conquest of the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim, and since it seems to reflect the policies that he began to put into effect, it would appear to have been written after 129 B.C.E.[46]

Some scholars, preferring neither of the above options, remain less precise and simply date Theodotus sometime in the second century B.C.E.[47]

Provenance. Generally, Theodotus is thought to have written either in a Palestinian or Alexandrian setting.

1. Palestine. As long as Theodotus was held to be a Samaritan, it was natural to see him writing

in a "Syrian-Palestinian" setting.[48] It is equally possible to see him as a Jewish author writing in Palestine, especially if he was closely identified with, perhaps even a participant in, Hasmonean politics.[49] His description of Shechem (Frgs. 1 & 2) has also been taken as evidence that he had first-hand familiarity with the city and region, or possibly was a resident of the area.[50]

2. Alexandria. Because of the influence of the Samaritan hypothesis, scholars have not been inclined generally to see Theodotus as writing in an Alexandrian setting. Instead, evidence is usually adduced to show the existence of Samaritans outside Palestine, most notably in Alexandria,[51] in order to demonstrate the possiblity that a Samaritan could have written the work in a non-Palestinian setting.[52] Indeed, the controversy between Jews and Samaritans in Egypt before Ptolemy VI Philometor is a conceivable setting for a sharply polemical re-telling of Gen 34.[53] Ostensibly, the strongest argument for an Alexandrian setting is Theodotus' intimate familiarity with Homer, and probably the wider classical tradition. It is now generally conceded, however, that the establishment of a Greek gymnasium in Palestine ca. 175 B.C.E. could have

yielded the likes of Theodotus.[54]

Although it is quite conceivable that Theodotus could have written either in a Palestinian or Alexandrian setting, or even in some other city of the Diaspora,[55] the question of his provenance remains open.[56]

Literary Features. The most striking literary feature of Theodotus' work is its thoroughly Homeric complexion.[57] There are occasional echoes of the LXX, but they are so slight and infrequent that it is difficult to produce hard evidence that Theodotus actually made direct use of the LXX.[58] More striking are the numerous instances where Theodotus takes a biblical idea or motif and thoroughly recasts it into Homeric or epic style.[59] In similar fashion, the language of Polyhistor's summaries differs conspicuously from the language of the LXX.[60]

By contrast, the work is characterized by numerous distinctively Homeric (i.e., not characteristic of later Hellenistic epic) terms, expressions, or usages that are not found at all in the LXX,[61] found in LXX only rarely or in cognate forms,[62] or used in LXX in a different sense.[63] Besides these terms that are distinctively Homeric, Theodotus (or Polyhistor) employs Homeric terms

that are also used in the Hellenistic epic poets, especially Apollonius of Rhodes, Callimachus, Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus.[64] Similarly, most of these terms are not found at all in LXX,[65] or used in LXX only infrequently or only in cognate forms,[66] or in a different sense.[67] In only a few instances does Theodotus use non-Homeric terms that also occur in Hellenistic epic poetry.[68] Finally, a number of terms, expressions, or usages occur that are either not attested or only rarely occur in epic poetry.[69]

Compared with Philo Epicus, Theodotus shows more restraint and greater refinement in both language and style,[70] but his superiority can be exaggerated.[71] Though he shows considerable mastery of Homeric style and writes verses that "are by no means devoid of poetic merit,"[72] his level of literary accomplishment must be measured against other Hellenistic epic poets who had developed a more independent style.[73]

Significance. In spite of their brevity, the Theodotus fragments have significant implications in several areas:

1. Jewish-Samaritan relations in the Hellenistic period. Even if Theodotus is seen to be a Jewish author, as an increasing number of

scholars now believe, the centrality of Shechem within the fragments and their possibly strong anti-Samaritan polemic make them important evidence for the study of Jews and Samaritans during the Hellenistic period (Kippenberg, Collins).

In a related vein, the description of Shechem (Frgs. 1-2) provides an important bit of evidence to be correlated with the archaeological investigations of Shechem (Bull, Kippenberg).

2. Hellenization. Because Theodotus provides such a clear instance of a Greek-speaking Jewish (Samaritan ?) author, intimately familiar with Homer and the broader classical tradition in some respects, he remains an important text for measuring the degree and kind of engagement Jews had with Hellenistic culture at this time (Hengel, Pummer). His case becomes all the more interesting if he is shown to have flourished in Palestine rather than in Alexandria, or some other Diaspora city, primarily because it is ostensibly harder to explain. Theodotus still bears closer analysis in relation to other debates, e.g., the degree of syncretism among Hellenistic-Jewish authors, esp. in his celebrated reference to Hermes (Frg. 1), and the less well-known use of δῖος in relation to Abraham (Frg. 5, line 2). Or, if Collins is

correct, Theodotus provides an intriguing example of a Palestinian Jew who was thoroughly Hellenized literarily, perhaps academically, yet who shows no evidence of having engaged alien intellectual traditions, but on the contrary remains thoroughly exclusivist, even militant: the quintessential enlightened hard-liner.

3. LXX studies and his appropriation of the biblical tradition. Because of his thoroughly independent stance vis-à-vis LXX, Theodotus is less an instance where we can analyze closely how a Greek-speaking Jewish author has reinterpreted particular LXX words or expressions. In this respect, he provides an interesting counterpart to later authors, e.g., Luke-Acts, who were much more thoroughly bound to and influenced by LXX.

Nevertheless, Theodotus shows how certain biblical traditions, especially Gen 34, were being reinterpreted. Accordingly, he provides a valuable component, along with *T. Levi* 5-7, *Jub.* 30, Jdt 9, Joseph and Asenath, *Gen. Rab.* 80, Philo, and Josephus, in constructing the history of tradition of the interpretation of Gen 34, and especially in seeing how a clearly embarrassing tradition came to be sanitized. Besides his reinterpretation of the rape of Dinah, Theodotus' portrait of Abraham has

some intriguing features.

Also illuminating are the ways in which he appropriates and makes use of other specific biblical traditions, e.g., the reference to the "ten peoples" in Gen 15:17-21 (a possible instance of promise-fulfillment), the covenant of circumcision (Gen 17:1-27, esp. his use of 'Ιουδαΐζω), and the proscription of intermarriage (Frg. 4).

4. History and transmission of literary traditions. Because these texts provide an instance in which one author (Eusebius) is quoting an earlier author (Polyhistor) who is both paraphrasing and quoting still an earlier author (Theodotus), and because two genres are involved (Hellenistic prose and Homeric hexameters), Theodotus provides an illuminating test case for investigating how a single epitomist worked, how reliably he transmitted actually quoted sources, and what was involved in responsibly summarizing a poetic text in the form of Hellenistic prose.

NOTES

1. *P.E.* 9.22 is the only passage which preserves poetic fragments attributed to an author named Theodotus. Polyhistor mentions him by name only once, and this in the introductory summary without any further identification (9.22.1). The title introducing the chapter, most likely attributable to Eusebius (cf. Mras, *GCS* [43,1], "Vorwort," viii-ix), also mentions Theodotus but provides no additional information except a variant title for the work (cf. below, nn. 3-11; also annotations, nn. 2, 7). It should be noted that Eusebius apparently thinks Theodotus is a pagan author; he is after all being cited as one of several pagan authors who have treated the early history of the Jews (cf. *P.E.* 9.1.1-2; and below, n. 12).

Elsewhere in *P.E.* Eusebius mentions a Theodotus twice (apart from Theodotus, the bishop of Laodicea, the addressee of both *P.E.* and *D.E.*). In *P.E.* 10.11.10, he quotes an excerpt from Tatian (*Discourse to the Greeks* 37.1), which mentions three Phoenician authors -- Theodotus, Hypsicrates, and Mochus -- whose works were translated into Greek by Laetus, who himself had written "an accurate treatise on the lives of the philosophers." Although this Phoenician author has been identified with the poet whose work Polyhistor excerpted (e.g. Gifford, 4.327; listed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.692 without qualification as one of the testimonia for Theodotus Epicus), this identification is most unlikely (so, Viger, *PG* [21], 721, n. 63; Mras, *GCS* [43.2] 540, s.v. "Theodotos"; also Laqueur, 1958; Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 222, identifies this Theodotus with Theophilus, now generally regarded as a

Hellenistic-Jewish historian; cf. *FHJA* 1.337-42).

Eusebius' other mention of Theodotus occurs in *P.E.* 9.42.2-3, where he provides an excerpt from Josephus *Ag.Ap.* 1.23 ¶¶ 215-18. ¶ 216 is generally cited as the other likely testimonium for Theodotus the poet. Responding to the silence of Greek historians concerning the Jews, e.g. Hieronymus of Cardia, Josephus says that Jewish antiquity is attested in Egyptian, Chaldaean, and Phoenician records, as well as among Greek historians (τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγραφεῖς), of whom he writes: (216) ἔτι δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις Θεόφιλος καὶ Θεόδοτος καὶ Μνασέας καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης καὶ Ἑρμογένης, Εὐήμερός τε καὶ Κόνων καὶ Ζωπυρίων καὶ πολλοί τινες ἄλλοι τάχα ... οὐ παρέργως ἡμῶν ἐμνημονεύκασιν. Like Eusebius, Josephus includes Theodotus among Greek historians who have referred to Jews. Müller, *Apion*, 181, identifies him as Theodotus of Tarsus who wrote περὶ Φρυγίας (Apollonius 2.122 Schol.) While this Theodotus mentioned by Josephus has also been identified with Theodotus the poet (so, Viger, *PG* [21], 721, n. 63; Reinach, *Textes*, 216; *Josèphe, Apion*, 41; listed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.692, with a question mark; Mras, *GCS* [43.2], 540, s.v. "Theodotos," thinks it probable), this identification has also been questioned (Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3] 154, "fraglich, eher unwahrscheinlich"; Laqueur, 1958, who identifies the Theodotus mentioned by Josephus with the one mentioned by Tatian; Müller, *Apion*, 181). While it is possible that Josephus in *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 337-41 depended on Theodotus Epicus for his treatment of the rape of Dinah, or at least on a common tradition, it nevertheless appears that the Theodotus to whom he refers in *Ag.Ap.* 1.23 ¶ 216 is an historian, not a poet.

The name Theodotus appears to have been commonly used among Jews of the Hellenistic-Roman period, occurring frequently in Egyptian papyri of

persons identified as Jewish either explicitly (*CPJ* 1.158-61 [No. 22]) or inferentially (*CPJ* 1.171-73 [No. 28]; 176-77 [No. 31]; 177-78 [No. 32]; 182-85 [No. 37]; 192-93 [No. 47]; 243 [No. 131]; 2.22-24 [No. 149]; cf. index, *CPJ*, 3.177). It also occurs in inscriptions, most notably the "Theodotus inscription," *CIJ* 2.332-35, no. 1404, from a Jerusalem synagogue dated in early first century C.E., which mentions Theodotus, who "constructed the synagogue for the reading of the law and the teaching of the precepts" (cf. Schürer, *History* 2.425, n. 4; also, A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965] 439-41); and from a later period, *OGIS* 74 = *CIJ* 1537, Θεοῦ εὐλογία· | Θεύδοτος Δωρίωνος | Ἰουδαῖος σωθεὶς ἐκ πε|λ(άγ)ους, "Thanksgiving to the God! Theodotus son of Dorion the Jew who was saved from the sea," a 2nd cent. C.E. inscription from Apollonopolis Magna (Upper Egypt); cf. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 520, n. 25.

In some cases, the name Theodotus served as the Greek equivalent of a Hebrew name, such as Mattathias (cf. 2 Macc 14:19, where Theodotus-Mattathias is perhaps an instance of a double name; so, Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.64), Nathaniel, Nathaniah, Jonathan, or Elnathan (on the use of Greek names among Jews, cf. generally, Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 346, 523-24, nn. 3-6; also his *The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic-Roman Age in the Light of the Papyri* [2nd rev. ed.; Hebrew, with English summary; Jerusalem, 1963] 241-44; also, Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 61-65; Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 154).

Accordingly, apart from the above mentioned references to *authors* named Theodotus, from roughly the same period we know of two references to Jews named Theodotus: *Ep. Arist.* 49, one of the 72 translators sent by Eleazar to Alexandria; Josephus *Ant.* 14.10.22 ¶ 248, father of Straton, (the

latter) an envoy sent by Hyrcanus I to Rome. The Theodotus mentioned in 2 Macc 14:19 as one of the delegates sent by the Syrian general Nicanor to negotiate with Judas appears not to have been Jewish; nor does Theodotus, the Sidonian magistrate ("archon of Sidon"), mentioned in *PMich.Zen.* 3, as sending a gift of Attic honey to Apollonius, Egyptian economic minister (*διοικητής*) under Ptolemy II Philadelphus (text given in M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1941] 1.227). Also, cf. 3 Macc 1:2, which mentions Theodotus, the Aetolian native who later became governor of Coele-Syria, who plots to kill Ptolemy IV (cf. Polybius 5.81.1-7; also 5.40.1-3).

While these various references attest the existence of persons named Theodotus, both Jews and non-Jews, in roughly the same period (and later) and vicinity as Theodotus the poet is likely to have flourished, none of them seems a likely candidate with whom he can be identified.

Cf. generally, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 154-55, nn. 3-7.

2. The specific content and context of each fragment is described in the annotations, nn. 1, 31, 42, 71, 91, 102, 119, 130.

3. Cf. annotations, n. 2.

4. On Philo the epic poet, cf. *P.E.* 9.20.1 (Frg. 1, line 2); 24.1 (Frg. 3, line 3); 37.1 (Frg. 4, lines 2-3); also, annotations on Philo the epic poet, n. 2; on Ezekiel the tragedian, cf. *P.E.* 9.29.14 (Frg. 15, line 3); 29.15 (Frg. 16, line 10).

5. That Eusebius' titles are his own descriptive markers is clearly seen in the titles supplied for

Philo Epicus, e.g., ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΙΩΣΗΦ is used to introduce Philo's *On Jerusalem* (Frg. 3, line 1 = *P.E.* 9.24.1; also Frg. 4, line 1 = *P.E.* 9.37.1; Frg. 1, line 3 = *P.E.* 9.20.1).

6. *FGrH* 3.692; cf. annotations, n. 6.

7. Freudenthal, 99-100.

8. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 155-56, also thinks the title *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* is inappropriate. Because of the exclusive attention given to Shechem, Walter thinks it unlikely that this section excerpted by Polyhistor is only a small portion of a larger work.

9. Freudenthal, 99-100.

10. It should be noted, however, that one can contest the title *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* without thereby concluding that the author was a Samaritan (so, Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 155-56). Fallon, 787, on the other hand, favors *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* as the likely title, yet leaves open the question of Theodotus' identity.

11. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 155-56, argues against the title primarily on the basis of the content of the fragments. In this respect, his position is similar to Freudenthal's, yet, unlike Freudenthal, he does not thereby conclude that the author was a Samaritan (cf. above, n. 10). Walter is convinced that the sole focus of the work was Shechem and that the section excerpted by Polyhistor was not part of a larger work which treated various important Jewish cities. Accordingly, the work should be seen as an epic poem about Shechem that belongs to the genre of Hellenistic city-epic, thus comparable to Philo Epicus' work *On Jerusalem*.

Fallon, 787, by contrast, notes the various objections that have been raised against the title. Admitting that these excerpts focus on Shechem, he is nevertheless willing to envision them as "one episode of a cycle or one part of a longer poem." Neither is he troubled by the use of the term "Jews" in the title, but sees it as an "understandable anachronism" used by Theodotus. Other suggested titles, such as "On Shechem" or "On the Foundation of Shechem," which align the work more closely with Philo the Epic Poet, he finds less plausible (787, n. 22). Collins, "Epic," 94, does not regard *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* as an implausible title (cf. annotations, n. 2).

12. There is some question whether Eusebius thought Theodotus was a pagan author. Cf. above, n. 1. Read one way, *P.E.* 9.1.1-4 appears to suggest that the authors whom Eusebius cites in the remainder of the book are Greeks who "themselves are not unacquainted with the affairs of the Hebrews." Moreover, he writes that he will "show how many of the Greek historians have mentioned by name both Jews and Hebrews ..." There follows testimony from pagan authors, such as Theophrastus, who themselves are cited by pagan authors, in this case Porphyry. Eusebius cites testimony from Hecataeus of Abdera, whom he regards as a pagan witness, but clearly this testimony is taken directly from Josephus, *Ag.Ap.*, although Eusebius does not say so. In other instances, Eusebius quotes directly from his pagan source, e.g., Numenius (9.7) and Porphyry (9.10). Still again, Eusebius cites a long section from Josephus *Ag.Ap.*, which contains quotations from such pagan authors as Berossus. In the long section in which Eusebius quotes from Polyhistor (9.17-39, though with brief interruptions), he clearly introduces Polyhistor as a pagan author of great renown. There follows

testimony from Eupolemus (9.17), Artapanus (9.18), Molon (9.19), Philo Epicus (9.20), Demetrius (9.21), Theodotus (9.22), Arapanus (9.23), Philo Epicus (9.24), Aristeas the Exegete (9.25), Eupolemus (9.26), Artapanus (9.27), Ezekiel the tragic poet (9.28), Demetrius (9.29), Ezekiel the tragic poet (9.29), Eupolemus (9.30-34), Timochares (9.35), anonymous author of the *Metrical Survey* (9.36), Philo Epicus (9.37), *Ep. Arist.* (9.38), and finally Polyhistor directly (9.39).

Neither Eusebius nor Polyhistor states explicitly whether he thinks the various authors cited are themselves pagan. Polyhistor simply does not identify the authors he quotes, other than mentioning the name or describing the contents of their composition. Delitzsch, *Geschichte*, 209, n. 1, notes the difficulty in determining the ethnic identity of Theodotus (and Philo Epicus). With respect to Theodotus, he thinks the overall tone of the fragments and the positive assessment of circumcision (Frg. 5) point to a Jewish identity, even though Eusebius actually regarded him as non-Jewish. Cf. also Jacobson, *Ezekiel*, 5, 177, n. 5.

Interestingly, the history of interpretation on this particular question has a gap. Grotius, *Annotationes*, 879, cites testimony from Theodotus as if the latter were a "Greek poet": "Σίκιμα Graeca flexione plerumque haec urbs appellatur, de qua totoque eo tractu exstant versus Theodoti poetae Graeci libro de Iudaeis, quos citat Eusebius praparationis lib. IX, c. I, sed corruptos, quos sic emendandos censeam: ..." Viger's note (*PG* [21] 721, n. 63) merely identifies Theodotus the poet as the one mentioned by Josephus in *Ag.Ap.* 1.23 ¶ 216, without indicating whether he thinks Josephus is correct in identifying him as a "Greek historian." Presumably, Viger agrees with Josephus. I do not yet know at what point this early editorial tradition, which regarded Theodotus as a "Greek

poet," changes, and precisely who first identifies him as a Jewish or Samaritan author.

13. Doubtless the most influential voice is Freudenthal (1875), 99-100, who acknowledges, however, Ewald's earlier suspicion that Theodotus was "perhaps a Samaritan" (cf. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2nd ed. [1852] 4.297; 3rd ed. [1864-68] 4.338 "ein Theodotus [vielleicht ein Samarier]"; also 7.91; *History* 5.260 [ET of German 3rd ed., 1867]; also Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 2nd ed. [1863] 2.520-21, 576-77; Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3rd ed. [1878] 3.625, "Theodotus war demnach unstreitig ein Samaritaner ..." [cf. Graetz, *History*, 1.517 (ET originally published 1891, reprinted 1946)]).

Subsequently, Theodotus is held to be a Samaritan by the following: Susemihl (1891-92), 2.655; Reinach, *Textes* (1895), 216; A. Büchler, *Tobiaden* (1899), 150, n. 147; Wendland, *BPW* 19 (1899) 900-901; Montgomery, *Samaritans* (1907), 284-85; Stearns, *Fragments* (1908), 100, "probably"; Schürer, *Geschichte* (4th ed., 1909), 3.499-500; Karpeles, *Geschichte* (3rd ed. 1920-21; repr. as 4th ed. in 2 vols, 1963; 1st Ger ed. 1886), 1.183-84; Thackeray, *Josephus* (LCL; London: Heinemann, 1926), 1.250, n. a; Riessler (1928; repr. 1966), 1339; A. Büchler, "Traces des idées et des coutumes hellénistiques dans le Livre des Jubilés," *REJ* 89 (1930) 341, 344 (apud Pummer, "Gen 34"); Bickerman, *Maccabees* (Ger. ed. 1937; ET 1979), 82; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur* (1954), 11; Ziegler, *Epos* (1966), 20; Bull, "Note" (1967), 224; Meeks, *Prophet-King* (1967), 219; Purvis, *Samaritan Pentateuch* (1968), 13, n. 21; Fallon-Yarbro (1970), 40; Denis, *Introduction* (1970), 272; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), 1.707 "certainly"; 2.963, n. 101, section iii.; 986, n. 202; Wacholder, "Theodotus" (1972), 1102; also, *Eupolemus* (1974), 284-85; Hengel, "Anonymität" (1972), 242; *Judaism*

and Hellenism (1974; 2nd Ger ed. 1973), 1.69, 89, 266; van der Horst, *JHP* (1987) 59; "Interpretation," 526-27; Mendels, *Land of Israel* (1987), 109-21, esp. 110-16.

14. Early doubts about his Samaritan identity were raised by Ludwich (1899), 5, esp. 7, n. 22, and Laqueur (1934), 1959. It is subsequently denied, with varying degrees of certainty, and his Jewish identity argued (or assumed) by the following: Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte* (6th ed., 1920; repr. 1959) 2(1).607; Schlatter, *Geschichte* (3rd Ger. ed., 1925; repr. 1972), 199, who simply assumes Theodotus is Jewish; Gutman, "Philo the Epic Poet" (1954), 36-37; *Beginnings* (1958), 1.246, 248; Kippenberg, *Garizim* (1971), 84; Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, (1976; rev. ed. 1981), 210; Collins, "Epic" (1980), 102, "a militant and exclusivist Jew"; *Athens and Jerusalem* (1983), 47-48; Pummer, "Gen 34" (1982), 178; "Note" (1982), 177; also "*Jubilees*" (1979), 174-75; Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3] (1983), 156; *ANRW* (1987), 111; Nickelsburg, "Theodotus" (1984), 124-25; van der Horst, "Korte Notities" (1985), 105-109 (who later changes his mind in his treatment of Theodotus in *JHP* and "Interpretation," 526-27; cf. n. 13 above).

The question is left open by the following: Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture* (1959), 99; Fallon (1985), 786; Schürer, *History* (1986), 3(1).561-62.

15. Freudenthal, 100, Shechem is "der Mittelpunkt des Gedichtes."

16. Freudenthal, 100.

17. Freudenthal, 99.

18. Freudenthal, 100. By linking this reference to the "ten peoples" to the "ten tribes of the

northern kingdom," Freudenthal reflects the older, traditional view of Samaritan origins that typified scholarly opinion in the 19th century. This view, based primarily on 2 Kings 17, held that Samaritan origins were traceable to the period following the Assyrian conquest of Samaria in 722/1, when Sargon resettled the land with foreigners, most notably the Kuthites. When these colonists intermarried with the Israelites who were left behind in the land, there emerged a "mongrel" people whose religious practices were a mixture of pagan and Israelite elements. In this sense, the Samaritans were viewed as descendants of the "ten tribes of the northern kingdom." Cf. MacDonald, *Samaritans*, 21-24; Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews*, 2-3.

19. Freudenthal, 100.

20. Freudenthal, 101.

21. Collins, "Epic," 94.

22. Collins, "Epic," 94.

23. Ludwich, 6, n. 8; followed by Schürer, *Geschichte* 3.500, n. 34; Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).607, "epische Sprechweise"; cf. Homeric passages cited in annotations, n. 28.

24. Cf. annotations, n. 2.

25. Cf. above, n. 4.

26. Cf. annotations, n. 115.

27. Collins, "Epic," 100, finds plausible Freudenthal's suggestion that the "ten peoples" be understood with reference to the Northern Kingdom, but understands it as "an assertion of Jewish

claims to sovereignty over Samaria," thus a way for Theodotus to justify Hyrcanus' expansionist policies.

28. This was already noted by Ludwich, 5, n. 2.

29. Cf. annotations, n. 5.

30. Cf. Collins, "Epic," 102, who insists that far from being syncretistic, Theodotus shows no evidence of a "universalist tone" that would have caused him to engage, much less appropriate, traditions alien to his own; rather his is a "vision of Judaism ... of the narrowest variety."

31. cf. Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).607, n. 4; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 84-85, cites 2 Macc 5:22-23 as evidence that Antiochus Epiphanes had to reckon with resistance to his policies at both Gerizim and Jerusalem.

32. Freudenthal, 101, observes, e.g., that Philo and Josephus consistently used "Hebrews" and "Israelites" when discussing the pre-exilic period of biblical history (cf. Josephus *Ant.* 1.6.4 ¶¶ 143-47, esp. ¶ 146; cf. ¶ 148; 11.5.7, esp. ¶¶ 169, 173). On the special connotations of the term "Hebrews" among Jewish authors, cf. Georgi, *Opponents*, 41-46, esp. 43.

33. Bull, "Note," 224, cites Josephus *Ant.* 9.14.3 ¶¶ 290-91; 11.8.6 ¶¶ 340-44 as evidence that Samaritans during the Hellenistic period called themselves "Jews," especially when politically expedient; also, cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 155; Fallon, 786, n. 5. But the evidence is not as clear as this. Josephus only says that the Samaritans, who are also known as the "Kuthim," claim to be the "kinsmen" of the Jews; he does not say that they

refer to themselves as "Jews." Even so, Bull takes Josephus' statement at face value. If, however, this is a polemical remark reflecting Josephus' well-known anti-Samaritan bias, it is not at all clear that we should regard this as evidence that Samaritans actually used the term "Jews" as a self-designation, much less that it was typical practice during the Hellenistic period.

Whether the term "Jews" would have been an appropriate self-designation by Samaritans must also be related to the complicated question of Samaritan origins. If, for example, Samaritan origins are to be traced to a priestly movement stemming from Jerusalem, then "Jews" might well have been their preferred title, since it would have linked them with "Judea." Cf. Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 57-59.

34. Most of the following observations are drawn from Collins, "Epic," 92-102. To be sure, Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 80-83, had already begun to articulate the revisionist case for Theodotus' Jewish identity, making some of the same basic observations as Collins later did, but Collins presented the most comprehenisve, and convincingly argued case to date, with many new observations.

35. Collins, "Epic," 97-98, stresses the "paradigmatic implications" of Theodotus' account, as well as that of parallel traditions. This reinforces his argument that Theodotus' portrayal of Shechem as being justifiably subjugated by Jacob's sons served as propaganda to support John Hyrcanus' pre-emptive actions against the Samaritans in destroying their temple on Mt. Gerizim in 129/128 B.C.E. and finally the city of Shechem in 109 B.C.E. Also cf. Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 84.

36. Cf. Collins, "Epic," 97-98; similarly, *Gen. Rab.* 80:2. On the use of Gen 34 as it relates to "zealots for God" in the Maccabean and Hasmonean period, N. Walter calls my attention to M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (2. Aufl.; Leiden, 1976), 182-83; also, Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 93.

37. Already noted by Laqueur, 1959. Even earlier, Ludwich, 7, n. 22, had observed the "objective calm" with which Theodotus reports the proposed circumcision of the Shechemites and their eventual destruction. Accordingly, he noted the doubt this cast on the Samaritan hypothesis and the increased likelihood that *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* was the correct title.

38. Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.655, saw the reference to Shechem as *ἱερὸν ἄστυ* as the functional equivalent of Pseudo-Eupolemus' description of Gerizim as *ὄρος ὑφίστου* (cf. annotations, n. 28).

39. So, Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 84.

40. So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 159, esp. n. 34, who also cautions against reading between the lines and seeing a silent polemic against Jerusalem, as does Freudenthal, 101, and after him, Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 284; cf. Philo the Epic Poet, Introduction, notes, n. 33. On the portrayal of cites in Hellenistic epic poetry, cf. Ziegler, *Epos*, 15-23; also, cf. Gutman, "Philo," 60-63; Fallon-Yarbro, 6-14; Fallon, 787.

41. It should be noted that the argument of Collins, "Epic," has two parts: a) that Theodotus was not a Samaritan, but a Jew, albeit a "militant and exclusivist Jew," and b) that his poem is fiercely anti-Samaritan in both its tone and content. It is possible to be convinced by the

former, but not by the latter, as e.g., Pummer, "Gen. 34," who unfolds an alternative interpretation of Theodotus' appropriation of Gen 34. Specifically, he argues that the thrust of Theodotus' re-interpretation is to underscore the importance of circumcision and the corresponding danger of intermarriage, and also to glorify the patriarchs, and that neither of these themes must be seen as deriving necessarily from an anti-Samaritan bias.

Perhaps the lesson to learn from this debate is how difficult it is to ascertain an author's ethnic identity from the supposed perspective reflected in that author's writing. Even if we concede that these brief poetic fragments portray the sons of Jacob in heroic terms and the Shechemites in negative terms, this does not necessarily imply that the author is *therefore* pro-Jewish and anti-Samaritan. As van der Horst, "Interpretation," 527, observes, "... the Samaritans of Theodotus' time, as Pentateuchal Jews, did not claim to be descendants of the Shechemites (who were all murdered), but of the Israelites left in the land at the time of the Assyrian exile, and of the priests who came back to teach the Assyrian colonists to worship the God of Israel (2 Kings 17). The Jews partly accepted these claims. The Shechemites of Hellenistic times can, therefore, easily be supposed to praise Simeon and Levi and to represent them as heroes who by their violent deed liberated the 'holy city' from its former wicked inhabitants. So Theodotus may have been a Samaritan author after all."

42. Ludwich, 3; Laqueur, 1959; Denis, 273 (though perhaps a contemporary of Philo Epicus whom he dates ca. 200-150 B.C.E.); Pummer, "Note," 177; Schürer, *History*, 562 (though "perhaps the time of John Hyrcanus").

Riessler, 1339, is clearly wrong in dating him in the first century C.E.

43. The case is most strongly argued by Bull, "Note," esp. 226-27; followed by Fallon, 788, "prior to middle of the second century B.C.E.," probably "at the end of the third century B.C.E. or beginning of the second century B.C.E." Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, 210, "probably dates from the early portions of the second century B.C."; Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).606-607, concede that his date is uncertain, but that he is probably a contemporary of Philo Epicus, ca. 200 B.C.E.; similarly, Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, 99. Nickelsburg, 125, though convinced by Collins (cf. below, n. 44) in other respects, is inclined to date Theodotus earlier than Hyrcanus, since similar reinterpretations of Gen 34, e.g. Jth 9 and *Jub.* 30, appear to predate Hyrcanus. Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 83-84, while disagreeing with certain features of Bull's analysis, nevertheless basically agrees with him that Theodotus writes at a time when the temple on Mt. Gerizim is still standing, hence the early part of the second century B.C.E.

44. Fallon, 788, notes the non-Homeric language Theodotus employs to describe the wall, which suggests that, at least in this instance, he may be describing a physical reality he had seen rather than an image born of poetic imagination. Cf. annotations, nn. 29-30.

45. This case is most strongly argued by Collins, "Epic," 102; restated in *Athens and Jerusalem*, 47-48; followed by Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 161; also *ANRW*, 111 (last third of first century B.C.E.); van der Horst, "Korte Notities," 106-107; *JHP*, 59.

46. In response to Bull, Collins, "Epic," 101,

notes the difficulty of dating precisely the neglect and eventual deterioration of the wall. He also observes that parts of the wall might still have existed even late into the second century; even so, memories of the earlier fortified wall might have informed Theodotus. Above all, he cautions against trying to correlate geographical descriptions in epic poetry too closely with physical realities.

47. So, Stearns, 100; Fallon-Yarbro, 40; Wacholder, "Theodotus," 1102; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.69, 89; Karpeles, 1.184, suggests the mid-second century during the time of Ptolemy Philometor (ca. 150 B.C.E.), noting the possibility (apparently) that this is the same Theodotus mentioned in *Ep. Arist.* 49.

48. This is the setting Freudenthal, 99, envisions for Pseudo-Eupolemus, and presumably for Theodotus as well, although he does not say so explicitly. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.89, seems to imply the same, since he treats Theodotus, along with Pseudo-Eupolemus, in his section on Jewish literature in Palestine. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 285, who defends the "Northern origin of Theodotus," suggests that Theodotus is actually a native of Shechem.

49. So, Collins, "Epic," 102.

50. So, Nickelsburg, 125.

51. E.g. Josephus *Ant.* 11.8.6 ¶¶ 340-45; 12.1.1 ¶¶ 7-10; 13.3.4 ¶¶ 74-79; also, generally, Schürer, *History*, 3(1).58-60; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 145-50. Fallon-Yarbro, 40, also note the discovery of Egyptian coins at Shechem.

52. E.g., Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 285.

53. Josephus, *Ant*. 13.3.4 ¶¶ 74-79; so Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 161.

54. Cf. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.65-78, esp. 70; so, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 161. Thus, as Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.707, remarks, there is "no reason to suppose that the authors (Philo Epicus and Theodotus) were members of a Samaritan colony of Alexandria."

55. A possibility allowed, e.g. by Fallon-Yarbro, 40; Schürer, *History*, 3(1).562.

56. So, Fallon-Yarbro, 40; Fallon, 788; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 161-62; *ANRW*, 111; Schürer, *History*, 3(1).562.

57. In analyzing the language, style, and meter, Ludwich, 5-8, adduces a number of Homeric parallels. Gifford, 4.307-309, advances beyond Ludwich by providing well-chosen Homeric parallels and a few references to other classical texts. Fallon-Yarbro draw on Ludwich and Gifford, but add many others, especially from the Hellenistic epic poets; consequently, they conclude, 13, "It seems then that in terms of diction, versification, morphology, and style, Theodotus' work is closest to Homer, and was probably written with the Homeric epics as a direct model." Pummer-Roussel, "Note," provide a thorough analysis of Frg. 7 in light of Homeric parallels. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 362-65, incorporate many parallels noticed by earlier scholars but adduce other carefully selected ones, especially from Homer and the Hellenistic epic tradition.

58. So, Fallon-Yarbro, 15, "... there is no

indication of usage of the LXX"; followed by Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 156; cf. annotations, nn. 3, 35-36 (esp. cf. orthography of proper names in LXX), 45, 46, 54, 68, 78.

59. E.g., Frg. 3, lines 8-9 (cf. annotations, n. 53); Frg. 3, lines 11-12 (cf. annotations, nn. 57-58); Frg. 3, lines 13-14 (cf. annotations, nn. 59-61); Frg. 4, line 22 (cf. annotations, n. 90); Frg. 5, line 5 (cf. annotations, nn. 97-98). Perhaps the single most graphic instance is Frg. 8, lines 6-17 (cf. annotations, nn. 132-47), where Theodotus renders the slaughter of Hamor and Shechem by Simeon and Levi in thoroughly Homeric fashion. Certainly, Frg. 7, lines 4-7, is another striking instance where Theodotus echoes Homer (analyzed by Pummer-Roussel, "Note,"), but it is not a clear case of taking a specific LXX motif or image and recasting it into Homeric style (cf. annotations, nn. 123-129).

60. E.g., Frg. 6, line 4 (cf. annotations, n. 106); Frg. 6, line 5 (cf. annotations, nn. 107-108); Frg. 8, lines 1-3 (cf. annotations, n. 131); Frg. 8, lines 18-19 (cf. annotations, nn. 148-49). Fallon-Yarbro, and Fallon, 785, closely analyze the language used by Polyhistor in his summaries as compared with that in the quotations directly cited from Theodotus. They demonstrate that the summaries are cast, for the most part, in the language and style of Hellenistic prose, while the direct quotations retain poetic language and style. Accordingly, they argue convincingly that Polyhistor has transmitted his source faithfully. Especially convincing is their analysis of Polyhistor's summary in Frg. 4, ¶¶ 4-5, where there is a conspicuously high percentage of non-Homeric terms (cf. annotations, nn. 71, 76, 77, 79, 80, 82); similarly, his paraphrase in Frg. 6 (cf.

annotations, nn. 110, 111), esp. his use of a prose term (λόγιον) for Theodotus' poetic term (μῦθος); cf. annotations, n. 113.

61. ὑδρηλός, 1.8 (cf. n. 10. In notes 61-63, 65-69, "n." refers to notes in the annotations, unless otherwise indicated.); ὑποτρέχω, 1.18 (cf. n. 30); νεηγενής (νειηγενές), 3.10 (cf. n. 56); τολυπεύω, 3.13 (cf. n. 59); κακορραφία, 3.15 (cf. n. 62); βλάπτω, 7.4 (cf. n. 123).

62. {αὐλῶπις}, 1.14 (e.g. αὐλός, αὐλών in LXX, e.g. 1 Sam 17:3; cf. n. 23).

63. κληΐς, Ion. for κλείς, 8.15 (κλείς 5x, "key," Judg 3:25; 1 Chr 9:27; Job 31:22; Isa 22:22; Bel 12; cf. n. 143).

64. Fallon-Yarbro are especially responsible for analyzing Theodotus' language and style in light of the Hellenistic epic tradition. I am indebted to them for many of the references to Apollonius of Rhodes, Callimachus, Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus. Indices and word lists used for checking these sources include the following: for Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, W. Wellauer, *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica. Index Verborum* (= pp. 191-307 of 1828 Leipzig ed., reprinted Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1970); for Callimachus, R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949-53); for *AnthGr*, A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965); *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); for other texts, J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925; repr. 1970);

H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Indices, also covering Powell, *CA*, by H. G. Nesselrath; Berlin/New York: Walter deGruyter, 1983).

65. δολιχός and ὁδὸς δολιχή, 1.9 (cf. n. 11); δρίος, 1.10 (cf. n. 15); λαχνήεις contr. λαχνῆς, 1.10 (cf. n. 15); ἄγχι, esp. with δὲ μάλ', 1.11 (cf. n. 18); διερός, 1.16 (cf. n. 25); ἄστυ, 1.16 (cf. n. 28); λισσός, 1.18 (cf. n. 30); ἔτης, 2.5 (cf. n. 39); ἀτειρής (ἀτειρός) *v.l.*, 2.6 (cf. n. 41); φώς, 2.6 (cf. n. 41); ἱκνέομαι, 3.5 (cf. n. 44); δριμύς, 3.7 (cf. n. 50); ἐνιπή, 3.7 (cf. n. 50); αὐτοκασίγνητος, 3.8 (cf. n. 51); πρόφρων, esp. with ὑποδέχεσθαι, 3.8 (cf. n. 52); δόμονδε, 3.8 (n. 53); κούρη, Ionic for κόρη, 3.11, 18 (cf. nn. 57, 67); ὁπλοτάτης, 3.12 (cf. n. 57); τελέθω, 3.12 (n. 58); λέχος, 3.13 (cf. n. 60); προγενεστερός, 3.14 (cf. n. 61); περικαλλής, 3.18 (cf. n. 68); ἀμύμων, 3.19 (n. 70); τεύχω (τέτυκται as = εἶναι), 4.19 (cf. n. 86); νυός, 4.20 (cf. n. 89); δῖος, 5.2 (cf. n. 94); ἀστεμφής, 5.6 (cf. n. 100); τίω, 7.4 (cf. n. 125); βλώσκω, 7.5 (cf. n. 126); ἐσθλός, 7.5 (cf. n. 127); λοίγιος, 7.7 (cf. n. 129); ὀρούω, 8.6 (cf. n. 132); δειρή, 8.8 (cf. n. 135); ἀσπαίρω *v.l.*, 8.10 (cf. n. 137); μένος, 8.12 (cf. n. 139); ἄσχετος, 8.12 (cf. n. 139); ἄσπετος, 8.14 (cf. n. 142); δέμας, 8.16 (cf. n. 146).

66. ἄγχι, 1.11 (in LXX with compounds, e.g. ἀγχιστεύειν; cf. n. 18); ἀτραπιτός, 1.14 (ἀτραπός 7x, e.g. Judg 5:6 + vss; cf. n. 21); ἀραιός, 1.14 (Ps 81 [82]:3 Aq.; Prov 10:15 Th; cf. n. 22); ὑπώρεια, 1.18 (Josh 15:33 Al; cf. n. 30); εὐρύς, 2.5 (εὐρύς 3x in different sense; cf. below, n. 67; εὖρος freq., cf. n. 38); κελαδέω, esp. with ποταμός, 3.6 (κελαδεῖν Aq Isa 49:13; 52:9; 54:1; 55:12; cf. n. 48); ὑποδέχεσθαι, 3.8 (Tob 7:7 [BA] 8 [S]; Jth 13:13; 1 Macc 16:15; 4 Macc 13:17; cf. n.

52); *δόμος v.l.*, 3.8 (1 Esdr 6:24; 2 Esdr 6:4; cf. n. 53; *ἐπιμαίομαι*, 3.12 (*μαιοῦσθαι* 3x, esp. Job 38:8 + 3x in vss; cf. n. 58); *οὐρανόθεν*, 5.3 (4 Macc 4:10; cf. n. 96); *μῦθος*, 6.12 (Wis 17:4; Sir 20:19; *μυθολόγος* in Bar 3:23; cf. n. 117); *θέμις*, 7.6 (2 Macc 6:20; 12:14; cf. n. 128); *χαίτη*, 8.13 (Sm. Job 18:16; Ps. 79 (80):12; cf. n. 140); *στέρνον*, 8.16 (Sir 26:18; cf. n. 145).

What is remarkable about these terms, for the most part, is how infrequently they occur in LXX. In several instances, they occur only a few times, and often in the later books or only in the versions. Thus, even when Theodotus' language seems to overlap with that of LXX, it does so only at the fringes. His language world seems far removed from that of LXX. Cf. next note, n. 67.

67. *εὐρύς*, 2.5 (Exod 38:4, 10, 24 *εὐρύς* = בית, "rings" for holding staves; *εὖρος* frequently; cf. above, n. 66; cf. n. 38); *κόρη* (*κούρη*) 3.11, 18 (LXX 8x, usually = אישון, pupil of eye; cf. nn. 57, 67); *μείγνυμι / μίγνυμι*, 3.16 (Gen 30:40; Exod 30:35; 2 Kgs 18:23; Prov. 14:16; Isa 36:8; possibly sexual connotations in Ps 105:35; cf. n. 63); *ὕβρις*, 6.5 (frequent in LXX, often = גאוה, "pride"; cf. n. 108).

With the exception of *ὕβρις*, these terms are notable for the infrequency with which they occur in LXX. In none of these instances is Theodotus centrally within the LXX thought world. Cf. previous note, n. 66.

68. *ἐρυμνός*, 1.12 (cf. 2 Macc 11:5; also 10:34; 12:14; cf. n. 20); *ὠρώρει*, pluperf. of *ὄρνυμι* as equivalent of *ἦν*, 7.7; 8.11 (not in LXX; cf. nn. 129, 138); *λαιός*, 8.9 (not in LXX; cf. n. 136); *σπαίρω*, 8.10 (4 Macc 15:15; cf. n. 137). Cf. Fallon, 787, n. 16.

69. *αἰγίνομος*, 1.7 (cf. n. 9); *πονέομαι* (in transitive sense), 1.10 (cf. n. 16); *ῥίζα* (in sense of "foundation"), 1.17 (cf. nn. 29-30); *κτηνοτρόφος*, 3.5 (cf. n. 46); *ὁμαίμος*, 3.16 (cf. n. 64); *ἐπίστρεπτος*, 3.19 (cf. n. 69); *ἀποσυλάω*, 5.5 (cf. n. 97); *πόσθη*, 5.5 (cf. n. 98); *οἰκήτωρ*, 7.4 (cf. n. 124). Cf. Fallon, 787, n. 17.

Of these, the following do not occur in LXX: *αἰγίνομος*, *ὁμαίμος*, *ἐπίστρεπτος*, *ἀποσυλάω*, *πόσθη*. Others occur, albeit infrequently: *κτηνοτρόφος* (Gen 4:20; 46:32, 34; Num 32:4) and *οἰκήτωρ* (1 Chr 4:41; Prov 2:21; Wis 12:3). *πονέω* and *ῥίζα* occur frequently enough, but Theodotus' particular use of these terms remains unusual.

70. Schürer, *History*, 3(1).562, "The linguistic form, quite different from Philo's, is simple, lively and clear"; similarly, Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).607.

71. E.g., Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 284, "Unlike Philo, Theodotus was a genuine poet ... perhaps the greatest writer of the Hellenistic biblical authors." In light of reassessments of Philo's poetic achievements, e.g. Atwell-Hanson, "Philo," 45-46 (cf. annotations on Philo Epicus, nn. 17-20), such claims for Theodotus' literary superiority may need to be more restrained; so, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 156.

72. Gifford, 4.307.

73. Fallon-Yarbro, 13, "Such an innocent imitation (of Homer) would have been impossible for any poet in the mainstream of Hellenistic literary life, and is an indication that in some sense Theodotus was on the fringes of that life." Or, as they observe, Theodotus may not have been writing for the general public but for a more limited audience, such as his

own Jewish or Samaritan community. On the Hellenistic epic tradition, cf. Fallon, 786-78; Ziegler, *Epos*; Lesky, *History*, 700-37; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.717-93. On Callimachus' independence vis-à-vis the earlier epic tradition, especially Homer, cf. J. Ferguson, *Callimachus* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980), 26-27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bull, R. J. "A Note on Theodotus' Description of Shechem," *HTR* 60 (1967) 221-27.

Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, 210-11.

Collins, J. *Athens and Jerusalem*, 27, 47-48, 51, 56 (n. 76), 58 (nn. 112-20), 59 (n. 127), 88, 100 (n. 36).

_____, "The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans," *HTR* 73 (1980) 91-104.

Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 11.

Denis, *Introduction*, 272-73.

Düntzer, H. *Die Fragmente der epischen Poesie der Griechen von Alexander dem Grossen bis zum Ende des 5ten Jahrhunderts nach Christus* (Köln, 1842), 94.

Ewald, *Geschichte*, 4.338; *History*, 5.260; 8.62.

Fallon, F. and A. Yarbro. "Fragments of an Epic Poem Attributed by Alexander Polyhistor to Theodotus." Unpublished seminar paper. Harvard New Testament Seminar. April 20, 1970. 41 pp.

Fallon, F., "Theodotus," in *OTP*, 2.785-93.

Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.707; 2.963, n. 101; 986, n. 202; generally, 1.553-674.

Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, 99-101.

Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3.50, 625; *History*, 1.517.

Grotius, H. *Annotationes in libros evangeliorum* (Amsterdam: J. & C. Blaev, 1641) 879; also *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum. denuo emendatius editae.* (9 vols., vol. 4, 1828; Groningae: ex off. W. Zuidema, 1826-34) 4.52-53 (comments on John 4:5).

Gutman, *Beginnings*, 1.245-61.

_____, "Philo," 36-63.

Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, 99.

Hengel, 'Anonymität," 242-43.

_____, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.69, 89, 266;

2.49 (n. 97), 61 (n. 250).
Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 2.520-21, 576-77.
Horst, van der, *Joods-hellenistische poëzie*, 51-57.
_____, "Korte notities over vroeg-joodse epiek," *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 39:2 (1985) 102-109, esp. 105-109.
Karpeles, *Geschichte*, 1.183-84.
Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 56, 83-84, 90.
Kuiper, K. "De Ezechiele Poeta Iudaeo," *Mnemosyne* N.S. 28 (1900) 240.
Laqueur, R. "Theodotos (21)," *PW*, 2. Reihe. 5A (1934) 1958-59.
Lloyd-Jones, H. and P. Parsons, "Theodotus," *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, 360-65 (Nos. 757-64).
Ludwich, A. *De Theodoti carmine graeco-iudaico*. Königsberg: Königsberg University, 1899. 8 pp.
Montgomery, J. A. *The Samaritans* (Philadelphia, 1907; repr. 1968) 13, 284-85.
Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "Theodotus the Epic Poet," in Stone, *Jewish Writings*, 121-25, 154.
Pummer, R. "The *Book of Jubilees* and the Samaritans," *Eglise et Théologie* 10 (1979) 147-78, esp. 174-75.
_____, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *HTR* 75 (1982) 177-88.
_____ and M. Roussel, "A Note on Theodotus and Homer," *JSJ* 13 (1982) 177-82.
Reicke, B. "Theodotus (2)," *BHH* 3 (1966) 1967.
Schlatter, *Geschichte*, 199.
Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).607.
Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.499-500.
_____, *History*, 3(1).561-62.
Stearns, 100-105.
Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.655.
Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 220-23, 283-85.
_____, "Theodotus," *EncJud* 15 (1971) 1102-3.
Walter, N., "Theodotos der Epiker," in *JSHRZ* (4.3), 154-171.

_____. "Theodotos," in *ANRW*, Part II. Principate (20.1), 110-12.

Wendland, P. Review of Ludwich, *Theodoti ...* *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 19 (1899) 900-901.

Ziegler, *Epos*, 20.

Select Bibliography on Samaritans

Bowman, J. *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity.* Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 4; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1975.

_____. *Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion and Life.* Pittsburgh Original Texts and Translation Series, 2; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1977.

Cohen, J. M. *A Samaritan Chronicle. A Source-Critical Analysis of the Life and Times of the Great Samaritan Reformer, Baba Rabbah.* Studia Post-Biblica, 30; Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Gall, A. F. von (ed.). *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner.* Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1918.

Gaster, M. *The Asatir. The Samaritan Book of the 'Secrets of Moses.'* London/Leipzig: The Oriental Translation Fund, New Series 26, 1927. Pp. 9-42.

_____. *The Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions. Vol. I: Samaritan Eschatology.* London: Search Publishing Co., 1932.

_____. *The Samaritans. Their History, Doctrines, and Literature.* The Schweich Lectures, 1923; London: The British Academy, 1925.

Kippenberg, H. G. *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 30; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971. Pp. 80-85.

Lowy, S. *The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis*. Studia Post-Biblica, 28; Leiden: Brill, 1977.

MacDonald, J. (ed. and trans.). *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah*. 2 vols.; vol. I (text) and vol. II (translation); *BZAW*, 84; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963.

_____. *The Samaritan Chronicle No. II*. *BZAW*, 107; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.

_____. *The Theology of the Samaritans*. London: SCM Press, 1964.

Montgomery, J. A. *The Samaritans. The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature*. Philadelphia: J. C. Winston, 1907; repr. New York: KTAV, 1968.

Pummer, R. *The Samaritans*. Iconography of Religions 23.5; Institute of Religious Iconography, State University Groningen. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Purvis, J. D. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. Harvard Semitic Monographs, 2; Cambridge: Harvard, 1968.

Thomson, J. E. H. *The Samaritans: Their Testimony to the Religion of Israel*. Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, 1919.

INDEX TO EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

Fragments One Through Eight

Frg. 1 - *P.E.* 9.22.1
Frg. 2 - *P.E.* 9.22.2
Frg. 3 - *P.E.* 9.22.3
Frg. 4 - *P.E.* 9.22.4-6
Frg. 5 - *P.E.* 9.22.7
Frg. 6 - *P.E.* 9.22.8-9a
Frg. 7 - *P.E.* 9.22.9b
Frg. 8 - *P.E.* 9.22.10-11

Source: Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.1-11.
Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 249-51; Viger, 426b - 429b.
Greek Text Used: Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, p. 512, line 11 - p. 516, line 10.
Editions: Steph., 249-51; Vig., 426b - 429b; Hein., 2.29-31; Gais., 2.385-90; Müll., *FHG* 3.217-19 (= No. 9); Migne, *PG* (21) cols. 721 B - 725 A (notes, cols. 1572-73); Dind., 1.493-96; Freu., (om.); Ludwich, 3-5; Giff., 1.536-39 (notes, 4.307-309); Stearns, 100-105 (= Frg. 1); Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, 512-16; Jac., *FGrH* 3.692-94 (= No. 732, Frg. 1); Denis, 204-207; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 360-65 (= Frgs. 757-64, corresponding to numbering system above).
Translations:
English: Giff., 3.457-59; Fallon, *OTP*, 2. 790-93 (= Frgs. 1-8).
French:
German: Riessler, 1263-65; notes, 1339 (Riessler's ch. 1 = ¶ 1; chs. 2 & 3 = ¶ 2; ch. 4 = ¶ 3; chs. 5-6 =

¶ 4-10; ch. 7 = ¶ 11); Walter, (*JSHRZ*, 4.3), 164-71 (Walter's Frgs. 1, 2, & 3 = *FHJA* Frgs. 1, 2, & 3; Frg. 4 = *FHJA* Frgs. 4 & 5; Frg. 5 = *FHJA* Frgs. 6 & 7; Frg. 6 = *FHJA* Frg. 8).

Dutch: van der Horst, *JHP*, 63-67 (Frgs. 1, 2, 3 = *FHJA* Frgs. 1, 2, 3; Frg. 4 = *FHJA* Frgs. 4 & 5; Frg. 5 = *FHJA* Frgs. 6 & 7; Frg. 6 = *FHJA* 8.

Fragment One (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.1)

ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΙΑΚΩΒ

(22.1) "Τὰ δὲ Σίκιμά φησι Θεόδοτος ἐν τῷ (1)
περὶ Ἰουδαίων ἀπὸ Σικιμίου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ λα- 426b
βεῖν τὴν ὀνομασίαν· τοῦτον γὰρ καὶ κτίσαι τὴν
πόλιν· κεῖσθαι δ' αὐτήν φησιν ἐν τῇ {περὶ}
Ἰουδαίων οὕτως·

''Η δ' ἄρ' ἔην ἀγαθή τε καὶ αἰγινόμος καὶ
ὑδρηλή,
οὐδὲ μὲν ἔσκεν ὁδὸς δολιχὴ πόλιν εἰσαφικέσθαι
ἀγρόθεν. οὐδέ ποτε δρία λαχνήεντα πονεῦσιν.
ἐξ αὐτῆς δὲ μάλ' ἄγχι δύ' οὔρεα φαίνετ' 426c
ἐρυμνά,
ποίης τε πλήθοντα καὶ ὕλης· τῶν δὲ μεσηγὺ
ἀτραπιτὸς τέτμηται ἀραιή {αὐλῶπις}· ἐν δ'
ἑτέρωθι

BION

1 ΘΕΟΔ. -- ΙΑΚΩΒ BON: om. I | 2 Σίκιμα ON: Σίκημα I: Σίκιμι B | 3 Σικίμου cj. Schmid-Stählin | Σικιμίου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ: Συχὲμ υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἐμμὼρ cj. Ludwich | Ἑρμοῦ: <Ἐμμὼρ> Giff. | 5 ἐν τῇ {περὶ} Ἰουδ. cj. Gais.: ἐν τῇ Ἰουδ. Giff.: ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδ. Wendland: ἐν τῇ † (libri numerus) Π. Ἰουδ. (ὁ τῶν Π.Ἰουδ.) cj. Jac.: ἐν τῇ Φερεζαίων περὶ Ἰουδ. cj. Seguier | 6 Ἰουδαίαν Ludwich | 7 ἥδ' N | καὶ ὑδ.: χὐδρηλή Lloyd-Jones | 9 ἔσκεν: ἔση ἐν B | 10 οὐδέποτε Grotius | πόθι cj. Ludwich | λαχνήεντ' ἀπόερσεν Grotius | πονεῦσιν: πονοῦσιν CF apud Ludwich; Düntzer Hein. | 11-18 ἐξ -- ἔρκος om. B | 14 ἀτραπίτῳ Seguier | τέτμητ' ἀραὴ Steph. | τέτμητ' {ἀραιὴ} αὐλωνιάς cj. Lloyd-Jones | {αὐλῶπις} Gais.: γλυφίς Ludwich | ἐν δ' ἑτέρωθι: ἔνθ' ἑτ. Ludwich: ἔνερθεν Grotius |

Fragment One[1]

Theodotus' Remarks Concerning Jacob

(22.1) "Now Theodotus says in his work *On the Jews*[2] that Shechem[3] received its name from Sikimius,[4] son of Hermes,[5] for this one also founded the city.[6] In his work *On the Jews*[7] he says that it is situated as follows:

'Now thus the land[8] was indeed fertile, browsed
by goats[9] and well-watered,[10]
Neither was it a long way[11] to enter the city[12]
From the country.[13] Nor[14] were there ever
dense thickets[15] for laborers.[16]
And out of it[17] very near[18] two mountains[19]
appear quite steep,[20]
Full of grass and trees. And between them
Is cut a path,[21] a narrow[22] hollow;[23] and on
the other side[24]

ἡ διερὴ Σικίμων καταφαίνεται, ἱερὸν ἄστυ,
νέρθεν ὑπὸ ῥίζῃ δεδμημένον, ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος
λισσὸν ὑπώρειαν ὑποδέδρομεν αἰπύθεν ἔρκος.'" 426d

BION

16 ἡ διερὴ Grotius: <ἡ διερὴ> Giff.: ἣ δ' ἱερὴ I: ἥδ' ἱερὴ ON (contra Jac. ἥδ' ἱερὴ IO): ἡδ' ἑτέρη CFG apud Gais.: γῆ διερὴ Ludwich | Σίκιμον Grotius | 18 λισσόν, ὑπώρειαν ὑποδέδρομεν cj. Jac. | ὑπ' ὤρειαν ON | <ὑποδέδρομεν> Giff.: ὑπὸ δ' ἔδρομεν I: ὑπο δ' ἔδρομεν ON: ὑπὸ δ' ἔδραμεν Steph.: ὑποδέδραμεν Grotius: δ' ὑποδέδρομεν Ludwich | αἰπύεν Scaliger apud Gais.: αἰπύον Grotius: αἴποθεν Lloyd-Jones |

Fragment Two (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.2)

(2) "Ὕστερον δέ φησιν αὐτὴν ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων κατα- (2)
σχεθῆναι, δυναστεύοντος Ἐμμώρ· τὸν γὰρ Ἐμμὼρ 426d
υἱὸν γεννῆσαι Συχέμ. φησὶ δέ·

''Ἐνθένδε, ξένε, ποιμενόφι πτόλιν ἦλυθ' Ἰακὼβ
εὐρεῖαν Σικίμων· ἐπὶ δ' ἀνδράσι τοῖσιν ἔτῃσιν
ἀρχὸς Ἐμὼρ σὺν παιδὶ Συχέμ, μάλ' ἀτειρέε φῶτε.'"

BION

1-6 Ὕστερον -- φῶτε om. B | 2-3 τὸν γὰρ ... φησὶ δὲ: τὸν δὲ ... φησὶ γὰρ cj. Jac. | 4 Ἐνθ. -- πτόλ.: ἔνθεν δ' ἐξενέποιμεν (-πωμεν ?), ὅθεν (ὅθι Lloyd-Jones) πόλιν Ludwich | ξένε: ξὺν Kuiper, *Mnemosyne* N.S. 28 (1900) 240 | ποιμενόφι (= ποιμένων) Mras: ποιμενόθι ION: ποίμνηθεν cj. Vig.: ποιμενόθεν Hein.: ποιμνιόφιν Kuiper | πτόλιν ON: πόλιν I | 5 τοῖς σίντῃσι cj. Viger | ἔτεσσιν c: Viger: ἔτης ἦν Ludwich: ἐπῆσαν cj. Lloyd-Jones | 6 Steph.: Ἐμμὼρ ION | ἀτειρέε Scaliger apud Gais.: ION (ἀτήρεε corr. Ludwich) |

16 The living[25] (city of) Shechem[26] appears,[27]
a holy city,[28]
Built below at the base (of the mountain),[29]
and around (the city) a smooth wall
Running (in) under the foot of the mountain,
on high, a defense enclosure.'"[30]

Fragment Two[31]

(2) (2) "Later, he[32] says, it[33] was occupied by the Hebrews[34] when Hamor was king.[35] For Hamor fathered a son Shechem.[36] And he says:

'From there, O Stranger, to the shepherds' city
came Jacob,[37]

5 To outstretched Shechem;[38] and over the men,
his kinsmen,[39]
Hamor[40] was the ruler, with his son Shechem,
a very stubborn pair.'"[41]

Fragment Three (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.3)

(3) "εἶτα περὶ ’Ιακὼβ καὶ τὴν εἰς Μεσοποταμίαν (3)
αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν καὶ τὸν τῶν δύο γυναικῶν γάμον
καὶ τὴν τῶν τέκνων γένεσιν καὶ | τὴν παρουσίαν 427a
τὴν ἐκ Μεσοποταμίας ἐπὶ τὰ Σίκιμα. εἶπε δέ·
5 ’’Ιακὼβ Συρίην κτηνοτρόφον ἶκτο καὶ εὐρὺ
ῥεῖθρον ’Εὐφρήταο λίπεν ποταμοῦ κελάδοντος.
ἦλυθε γὰρ κἀκεῖθι λιπὼν δριμεῖαν ἐνιπὴν
αὐτοκασιγνήτοιο· πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο δόμονδε
Λάβαν, ὅς οἱ ἔην μὲν ἀνεφιός, ἀλλὰ τότ’ οἷος
10 ἦνασσεν Συρίης, νειηγενὲς αἷμα λελογχώς. 427b

BION

1-5 εἶτα -- ἶκτο om. B | 2 δύο ON: δυοῖν I | 4 εἶπε δέ Mras: ἐπεὶ δὲ ION: εἰς δ’ Steph.: ὡς δ’ Ludwich | 5 ἶκτο Vig.: ἵατο I: εἵατο ON | 6 ’Εὐφρήταο om. B: ’Αφρήταο I | λίπεν I: λεῖπεν BON: λίαν Seguier: λίην Ludwich | 7 κἀκεῖσε Ludwich | 8 πρόφρων <δ’> cj. Jac.| δόμον δὲ Ludwich | 9 ὅς οἱ: ὅσοι N: ὅς τοι Ludwich: ὅς γ’ οἱ Steph. | ἔην Scaliger apud Mras: ἔτας BION | τότ’ οἷος B: τότ’ οἷος I: τόθ’ οἷος ON | 10 ἦνασσε MSS | νειηγενὲς Steph.: νεηγενὲς MSS: εὐηγενὲς Ludwich: ξυνηγενὲς cj. Lloyd-Jones: γαιηγενὲς Fallon |

Fragment Three[42]

(3) (3) "Then, concerning Jacob, his arrival in Mesopotamia, his marriage to his two wives, the birth of his children, and his arrival from Mesopotamia to Shechem, he said:[43]

'Jacob came[44] to Syria[45] rich in cattle,[46]
and the wide
Stream[47] of Euphrates he left behind, a roaring
river.[48]
For he also went there,[49] having left the
bitter rebuke[50]
Of his own brother.[51] Graciously did Laban
receive[52] him into his home--[53]
Laban, who was his own cousin,[54] but at that
time alone[55]
Did he rule over Syria, having acquired newborn
blood.[56]

τῷ δὲ γάμον κούρης μὲν ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν
ὁπλοτάτης· οὐ μὴν τελέθειν ἐπεμαίετο πάμπαν,
ἀλλὰ δόλον τολύπευσε καὶ εἰς λέχος ἀνέρι πέμπε
Λείαν, ἥ οἱ ἔην προγενεστέρη. οὐδέ μιν ἔμπης
ἔλλαθεν, ἀλλ' ἐνόησε κακορραφίην καὶ ἔδεκτο 427c
παῖδ' ἑτέρην, ἀμφοῖν δ' ἐμίγη σὺν ὁμαίμοσιν ᾗσι.
τῷ δ' υἱεῖς ἐγένοντο νόῳ πεπνυμένοι αἰνῶς
ἕνδεκα καὶ κούρη Δείνα περικαλλὲς ἔχουσα
εἶδος, ἐπίστρεπτον δὲ δέμας καὶ ἀμύμονα θυμόν.'"

BION

12 τελέειν Ludwich | 13 τολίπευσε Steph.: τολύπευσε corr. Viger | λέχος: λάχος I | 14 οὐ δέ Ludwich | 15 ἔλαθεν Steph. | 16 συνομαίμοσιν Lloyd-Jones | 18 Δίνα B | 19 ἐπίστρεπτον Hein.: ἐπίπρεπτον ON: ἐπίπρεπον B: ἐπίτρεπτον I | τε Lloyd-Jones: ἠδὲ Seguier |

And to him the marriage of his daughter he
promised, indeed committed
His youngest.[57] Yet he did not at all intend
for this to come to pass;[58]
Instead he wound a skein of wile,[59] and
to the marriage bed[60] sends to the man
Leah, who was his elder daughter.[61] Yet it did
not at all
Escape Jacob's notice; instead he perceived the
vile deed,[62] and took
The other maiden, indeed wed them both,[63] who
were sisters.[64]
And to him there were born sons,[65] exceedingly
wise in understanding,[66]
Eleven in all, and a daughter[67] Dinah who had a
very beautiful
Appearance,[68] a stunning figure[69] and a
noble heart too.'"[70]

Fragment Four (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.4-6)

(4) "ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Εὐφράτου φησὶ τὸν Ἰακὼβ ἐλ- (4)
θεῖν εἰς τὰ Σίκιμα πρὸς Ἐμμώρ· τὸν δὲ ὑπο-
δέξασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ μέρος τι τῆς χώρας δοῦναι.427d
καὶ αὐτὸν μὲν τὸν Ἰακὼβ γεωμορεῖν, τοὺς δὲ
5 υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ ἕνδεκα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὄντας ποιμαί-
νειν, τὴν δὲ θυγατέρα Δείναν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας
ἐριουργεῖν. καὶ τὴν Δείναν παρθένον οὖσαν
εἰς τὰ Σίκιμα ἐλθεῖν πανηγύρεως οὔσης βουλο-
μένην θεάσασθαι τὴν πόλιν· Συχὲμ δὲ τὸν τοῦ
10 Ἐμμὼρ υἱὸν ἰδόντα ἐρασθῆναι αὐτῆς καὶ ἁρπά-
σαντα ὡς ἑαυτὸν διακομίσαι καὶ φθεῖραι αὐτήν.

BION

1 Ἐφράτου B | 2 δ' Ludwich | 4 δ' B | 5 υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ ἕνδεκα: ἕνδεκα υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ B | τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὄντας om. B | 6 θυγατέρα om. B | Δίναν B | 7 Δίναν B | 8-9 βουλομένη B | 10 υἱὸν om. B | 10-11 ἰδόντα -- ἁρπάσαντα: ἰδόντα καὶ τρωθέντα ἁρπᾶσαι (!) καὶ B (καὶ superscr. B^1) | 11 ὡς: εἰς B | αὐτήν om. B |

Fragment Four[71]

(4) "And from the Euphrates,[72] he says,[73] Jacob came into Shechem to Hamor,[74] and the latter received him hospitably and gave him a certain portion of land.[75] Jacob himself was a farmer but his eleven sons were shepherds.[76] And his daughter Dinah and his wives worked in wool.[77] And Dinah, while still a virgin,[78] came to Shechem when there was a great festival because she wanted to see the city.[79] When Shechem, the son of Hamor, saw her, he loved her; and, seizing her as his own, he carried her away and raped her.[80]

(5) αὖθις δὲ σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἐλθόντα πρὸς τὸν (5)
Ἰακὼβ αἰτεῖν αὐτὴν πρὸς γάμου κοινωνίαν· τὸν
δὲ οὐ φάναι δώσειν, πρὶν ἂν ἢ πάντας τοὺς οἰ-
15 κοῦντας τὰ Σίκιμα περιτεμνομένους Ἰουδαΐσαι·
τὸν δὲ Ἐμμὼρ φάναι πείσειν αὐτούς. φησὶ δὲ 428a
περὶ τοῦ δεῖν περιτέμνεσθαι αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰακώβ·
(6) Οὐ γὰρ δὴ θεμιτόν γε τόδ' Ἑβραίοισι (6)
τέτυκται,
20 γαμβροὺς ἄλλοθεν εἴς γε νυούς τ' ἀγέμεν
ποτὶ δῶμα,
ἀλλ' ὅστις γενεῆς ἐξεύχεται εἶναι ὁμοίης.'"

BION

13 πρὸς -- κοινωνίαν: εἰς γυναῖκα B | 14 δ' B | φάναι δώσειν: φησι δοῦναι B | ἂν om. B | 14-15 οἰκ. τὰ Σίκιμα: ἐν Σικίμοις B | 15 περιτεμνομένους I: περιτεμομένους O: περιτεμο.μένους N: περιτμηθέντας B | 16-17 φησὶ -- αὐτοὺς om. B | 17 αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰακώβ I: ὁ Ἰακὼβ αὐτούς ON | ὁ Ἰακώβ: καὶ δὴ ὁ Ἰακώβ B | 20 καὶ ἄλλοθεν B | εἴς γε: ἠὲ Lloyd-Jones | γε νυοὺς Steph.: γενυοὺς ION: γένοιος B | τ' ἀγέμεν Mras: ἀγέμεν Steph.: τεταγμένη BON: τεταγμένης I | 21 ποτὶ Steph.: ὅτι BION | 22 γενεᾶς Steph. | ἔξ εὔχεται Düntzer apud Ludwich |

(5) And afterwards, when he came with his father to Jacob, he sought her as a partner for marriage.[81] But her father said that he would not give her until all those living in Shechem became Jews by being circumcised.[82] Hamor said that he would persuade them.[83] And he says[84] concerning the necessity of their becoming circumcised:[85]

(6) 'For indeed this very thing is[86] not allowed[87] for Hebrews

To bring home[88] sons-in-law and daughters-in-law from another place[89]

But only one who boasts[90] of being of the same race.'"

Fragment Five (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.7)

(7) "εἶτα ὑποβὰς περὶ τῆς περιτομῆς· (7)
'"Ος ποτ', ἐπεὶ πάτρης ἐξήγαγε δῖον Ἀβραάμ,
αὐτὸς ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν κάλεσ' ἀνέρα παντὶ σὺν 428b
οἴκῳ
σάρκ' ἀποσυλῆσαι πόσθης ἄπο, καί ῥ' ἐτέλεσσεν·
ἀστεμφὲς δὲ τέτυκται, ἐπεὶ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἔειπε.'"

BION

2-6 "Ος -- ἔειπε om. B | 2 ποτ' ἐπεὶ Ludwich: ποτ' ἐπὶ ION: ποθ' ἑῆς Steph. | ἐξήγαγε: ἐξή I | 3 κάλεσ' : κέλετ' Steph.: κέλεσ' C apud Ludwich |

Fragment Five[91]

(7) (7) "Then, further down, concerning circumcision:[92]

'That one[93] once, when he led the noble
Abraham[94] out of his fatherland,[95]
He himself from heaven[96] called the man with all his house
To strip off[97] the flesh from the foreskin,[98]
and thus he accomplished[99] it
And it remains unchanged[100] since God himself uttered it.'"[101]

Fragment Six (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.8-9a)

(8) "πορευθέντος οὖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ Ἐμμὼρ (8) καὶ τοὺς ὑποτασσομένους παρακαλοῦντος περιτέμνεσθαι, ἕνα τῶν Ἰακὼβ υἱῶν τὸ ὄνομα Συμεῶνα διαγνῶναι τόν τε Ἐμμὼρ καὶ τὸν Συχὲμ ἀνελεῖν, τὴν ὕβριν τῆς ἀδελφῆς μὴ βουληθέντα πολιτικῶς ἐνεγκεῖν· ταῦτα δὲ διαγνόντα Λευὶν τῷ ἀδελφῷ 428c κοινώσασθαι· λαβόντα δ' αὐτὸν συγκάταινον ἐπὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν παρορμῆσαι, λόγιον προφερόμενον τὸν θεὸν ἀνελεῖν φάμενον τοῖς Ἀβραὰμ ἀπογόνοις δέκα ἔθνη δώσειν. (9) φησὶ δὲ οὕτως ὁ Συμεὼν (9) πρὸς τὸν Λευίν·

Εὖ γὰρ ἐγὼ μῦθόν <γε> πεπυσμένος εἰμὶ θεοῖο·
δώσειν γάρ ποτ' ἔφησε δέκ' ἔθνεα παισὶν
Ἀβραάμ.'"

BION

1 τοῦ om. ON | 3 τὸ om. Steph. | 6 διαγνόντα om. B | τῷ ἀδελφῷ Λευὶν B | 7 κοινωνήσασθαι Seguier citing MS 465 (= B) | δὲ B | σὺν κατ' αἶνον I | 8 παρορμῆσαι: ὁρμῆσαι B | προφερόμενον: προσφερόμενον Steph. | 9 ''Αβραὰμ (!) B | 11 τῷ Λευὶ B | 12 μύθοιο Ludwich | γε Steph. | πεπυσμένος Steph.: πεπεισμένος MSS | 13 δέκ' ἔθνεα om. B: δὲ κ' Steph. (Viger n. b = δέκ') | 14 Ἀβραάμ B |

Fragment Six[102]

(8) (8) "Thus after Hamor came into the city,[103] and while he was encouraging his subjects to be circumcised,[104] one of the sons of Jacob named Simeon[105] decided to kill[106] both Hamor and Shechem since he was unwilling to endure civilly[107] the outrage[108] to his sister. In deciding these matters, he communicated with his brother Levi;[109] and in obtaining his assent,[110] he spurred him to action[111] by citing[112] an oracle[113] which said that God ordained[114] to give to Abraham's descendants ten (9) nations.[115] (9) Thus Simeon says to Levi:

'For well have I heard[116] a word of God;[117] For he once said that he would give[118] ten nations to the sons of Abraham.'"

Fragment Seven (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.9b)

(9b) "τὸν δὲ θεὸν αὐτοῖς τοῦτον τὸν νοῦν ἐμ- (9b)
βαλεῖν διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐν Σικίμοις ἀσεβεῖς εἶναι. 428d
φησὶ δέ·

'Βλάπτε θεὸς Σικίμων οἰκήτορας, οὐ γὰρ ἔτιον
5 εἰς αὐτοὺς ὅστις κε μόλῃ κακὸς οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλός·
οὐδὲ δίκας ἐδίκαζον ἀνὰ πτόλιν οὐδὲ θέμιστας·
λοίγια δ' ὠρώρει τοῖσιν μεμελημένα ἔργα.'"

BION

4 ἔτιον ON: αἴτιον BI: ἄατος Steph. | 5 κε ON: καὶ BI | μόλῃ BI: μόλει ON: μόλοι Giff. | κακὸς: καλὸς I | μὴν B | ἐσθλοὶ Ludwich | 6 οὐδὲ ... οὐδὲ: οὔτε ... οὔτε Ludwich | πτόλιν O: πόλιν BIN | θεμιστάς Viger | 7 λοίγια -- ἔργα om. B | τοῖσx I^{ac}: τοῖσι I^{1} |

Fragment Seven[119]

(9b) (9b) "God implanted[120] this notion in their mind because the Shechemites were godless.[121] He says:[122]

'God disabled[123] the inhabitants[124] of Shechem, for they did not honor[125]

5 Whoever came to them,[126] the low, not even the noble;[127]

Neither did they dispense justice nor enforce laws throughout their city.[128]

Their deadly deeds were their chief concern.'"[129]

Fragment Eight (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.22.10-11)

(10) "τὸν οὖν Λευὶν καὶ τὸν Συμεῶνα εἰς τὴν (10)
πόλιν καθωπλισμένους ἐλθεῖν καὶ πρῶτα μὲν τοὺς
ἐντυγχάνοντας ἀναιρεῖν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὸν
'Εμμὼρ καὶ τὸν Συχὲμ φονεῦσαι. (11) λέγει δὲ (11)
περὶ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως αὐτῶν οὕτως·

'"Ως τότε δὴ Συμεὼν μὲν 'Εμὼρ ὤρουσεν ἐπ'
αὐτὸν
| πλῆξέ τέ οἱ κεφαλήν, δειρὴν δ' ἔλεν ἐν 429a
χερὶ λαιῇ,
λεῖψε δ' ἔτι σπαίρουσαν, ἐπεὶ πόνος ἄλλος
ὀρώρει.
τόφρα δὲ καὶ Λευὶν μένος ἄσχετος ἔλλαβε
χαίτης
γούνων ἁπτόμενον Συχὲμ ἄσπετα μαργήναντα.
ἤλασε δὲ κληῖδα μέσην, δῦ δὲ ξίφος ὀξὺ
σπλάγχνα διὰ στέρνων, λίπε δὲ φυχὴ δέμας
εὐθύς.'

BION

1-8 τὸν -- οἱ om. B | 6 ὡς Steph. | 'Εμὼρ Steph.: 'Εμμὼρ ION | 7 αὐτὸν Steph.: αὐτῶν I: αὐτῷ ON | 8 ἀλλὰ κεφαλήν B | 9 χειρὶ BN | 10 ἔτ' ἀσπαίρουσαν Fallon | 12 ἔλαβε BI | 14 ἁπτόμενον γούνων Steph. | μαργήναντα B: μάργην ὄντα ION | 17 εὐθύς Steph.: αὖθις MSS: αὖθι Fallon |

Fragment Eight[130]

(10) (10) "Thus Levi and Simeon came into the city fully armed, first killing those whom they met, then murdering both Hamor and Shechem.[131]

(11) (11) With respect to their slaying of them he says:

'So then Simeon lunged[132] for Hamor himself[133]
And struck his head,[134] seized his throat[135]
with his left hand[136]
But let go as it gasped,[137] since another task arose.[138]
Meanwhile, Levi, with unbounded strength,[139]
grabbed (Shechem's) locks of hair,[140]
While Shechem, clutching his knees,[141] raged furiously.[142]
And he struck the middle of his collarbone,[143]
and the sharp sword pierced[144]
The internal organs through the breastbone[145]
and his life left his body[146]
immediately.'[147]

πυθομένους δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἑτέρους ἀδελφοὺς τὴν
πρᾶξιν αὐτῶν ἐπιβοηθῆσαι καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐκπορ- 429b
θῆσαι καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἀναρρυσαμένους μετὰ τῶν
αἰχμαλώτων εἰς τὴν πατρῴαν ἔπαυλιν διακομίσαι."

BION

ρ
20 ἀναρυσ. ON^{ac}: ἀναρυσ. N^{2}: ἀνερυσαμένους cj. Giff. |

And when the other brothers heard of their deed, they came to their aid and pillaged the city.[148] After they had rescued their sister,[149] they carried her with the captives to their father's house."[150]

ANNOTATIONS

1. This fragment and the following selections from Theodotus occur in a section treating Jacob (*P.E.* 9.21-22). In the section immediately preceding, Eusbeius treats Abraham (9.16-20; cf. discussion in Philo Epicus, annotations, n. 1), and in the following sections Joseph (9.23-24), Job (9.25), and Moses (9.26-29). In 9.21, Eusebius resumes quoting from Alexander Polyhistor's work *Concerning the Jews* and gives an excerpt from Demetrius that focuses largely on Jacob, although treating Joseph as well (9.21.1-9 = Frg. 2, *FHJA* 1.62-75). The Demetrius fragment concludes by discussing chronographical features of Israel's history from the time of Abraham until the time of Moses (9.21.16-19). Continuing to quote from Polyhistor (9.21.19), Eusebius now provides excerpts from Theodotus (9.22). Though they initially focus on Shechem (9.22.1-2), they also treat Jacob (9.22.3-4). More space, however, in both the Theodotus excerpts and Polyhistor's narrative summary, is given to the rape of Dinah by Shechem, the son of Hamor, and the subsequent revenge of Simeon and Levi (9.22.4-11). In the following section on Joseph (9.23-24), Eusebius continues to quote from Polyhistor, providing excerpts from Artapanus (9.23 = Frg. 2, *FHJA* 1.204-209) and Philo the Epic Poet (9.24 = Frg. 3, *FHJA* 2).

2. A similar title occurs in several of the authors cited by Polyhistor; cf. *P.E.* 9.17.2 (=Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.2; cf. *FHJA* 1.170) Εὐπόλεμος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων τῆς Ἀσσυρίας; *P.E.* 9.23.1 (=Artapanus, Frg. 2.1; cf. *FHJA* 1.204) Ἀρτάπανος δέ φησιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἰουδαίων; *P.E.* 9.25.1 (=Aristeas, Frg. 1.1; cf. *FHJA* 1.268) Ἀριστέας δέ φησιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἰουδαίων.

Because of the similarity in the form of the

title attributed to the different authors, it may have been Polyhistor's formulation rather than that of the respective authors themselves; indeed, it may have been a descriptive phrase rather than a formal title. Nevertheless, questions have been raised about the appropriateness of the title, given the content of the work, and whether a work entitled *On the Jews* could have been written by a Samaritan. So, Freudenthal, 99; Schürer, *History*, 3(1).561. Collins, "Epic," 94, however, insists that the title is "not implausible," especially if the scope of the work was broader, including the period of the patriarchs rather than focusing exclusively on Shechem. Bull, "Note," 224, observes (citing Josephus *Ant.* 9.14.3 ¶ 290-91; 11.8.6 ¶ 340) that Samaritans called themselves Jews when it was politically expedient. Cf. generally, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 155; Fallon, 787. The title is compatible with the later occurrence of Ἰουδαΐζω (assuming it is Theodotus' term) in Frg. 4, line 15 (cf. Ludwich, 7, n. 22).

It does not present the problematic features of the title that occurs later in the paragraph. Cf. below, n. 7.

3. The city (τὰ Σίκιμα) and the person (Συχέμ) are consistently differentiated in *P.E.* Their occurrences may be arranged as follows, with "T" indicating use in lines actually quoted from Theodotus and "AP" indicating Alexander Polyhistor's narrative summary of Theodotus:

τὰ Σίκιμα (or other inflected forms of the plural):

9.21.8 (Σικίμων) = Demetrius, Frg. 2.8 (cf. *FHJA* 1.66, line 15; also, 82, n. 13, which should be refined in light of the observations in this note)
9.22.1 (τὰ Σίκιμα) = Theodotus, Frg. 1, line 3 (AP)
9.22.1 (Σικίμων) = Theodotus, Frg. 1, line 16 (T)
9.22.2 (Σικίμων) = Theodotus, Frg. 2, line 5 (T)

9.22.3 (τὰ Σίκιμα) = Theodotus, Frg. 3, line 4 (AP)
9.22.4 (τὰ Σίκιμα) = Theodotus, Frg. 4.4, line 2 (AP)
9.22.4 (τὰ Σίκιμα) = Theodotus, Frg. 4.4, line 8 (AP)
9.22.5 (τὰ Σίκιμα) = Theodotus, Frg. 4.5, line 15 (AP)
9.22.9b (τοὺς ἐν Σικίμοις) = Theodotus, Frg. 7, line 2 (AP)
9.22.9b (Σικίμων) = Theodotus, Frg. 7, line 4 (T)

Συχέμ (Shechem, son of Hamor):

9.21.9 = Demetrius, Frg. 2.9 (cf. *FHJA* 1.66, line 24)
9.21.9 = Demetrius, Frg. 2.9 (cf. *FHJA* 1.68, line 3)
9.22.1 (v.l.; cf. below, n. 3) = Theodotus, Frg. 1, line 3 (AP)
9.22.2 = Theodotus, Frg. 2, line 3 (AP)
9.22.2 = Theodotus, Frg. 2, line 6 (T)
9.22.4 = Theodotus, Frg. 4.4, line 9 (AP)
9.22.8 = Theodotus, Frg. 6.8, line 4 (AP)
9.22.10 = Theodotus, Frg. 8.10, line 4 (AP)
9.22.11 = Theodotus, Frg. 8.11, line 14 (T)

This orthographical distinction is generally maintained in LXX, although both terms translate שכם. Both forms, however, can be used to designate the place. For example, in Judg 8:31; 9:1-3, 31, 34. 39, 41, 46-47, 57, in Alexandrinus the place is designated Σίκιμα, whereas in Vaticanus it is designated Συχέμ.

In 4 Macc 2:19 Σικιμίται is used to designate the inhabitants of the city in contrast to the more usual οἱ ἄνδρες Σικίμων (cf. Judg 9:2) or similar expressions.

On the etymology of Shechem, cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 16-17.

4. Because of the distinctiveness of this spelling (this particular form occurs only here), the transliterated form is retained in the translation. The chief critical question is whether this unusual name was actually used by Theodotus, and if so, why.

Given Theodotus' consistent use of Συχέμ, both in the lines of poetry attributed to him as well as in Polyhistor's narrative summaries of his work (cf. above, n. 3), Ludwich, 5, n. 2, conjectures that Theodotus originally wrote Συχὲμ υἱοῦ, which Polyhistor perhaps misunderstood and transmitted as Σικιμίου. In addition to noting the unsuitability of Σικίμιος for use with dactylic hexameter, Ludwich also observes that in none of the preserved fragments of Theodotus does there occur a Hebrew masculine name inflected by using Greek suffixes, as is the case with Σικιμίου. Ludwich is followed by Fallon-Yarbro, 16-17, who amplify his position, citing, e.g.,'Ιακώβ (Frg. 2, line 4;), Λάβαν (Frg. 3, line 9); 'Αβραάμ (Frg. 5, line 2; Frg. 6, line 14); Συμεών (Frg. 8, line 6); Λευὶν (Frg. 8, line 12).

Those who argue for the authenticity of the MSS tradition see Theodotus' use of Σικίμιος as intended to distinguish the early founder of the city from its later inhabitants Hamor and Shechem; cf. Fallon, 790, n. c on Frg. 1.

Actually, the authenticity of this proper name must be considered along with the following phrase, on which, cf. below, n. 5.

5. This translation renders the MSS reading generally accepted in the editorial tradition (so, Stephanus, Viger, Heinichen, Gaisford, Müller, Migne [=Viger], Dindorf, Ludwich, Stearns, Mras, Jacoby, and Denis [=Mras]). Even so, its authenticity has been disputed. How the textual problem is resolved determines the degree, if any, of syncretism one is willing to ascribe to Theodotus.

One possibility is to accept the MSS tradition and regard the phrase as Theodotus' own formulation. If so, he thinks of Sikimius as a figure of the distant past, to be distinguished from Shechem, son of Hamor, who flourished much later, and whose exploits are recorded later in the fragments. Moreover, he

identifies this otherwise unattested Sikimius as the "son of Hermes." If this refers to the Greek god Hermes, Theodotus would appear to be thoroughly syncretistic; so, Freudenthal, 100, who sees Theodotus as an example of "Samaritan Hellenism," similar to other Samaritan authors, notably Pseudo-Eupolemus and Cleodemus Malchus, in his willingness to incorporate Greek mythological elements into biblical history. Similarly, Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.499-500; *History*, 3(1).562. If, however, it is taken as an instance of Theodotus' "demythologizing euhemerism," it is probably a case of "soft syncretism" in which a Jew/Samaritan merely identifies an ancient Greek god or hero as an ordinary human being. So, Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.89. Another possibility, as suggested by P. W. van der Horst (in a private communication), is that the reference to Sikimius as the "son of Hermes" need not be seen as an indication of the author's syncretism at all. Rather, the author may have wanted to smear the Shechemites' reputation and did so "by stressing their leader's relationship with a pagan god."

Still another possibility is to regard the phrase as a textual corruption, at least in some sense, and therefore not as a genuine reflection of Theodotus' own views. If so, this would eliminate the one clear instance of suspected syncretism in Theodotus.

Specifically, Ludwich, 5, n. 2, conjectures that Σικιμίου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ may have been a corruption of Συχὲμ υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἐμμὼρ. Gifford, 1.536, perhaps following Ludwich's suggestion, at least partially, reads Ἐμμώρ, but brackets it as a conjectural addition; thus, ἀπὸ Σικιμίου τοῦ <Ἐμμὼρ>, explaining, 4.307, that "Ἑρμοῦ is apparently a mistake for Emmor, or Hamor, the father of Shechem (Gen 33:19)." The occurrence of the correct form Ἐμμώρ in Frg. 2, line 2, convinces Gifford that this must have been the term originally used by Theodotus, the weight of the MSS support for Ἑρμοῦ in Frg. 1, line 3, notwithstanding.

One way of accounting for the corruption is to attribute it to Polyhistor, who either intentionally or unintentionally altered the reading he found in Theodotus. So, Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 48: "The one apparent piece of syncretism, in *P.E.* 9.22.1, which states that Sikimos was son of Hermes, must be regarded as a blunder by Polyhistor, since the father's name is otherwise given consistently as Emmor"; similarly, "Epic," 102.

Besides the fact that the MSS tradition uniformly reads Ἑρμοῦ, the following considerations have been proposed in favor of authenticity:

(1) Relating biblical figures to mythological figures of the remote past, particularly in connection with founding legends, is characteristic of Hellenistic literature generally, and of Hellenistic-Jewish authors specifically; so, Schürer, *History*, 3(1).562, n. 76; also Fallon, 790, n. c on Frg. 1. Cf., e.g., Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.9; Frg. 2 (*FHJA* 1.174-77, 185-87, esp. nn. 30, 31, 38, 46, 47); Cleodemus Malchus, Frg. 1 A & B, esp. 1B.4 (*FHJA* 1.252-55, 258-59, nn. 15 & 17).

(2) Though Ludwich's suggested emendation is ingenious because of its formal similarity to the phrase preserved in the MSS tradition, it creates an inconsistency in the account: the city could not have been ruled by the father Hamor (Frg. 2, lines 2-3; also Gen 34:2) even before it was founded by his son Shechem (Frg. 1, lines 3-5). So, Schürer, *History*, 3(1).562, n. 76.

Other considerations, however, which make it unlikely that the phrase ἀπὸ Σικιμίου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ is directly traceable to Theodotus, include the following:

(1) Since Σικίμιος, with its three successive short syllables, would have been unsuitable for Theodotus' use in composing dactylic hexameters, it is not likely to have been his word. Cf. Ludwich, 5, n. 2; also, Fallon-Yarbro, 17, who also observe that

Theodotus "consistenly scans the first two vowels short in Σικιμων." Fallon, 790, n. c on Frg. 1, however, subsequently observes that the "name of the son could have been scanned Sikimios to fit epic meter."

(2) As noted above (n. 4), Theodotus consistently uses the uninflected form of Hebrew proper nouns ending with consonants. Thus, if the inflected form Σικιμίου is Theodotus' own formulation, it is an exceptional case.

(3) There is some evidence that persons mentioned in the biblical text were rendered by Polyhistor as Greek mythological figures. Especially illuminating is the way he changes Japheth (Ἰαπετός; cf. Gen 5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 9:18, 23, 27; 10:1-5, 21; 1 Chr 1:4-5; Jth 2:25) in *Sib. Or.* 3:10 to Prometheus (Προμηθέα) in Eusebius' *Chronicle*, section on the Chaldeans (cf. J. Karst, ed. & trans., *Eusebius Werke*, Bd. 5: *Die Chronik* [*GCS*, 20; Leipzig, 1911], p. 12, lines 10-16 = "Sync. 80,19"); for variations of the tradition, cf. *P.E.* 9.14-16; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.4.3 ¶¶ 117-21; Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 2 (=*FHJA* 1.176-77, 187, nn. 46-47). Cf. Freudenthal, 25-26, noting Eusebius' (and Josephus') dependence on Polyhistor in the *Chronicle*, and also providing parallel Greek texts of *Sib. Or.* and Syncellus' Greek version [ed. Dindorf, Bonn 1829, Corp. Script. histor. Byzant., p. 81] for comparison; also, Fallon-Yarbro, 17: "it seems clear that Al(exander) Poly(histor) is responsible for the identification of Ἐμώρ with Ἑρμοῦ."

(4) In none of the remaining fragments attributed to Theodotus do similar instances of syncretism occur. By contrast, such tendencies appear to be recurrent, or at least, more pervasive, in Artapanus, Pseudo-Eupolemus, and Cleodemus Malchus, that is, insofar as their fragmentary status allows us to generalize. If this is a case of Theodotus' syncretism, it is at least a conspicuous single instance.

If the MSS reading is authentic, the most likely

explanation is that Theodotus, in keeping with the Hellenistic epic tradition, has sought to enhance the ancient origin of the founding of Shechem by tracing its beginning to a remote figure of the past, Sikimius. Designating him the "son of Hermes" may be nothing more than the euhemeristic tendency of identifying mythological figures as ordinary human beings, yet the name Hermes still had its own aura and would effectively link the earliest history of Shechem with the primordial past. What made this association easy was the close verbal similarity between the names Theodotus found in the biblical text, Συχέμ and Ἐμ(μ)ώρ, and the otherwise unattested figure Σικίμιος and the more celebrated figure Ἑρμῆς. So, Schürer, *History*, 3(1).562; Fallon, 790, n. c on Frg. 1; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 164, n. d. On Artapanus' identification of Moses as Hermes, cf. *FHJA* 1.234-35, n. 55.

6. On the importance of foundation legends in Hellenistic literature, cf. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.513-14, 632 (esp. nn. 127-131 in 2.894-95), 775-76 (cf. nn. 416-424 in 2.1084); specifically, Apollonius of Rhodes *Foundations* (Κτίσεις), now lost, treating the founding of various Ptolemaic cities, most notably Alexandria, and Callimachus *On the Foundations of Islands and Cities* (Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων), also lost.

7. The change in the article from τῷ (line 2) to τῇ (line 5) in the MSS tradition has occasioned several suggested emendations. Gaisford's proposal that περὶ should be deleted, perhaps as an instance of dittography (cf. line 3) is adopted by Gifford; like Gaisford, Mras brackets it in the text as a conjectural deletion. This has the effect of making the phrase a reference to the location of Shechem, assuming that a word (e.g., χώρᾳ) has dropped out or is to be supplied; thus, "it is situated, he says, in

the land of the Jews" (cf. Mras, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 164, n. e; so, Fallon, 790). Similarly, Ludwich, 3, *κεῖσθαι δ' αὐτήν φησιν ἐν τῇ περὶ 'Ιουδαίαν*; also Seguier, *PG* (21) 1572, *ἐν τῇ Φερεζαίων περὶ 'Ιουδαίων* (cf. LXX Gen 15:20; 34:30).

The other interpretive possibility is that the phrase is to be understood as a second reference to the title of Theodotus' work. Accordingly, Wendland emends *τῇ* to *τῷ*, thus conforming the title to the form in line 2. Jacoby conjectures that the originally cited book number has dropped out, leaving the dangling *τῇ*. Cf. Philo the Epic Poet, Frg. 3 (= *P.E.* 9.24.1), *καὶ Φίλων ἐν τῇ ιδ' τῶν Περὶ 'Ιεροσόλυμα*. A similar variation occurs in the form of Artapanus' book title: *'Αρτάπανος δέ φησιν ἐν τῇ Περὶ 'Ιουδαίων* (cf. Frg. 3.1, *FHJA* 1.208 = *P.E.* 9.27.1), but, oddly enough, it has not received the same attention. Possibly, a feminine noun has dropped out, e.g., *συγραφή, σύνταξις*. Cf. *P.E.* 9.17.1, *καὶ ὁ Πολυΐστωρ 'Αλεξανδρος ... ὃς ἐν τῇ Περὶ 'Ιουδαίων συντάξει ...* (=Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.1, *FHJA* 1.170-71). This latter view is reflected in the translations of Gifford, 3.457; Riessler, 1263; and Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 164.

8. A feminine subject must be supplied with *ἡ* (unless the reading of N is adopted [*ἥδ'*], in which case the line would open, "Now there ..."), most likely, *χώρα* rather than *πόλις*, since the following lines clearly describe the surrounding countryside. So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 164, n. f; against Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 83.

9. *ἀγαθή τε καὶ αἰγινόμος*. Cf. Homer *Od.* 15.405-406 (Syria) *ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μέν, | εὔβοτος, εὔμηλος ...*

Strictly speaking, the paroxytone *αἰγινόμος* has an active sense, "feeding goats"; or, taken substantively, "goatherd" (*AnthGr* 6.221; 9.744 *ᾠγινόμοι* [Leonidas of Alexandria, 1st cent. C.E.]).

The proparoxytone *αἰγίνομος* has the passive sense "browsed by goats" (*AnthGr* 9.217 [Mucius Scaevola]). Clearly, the sense is that the fertile land provided abundant pasturage for goats. The term does not occur in Homer; though, cf. *Od.* 13.246 *αἰγίβοτος δ' ἀγαθή καὶ βούβοτος*. Cf. *LSJ*, 35; Gifford, 4.307; Fallon-Yarbro, 18; Lloyd-Jones & Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 363.

αἰγινόμος does not occur in LXX.

10. *ὑδρηλή*. Cf. Homer *Od.* 9.133 (*λειμῶνες*) *ὑδρηλοὶ μαλακοί*; also *h.Ap.* 41. Cf. *LSJ*, 1844; Gifford, 4.307; Lloyd-Jones & Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 363.

ὑδρηλός does not occur in LXX.

11. *ὁδὸς δολιχὴ*. Cf. Homer *Od.* 4.393 *δολιχὴν ὁδὸν ἀργαλέην τε*; also 4.483; 17.426; *h.Merc.* 86; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.602; *δολιχός* alone in *Arg.* 1.21, 568, 914; 4.150, 838, 1288; Callimachus *Epigr.* 13.2; *Frg.* 602.2. Cf. *LSJ*, 443.

δολιχός does not occur in LXX.

12. *πόλιν εἰσαφικέσθαι*. Cf. Homer *Il.* 22.17 *Ἴλιον εἰσαφικέσθαι*. Cf. Lloyd-Jones & Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 363.

εἰσαφικέσθαι does not occur in LXX.

13. *ἀγρόθεν*. Cf. Homer *Od.* 13.268; 15.428. *ἀγρόθεν* does not occur in LXX.

14. *οὐδέ ποτε*. Perhaps *οὐδέποτε* (so, Grotius), though preferably divided in Homer, sometimes with an intervening word, e.g., *Il.* 6.99; mostly with past tenses in Homer, e.g., *Il.* 1.155; 5.789. Cf. *LSJ*, 1269.

15. *δρία λαχνήεντα*. Literally, "woolly or shaggy thickets"; Gifford, 3.457, "leafy copse"; Fallon, 790, "leafy woods"; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, "dorniges Gestrüpp." The phrase echoes the epic tradition.

δρίος, τό, "copse," "thicket" (*LSJ*, 449). Cf. Homer *Od.* 14.353 ὅθι τε δρίος ἦν πολυανθεός ὕλης; also *Od.* 6.106 *v.l.* ἀγρόμεναι παίζουσιν ἀνὰ δρία παιπαλόεντα Megaclides; Hesiod *Op.* 530 ἀνὰ δρία βησσήεντα; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.970 κατὰ δρία; Anonymus *Saltus Montanus* (*CA*, 185, No. 7.3); not in LXX.

λαχνήεις, "woolly," "hairy," "shaggy" (*LSJ*, 1033). Cf. Homer *Il.* 24.451 λαχνήεντ' ὄροφον λειμωνόθεν ἀμήσαντες; *Il.* 2.743; 18.415; also 9.548; 24.451; Callimachus *Aet.* 1, *Fr.* 24.2; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.1312 ὕψι δὲ λαχνῆέν τε κάρη; not in LXX. On its inflection, cf. Smyth, ¶ 299D. Cf. Gifford, 4.307.

16. "Laborers" renders πονεῦσιν, from πονέω, πονέομαι (frequent in Homer, though not in a transitive sense; cf. Fallon, 787, n. 17), "to work hard," "toil," "labor." Taken intransitively, the sense is "those who labor," in which case the "dense thickets" appear not to be a hindrance to laborers, or farmers; that is, the land was clear; so, Ludwich, 6, n. 4, "Die Feldarbeit wird durch kein Gebüsch beeinträchtigt." Similarly, Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 83, "Und kein dichtes Gebüsch macht je Schwierigkeiten." Taken transitively, the sense is "afflict," "distress," or as Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 512, proposes "machen Mühe" (followed by Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 165; also cf. Riessler, 1263) in which case an indirect object has to be supplied, e.g., the wanderer or traveller. Fallon, 790, "nor even leafy woods for the weary." Cf. *LSJ*, 1447; similarly, Gifford, 3.457, "no leafy copse the weary wanderer found." This latter sense Ludwich, 6, n. 4, regards as entirely wrong.

Fallon-Yarbro, 19, 42, take πονεῦσιν as a transitive verb: "Nor did downy trees ever cause toil."

As to the form, πονέω would ordinarily contract to πονοῦσιν; hence the reading in CF apud Ludwich; cf.

app. crit.

Grotius' conjecture ἀπόερσεν has the advantage of being a Homeric form (cf. *Il.* 6.348; 21.283, 329; so, *LSJ*, 198), and would apparently yield something like "never did dense thickets (or leafy woods) have to be swept away, i.e., cleared." Ludwich, 6, n. 4, however, regards the conjecture as completely unnecessary.

Cf. LXX Prov 16:26; Sir 11:11.

17. I.e., the land, assuming χώρα, or a similar feminine noun, is supplied with ἡ in line 7. Cf. above n. 8. So, Gifford, 3.457, "Yet from it (the land) ..."

18. δὲ μάλ' ἄγχι. "and close beside." Cf. Homer *Il.* 5.570; 24.126; *Od.* 6.56; *h.Apoll.* 246, 378; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.294 ἄγχι μάλ'.

ἄγχι, frequent in Homer (*Il.* 5.185 *al.*; *Od.* 4.370 *al.*), also frequent in Apollonius of Rhodes, the poetic adverb of place, "near," frequently used with the genitive, which sometimes precedes (e.g., *Il.* 8.117; cf. *LSJ*, 16), is to be taken with ἐξ αὐτῆς; thus, Fallon-Yarbro, 42, "very close to the city"; similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165; Fallon, 790, "very close by the city." Conceivably the sense is "very near each other" and is to be taken with the following phrase "two mountains."

ἄγχι does not occur in LXX, although compounds, esp. ἀγχιστεύειν, occur; e.g., Ruth 3:13; 4:4.

19. Clearly, Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim. Cf. Grotius, 879; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, n. k; Fallon, 790, n. e on Frg. 1. Lloyd-Jones & Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 363, note LXX Gen 12:8.

20. Ἐρυμνός, of hills, "steep," "sheer," e.g., Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.514-15 ἀμφί τ' ἐρυμνὴν | Ὄθρυν; Callimachus *Hym. Del.* 4.23 κεῖναι μὲν πύργοισι περισκεπέεσσιν ἐρυμναί; Simias (*CA*, 109; No. 1.7, 11). The term does not occur in Homer. Cf. *LSJ*, 693;

Fallon-Yarbro, 19.
Cf. LXX 2 Macc 11:5 R; ἐρυμνότης, "strength," 10:34; 12:14.

21. Ἀτραπιτός, from ἀτραπίζω, "go through," "traverse," hence "path," though usually ἀτραπός. Cf. *Od.* 13.195; 17.234 (ἀταρπιτός; also *Il.* 18.565); Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.123, 1173; Callimachus *Hym. Del.* 4.74; Rhianus (*CA*, 10, No. 1.15; 20, No. 72.1); Archimelus (*SH*, 79, No. 202.8). Cf. *LSJ*, 272.
ἀτραπιτός does not occur in LXX; ἀτραπός, as "path," cf. Judg 5:6; Job 19:8; 24:13; Prov 7:25; Sir 5:9; also Wis 5:10.

22. ἀραιή. Cf. Homer *Od.* 10.90 ἀραιὴ δ' εἴσοδός ἐστιν; *Il.* 16.161; 18.411; 20.37; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.762 ἀραιὰς ἶνας. Cf. *LSJ*, 233.
Cf. LXX Ps 81 (82):3 Aq; Prov 10:15 Aq, Th.

23. αὐλῶπις. *LSJ*, 277, "in *Iliad* always epithet of τρυφάλεια, helmet *with a tube-like opening* between the cheek-pieces." Cf. *Il.* 5.182; 11.353; 13.530; 16.795 (LCL: "crested [helm]"); also Sophocles, *Fr.* 727; for a discussion of the meaning of αὐλός, αὐλών, etc., cf. Athenaeus 5.189c. The term does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes, Callimachus, or other texts in Lloyd-Jones & Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* Nor does it occur in LXX, although cognate forms, e.g., αὐλός, αὐλών, do occur, e.g., 1 Chr 10:7 *etc.*
Because αὐλῶπις extends the meter, Gaisford proposes its deletion, and is followed by Mras, Jacoby, Denis; hence omitted in the translation of Fallon-Yarbro, 19, 42; Fallon, 790. Ludwich, 6, n. 5, rehearses Gaisford's listing of the textual evidence (τέτμητ' ἀραὴ as read in the vulgate beginning with Stephanus; τἐτμηται ἀραιὴ in CFGI; τ. ἀραιὴ in D; τἐτμηται ἀ. in E) and notes his proposed emendation (and its acceptance by Dindorf and Müller), observing rightly, however, that the various readings alter the

form of τέτμηται and ἀραιή while apparently retaining αὐλῶπις. He also observes that if one deletes αὐλῶπις, the final vowel of ἀραιή is in hiatus. Accordingly, he proposes as the original reading γλυφίς, "*notched end* of the arrow," perhaps "groove" (cf. Homer *Il.* 4.122; *Od.* 21.419; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.282; so *LSJ*, 353), suggesting further that over it was written the gloss αὐλών, "hollow," perhaps to clarify that the notch was a "trench." Accordingly, a later copyist could understandably have combined αὐλών and γλυφίς, thus producing αὐλῶπις. Apparently acknowledging the force of Ludwich's observations, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, notes the lacuna with an ellipsis: "ein schmaler Pfad [...] gebahnt."

In any case, Theodotus appears to be describing the narrow passageway running between Ebal and Gerizim. So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, n. 1.

24. ἐν δ' ἑτέρωθι. Ludwich's proposal ἔνθ' ἑτέρωθι, "thither on the other side," has the merit of removing the otherwise intrusive ἐν; though, cf. *v.l.* ἐκ δ' ἑτέρωθεν in Theocritus 22.91; so, *LSJ*, 703. Cf. *Od.* 12.235; ἑτέρωθι in later prose, e.g., Julian *Or.* 2.69a. Grotius' emendation ἔνερθεν (influenced perhaps by the occurrence of νέρθεν in line 17), "from beneath," "up from below," or simply "beneath," "below," e.g., "in the vale below" (Euripides *Ba.* 752; cf. Sophocles *Ph.* 20), significantly alters the sense (cf. the critique of Grotius in Ludwich, 6, n. 6). This would suggest that the city lies at the base of one of the mountains. Bull, "Note," 222, however, observes that "'on the other side' (of the high point of the pass between the two mountains), seems a more accurate translation and more in line with the Homeric mode of observation. This assumes that Shechem was observed by one travelling from west to east through the pass and who upon arriving at the watershed of the pass was able to observe the city below him and to the east of him. In point of fact, the city can be clearly

observed from either perspective."

Fallon, 790, n. g on Frg. 1, observes that the "consistent perspective from which the entire scene is described seems to be the encampment of Jacob before Shechem as in Gen 33:18-20." He renders ἐν δ' ἑτέρωθι as "on one side," as a rough equivalent of "elsewhere," or "in another quarter," because normally it is used antithetically with ἔνθεν; thus, ἔνθεν μὲν .. ἑτέρωθι δὲ, "on the one side ... and on the other side"; e.g., Homer *Od.* 12.235; cf. *LSJ*, 566; Fallon-Yarbro, 19.

Cf. LXX 4 Macc 6:4 ἑτέρωθεν.

25. ἡ διερή. The translation here renders Mras's text, which accepts Grotius's proposal to emend the MSS tradition (ἣ δ' ἱερὴ in I and ἥδ' ἱερὴ in ON) to ἡ διερή. Not only were ἡ δὲ and ἥδε unsuitable, but ἱερὴ was thought to be redundant because of the occurrence of ἱερὸν ἄστυ in the same line; so, Gifford, 4.307; Fallon-Yarbro, 20.

The term διερή, from διερός, -ά, -όν, "alive," "active," rare in Homer (cf. *Od.* 6.201; also 9.43), suggests a "bustling" Shechem (cf. *LSJ*, 425); so, Fallon, 790; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, "<die lebensvolle> (Stadt)"; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 83, "das lebendige Sichem."

There is another possibility. Since the term, especially after Homer, was used in the sense of "wet," "liquid" (Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.184; 2.1099; 4.1457; Callimachus *Hec.* Frg. 239; cf. *LSJ*, 425 [II]), the phrase may mean "watery"; hence, Gifford, 3.457: "mid sparkling streams," citing Plutarch *Moral.* 735 E ἢ διερὸν ὡς μυρσίνη καὶ κιττός; *Moral.* 951 B ἀέρος διεροῦ; also Pindar *Paean* 9, *Fr.* 44.17-18 νότιον θέρος ὕδατι ζακότῳ ῥέον (διερόν Scaliger); Aeschylus *Eumen.* 263 (αἷμα) τὸ διερὸν πέδοι χύμενον οἴχεται; Hesychius διερόν· ὑγρόν· χλωρόν. However, Bull, "Note," 223, objects that this is both redundant (cf. ὑδρηλή in line 8) and archaeologically

unsupportable. Also worth noting is Hesychius' full entry: *διερόν· ὑγρον. χλωρόν. ζωόν. ἔναιμον· ὑγρὸς γὰρ ὁ ζῶν, ὁ δὲ νεκρὸς ἀλίβας* (Aeschylus, *Eum.* 263).

διερός does not occur in LXX. As to the form of the adjective, cf. *AnthGr* 7.123 (Diogenes Laertius) *διερῇ φλογί*; cf. *LSJ*, 425; Smyth, ¶ 286; also ¶¶ 30 & 218.

That the term was most fitting as a description either of the flourishing city or the verdant region is generally acknowledged; so, Gifford, 4.307; Wright, *Shechem*, 9-13; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, n. n.

How the textual problem is resolved may not be inconsequential, especially in deciding whether Theodotus was a Samaritan. If the MSS tradition is correct, even though redundant, and we are to read "the holy (city of) Shechem appears...," this might suggest more than a neutral attitude toward the city; in fact, the redundancy may reinforce the point. Collins, "Epic," 94, insists, however, that referring to Shechem as *ἱερόν* is not conclusive in deciding on Theodotus' identity, since the term "was commonly applied to cities in Homer and in any case Shechem was a holy site in the biblical tradition." Cf. further discussion below, note 28.

26. On the genitive plural form of *Σίκιμα*, cf. above n. 3. Taken as a reference to the city, the phrase is thus rendered by Fallon, 790, as "bustling Shechem"; or Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 83, "das lebendige Sichem." Alternatively, the plural form may refer to the inhabitants; thus, Riessler, 1563: "die Stadt der Sichemiten"; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165: "der Sikimer." Probably because of the problematic form of the genitive plural, Grotius emends *Σικίμων* to *Σίκιμον*, which, Ludwich, 6, n. 7, finds difficult to allow.

27. *καταφαίνεται*. Cf. Homer *h.Ap.* 431; Theocritus 7.11; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.1231; Thucydides 5.6.3.

Cf. LXX Gen 48:17.

28. Whether Theodotus understood *ἱερὸν ἄστυ* in the technical sense as a "sacred city," i.e., a religious center or shrine, or in the more ordinary sense as a "revered city," perhaps "splendid city," is a critical question, especially in identifying the author's ethnic status and determining his theological outlook. The former position is taken by Freudenthal, 100; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.499 (cf. *History*, 3[1].561); Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.655, who sees it as a claim equivalent in import to Pseudo-Eupolemus' description of Gerizim as *ὄρος ὑφίστου* (Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.6, *FHJA* 1.172-73, 183, n. 21); Montgomery, *Samaritans*, 284-85; Riessler, 1339; cf. Bull, "Note," 223-24.

By contrast, Ludwich, 6, n. 8, insists that Shechem is not depicted here as "eine *heilige* Stadt im religiösen Sinne," because *ἱερόν* is stock epic language frequently used to praise cities, e.g., Troy (Homer *Il.* 16.100 *Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα*; *Od.* 1.2 *Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον*), Pergamus (*Il.* 5.446 *Περγάμῳ εἰν ἱερῇ*), Athens (*Od.* 11.323 *ἐς γουνὸν 'Αθηνάων ἱεράων*), Sunium (*Od.* 3.278 *Σούνιον ἱρόν*); cf. *Il.* 4.103; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.505 *ἱερὴν 'Ηλεκτρίδα νῆσον*; 4.1139 *Φαιήκων ἱερῷ ... ἄντρῳ*; 4.1758 *Καλλίστη, παίδων ἱερὴ τροφὸς Εὐφήμοιο*; though, cf. 1.696, 1332; 4.1472. On *ἱερὸν ἄστυ*, cf. Nonnus *D* 13.77, 318; 5.85.

ἄστυ does not occur in LXX.

Similarly, Schmid-Stählin, 607; Fallon-Yarbro, 20; Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 84; Collins, "Epic," 94; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 157-58, 165, n. p; Fallon, 786, esp. n. 8; also, Schürer, *History*, 3(1).561, esp. n. 75; Gutman, *Beginnings*, 1.248.

In addition, Collins, "Epic," 95, notes the absence of any reference to the temple on Mt. Gerizim, or to the mount as "holy."

29. Literally, "from beneath under a base, or foundation, having been built," taking *δεδμημένον* as the perf. pass. part. of *δέμω*, "build," rather than of *δάμνημι* = *δαμάζω*, "overpower." Cf. *LSJ*, 378, 368; also Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, n. q. The translation here follows Bull, "Note," 226, who also observes, 224, that this description "conforms to the fact that the remains of Shechem are located on a low mound or shoulder at the base of Mount Ebal." As Fallon, 790, notes, "the use of *ῥίζα* in an extended sense to indicate the root or foundation of a mountain is a post-Homeric development"; cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 20; *LSJ*, 1570.

ῥίζα occurs frequently in LXX, but ordinarily in the sense of "root."

30. The difficulty of lines 17b-18 is clearly seen in their textual and editorial history. The basic interpretive question, of course, is how Theodotus actually depicts the wall. This, in turn, becomes an important consideration in establishing the date of Theodotus (e.g., Fallon-Yarbro, 21; Collins, "Epic," 101-102; also, cf. Introduction, discussion of date and historical setting).

At one level, the interpretive options can be presented and discussed as they relate to Mras's text, which we have adopted. Even if his text is accepted, however, the problem still remains difficult, both in terms of the overall syntax and how we understand particular terms. Before proceeding with our interpretation of Mras's text, it will be useful to rehearse the previous textual history.

Three elements of the text (as presented in Mras) have been problematic: 1) *ὑπώρειαν*, 2) *ὑποδέδρομεν*, and 3) *αἰπύθεν*.

1) *ὑπώρειαν*. As it stands, this acc. sing. form of *ὑπώρεια*, sometimes written *ὑπώρεα*, meaning "the foot of a mountain," "skirts of a mountain range," occurs in Homer (though mostly with gen., e.g., *Il.* 20.218 *ἔθ' ὑπωρείας ᾤκεον ... Ἴδης*; also *Epigr.* 6.5),

but also in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.380, and frequently in Herodotus (4.23; cf. 1.110; 2.158; 7.129, 199; 9.19, 25). Cf. LXX Josh 15:33 Al. Cf. *LSJ*, 1904. As an accusative, it can serve as the object of the preposition *ἀμφί* or as the direct object of *ὑποδέδρομεν*.

This form is accepted in the editorial tradition as early as Stephanus, although in later editions *ὑπ' ὤρειαν* is given as *v.l.* in ON (Gifford cites O, Mras cites ON). The phrase is difficult not only because of the apparent redundancy of *ὑπό*, given the reading in ON (and I) of the following phrase (*ὑπο δ' ἔδρομεν*), but also because of the unusual form of the noun. The latter is not listed in *LSJ*, 2037, except in connection with *ὠρεῖον*, the Cretan form of *οὐρεῖον*, "guard-house," "fort," where the following entry from Hesychius is listed: *ὤρεια· φυλακτήρια*. If the reading in ON is an early instance of this term, the phrase would likely be rendered "under the fort or guard-house," perhaps "under the (walled) fortress." But how this would relate to what precedes or what follows was not obvious. By contrast, *ὑπώρειαν* does make sense in the context, especially in light of line 17a. In the editorial tradition, no serious effort has been made to interpret these lines in light of the reading in ON.

From the app. crit. in Mras, it can be surmised that *ὑπώρειαν* is read in I (it belongs to a larger section omitted by B).

In a private communication, A. Wainwright has suggested tentatively that *ὑπώρειαν* might be emended to the adjective form *ὑπώρειον*, understood as nominative neuter singular, limiting *ἔρκος*. He notes, however, the rarity of the adjective, and wonders whether the change would in fact improve the sense of the passage.

2) *ὑποδέδρομεν*. This form of *ὑποτρέχω* (aor. - *ὑπέδραμον*; poet. perf. - *ὑποδέδρομα*; e.g., *h.Ap.* 284) can be variously rendered: 1) "run in under," - of one

who "ran in under the spear or sword and clasped his knees" *Il.* 21.68; *Od.* 10.323; thus, often militarily, to dodge a weapon; also, later with acc., e.g., Acts 27:16 *νησίον ... ὑποδραμόντες*, "run under the lee of..."; 2) "run under, stretch away under," e.g., *h.Ap.* 284 *δ' ὑποδέδρομε βῆσσα*; 3) "run in between," "intercept," to describe the movement of heavenly bodies, e.g., the moon "runs in between" the circle of the sun. So, *LSJ*, 1899. *ὑποτρέχω* does not occur in Apollonious of Rhodes and Callimachus; nor in LXX.

Since the textual tradition also involves certain forms of *τρέχω*, it might be useful to note its common forms: usually the fut. and aor. come from root *δραμ-*; hence, aor. *ἔδραμον* = common aor. *Il.* 18.30; *Od.* 23.207; pf. *δεδράμηκα*; poet. pf. *δέδρομα Od.* 5.412; 20.357. So, *LSJ*, 1814-15.

The MSS tradition, which uniformly reads *ὑπὸ δ' ἔδρομεν* (although the ultima of *ὑπό* is unaccented in ON), was early adopted by the editorial tradition, although Stephanus emends the verb to *ἔδραμεν*, thus conforming it to the more usual spelling of the second aor. form of *τρέχω*. The difficulty here, however, is the dangling preposition *ὑπό*. Conceivably, it can be related to *ἕρκος*, which would be understood as its object in the accusative, hence "under the enclosure or wall." Line 18b would then produce something like "... and it (?) ran from above under the enclosure." Another possibility, represented by Viger, *PG* (21) 722C, is to take *ὑπό* by itself, understand it adverbially, and relate it with *αἰπύθεν*, hence "infra supraque..." Either way, this stretches the syntax.

Grotius, *Annotationes*, is apparently the first to propose that the whole phrase should be collapsed into the single form *ὑποδέδραμεν*. Why he chooses to retain this unusual form of spelling is not stated. We can surmise that he simply emends the form of the text as it stood in Viger (or the vulgate), rather than that he is working with the actual MSS tradition. Nevertheless, his emendation has the merit of

supplying an appropriate verb form, even though we are not sure what its subject or object is. This emendation is also to be seen alongside Grotius' emendation of the following word (cf. below).

Once Grotius proposes his emendation, further refinements are then possible. Acknowledging Grotius' emendation, Ludwich not only proposes the more usual poetic perfect form *ὑποδέδρομεν* (citing Homeric precedent for the orthography), but also proposes that the form be preceded by *δ'*, which is typically the case in the Homeric passages he cites (*Od.* 5.412 *λισσὴ δ' ἀναδέδρομε πέτρη*; *Od.* 20.357 *κακὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν ἀχλύς*; *h.Ap.* 284 *κοίλη δ' ὑποδέδρομε βῆσσα*). Ludwich's proposal is accepted by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, who print <*δ'*> in their text. This has the effect of treating *ὑπώρειαν δ' ὑποδέδρομεν αἰπύθεν ἔρκος* as a single thought-unit; indeed, the effect is equivalent to Jacoby's conjecture in his app. crit., 692, that a comma be supplied after *λισσόν*, which broke the earlier pattern of supplying a comma after *ὑπώρειαν*, thus linking it with the preceding clause (so, Viger, Heinichen, Gaisford, Dindorf). Ludwich's emendation is reflected in the translation by Fallon, 790, which clearly separates the two clauses: "there was a smooth wall around the town; and the wall for defense up above ran in under the foot of the mountain"; also cf. Fallon, 790-91, n. j on Frg. 1.

Like Ludwich, Gifford, 1.536, also acknowledges his debt to Grotius, and emends the text to read *ὑποδέδρομεν*, although he brackets the form in his text as a textual addition. Mras, by contrast, while attributing the proposed emendation to Gifford (and not Ludwich), prints the form without brackets in his text.

3) *αἰπύθεν*. This adverbial form (*αἰπύς, -εῖα, -ύ* + the ablatival [locative] suffix *-θεν*, hence "from above," "from on high"; cf. *LSJ*, 789; Smyth, ¶ 342) poses a problem as early as Scaliger, whose emendation (*αἰπύεν*) is cited by Gaisford, 2.385, although its

source is not given (so noted by Ludwich, 6, n. 10). In a similar vein, Grotius, 879, proposes *αἰπύον*. In both instances, there is an apparent attempt to render the adverbial form into a more acceptable adjectival form, but neither corresponds to *αἰπύ*, the usual form of the acc. sing. neut. required to modify *ἔρκος*. Thus, as Ludwich, 6-7, n. 10, observes, the received text is perhaps formed on the analogy of *αἰνόθεν*, the adverbial form of *αἰνός*, "dread," "horrible" (cf. *Il.* 7.97; *LSJ*, 40; also *LSJ*, 789, s.v. *-θεν*, which indicates that the usual connecting vowel is o, e.g., *ἄλλοθεν*, *οἴκοθεν*, etc.). Accordingly, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons read *αἴποθεν*, from *αἶπος*, "height," "steep" (*LSJ*, 41). Nevertheless, Ludwich, 6-7, n. 10, insists that the received text, even though possibly transmitted inaccurately (thus perhaps originally *αἴποθεν*), is still preferable to the suggested emendations of Scaliger and Grotius.

The point is worth making since Bull, "Note," 225, while acknowledging that *αἰπύθεν* has an adverbial sense, "from the heights," nevertheless understands it adjectivally: "thus *αἰπύθεν ἔρκος* can be understood to mean a 'high or steep defense enclosure.'" As Fallon-Yarbro note, 21, Bull's translation "fits well the archaeological evidence but *αἰπύθεν* is not an adjective."

As will be noted later, the critical interpretive question here is whether the wall is conceived as extending down the side of the mountain, i.e., "from above," or "from the summit" (Gifford) to the base of the mountain below, or whether it is simply to be regarded as a "high enclosure," i.e., as an impressively high wall that surrounds the city. Clearly, the adverbial form in the received text suggests the former while an adjectival form, as proposed by Scaliger and Grotius, and as translated by Bull, suggests the latter image.

Neither *αἰπύθεν* nor *αἰπύς* occurs in LXX.

History of Interpretation. As the various

translations indicate, the editorial tradition has struggled to understand what is properly being conveyed in these lines.

1) Viger. The received text (= Stephanus) is represented in Viger's text in Migne, *PG* (21) 721C1, ... ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος Λισσὸν ὑπώρειαν, ὑπὸ δ' ἔδραμεν αἰπύθεν ἔρκος, with the accompanying Latin translation, 722C1: "Qua circum laevi consurgunt moenia saxo, | Atque infra supraque urbem munimine cingunt." (Viger's text is reprinted in Müller, *FHG* 3.217, with emendations by Grotius and Scaliger incorporated into the Greek text; the Latin translation is identical.) Viger's Latin translation may be roughly rendered as follows: "where around there arise defensive walls made of smooth rock, and also both below and above they surround the city as an enclosure (fortification)." Viger clearly takes ὑπώρειαν with the first clause (as indicated by the comma), and apparently renders it as "saxo." As noted above, he accepts the MSS tradition ὑπὸ δ' ... αἰπύθεν, renders it as "infra supraque," and apparently renders ἔρκος as "munimine." What remains puzzling, however, is how one should envision the defense walls encircling the city as an enclosure. In what sense are they both "above and below"?

As noted above, Viger's Greek text, with identical punctuation, is retained by Heinichen, Gaisford, and Dindorf.

2) Grotius. In *Annotationes*, 879, Grotius gives the following Greek text ... ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος | Λισσὸν ὑπώρειαν ὑποδέδραμεν αἰπύον ἔρκος. Although Grotius provides no translation, his text could perhaps be rendered "around the base of the mountain ran (runs) a smooth wall, a high enclosure."

3) Gifford. Advancing the earlier tradition, Gifford, 1.537, reads ... ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος | λισσὸν ὑπώρειαν <ὑποδέδρομεν> αἰπύθεν ἔρκος, which he translates, 3.457, "... around whose base | E'en from the summit runs the well-built wall." In his notes,

4.307, he notes Homeric echoes in the language used by Theodotus: λισσόν Homer *Od.* 3.293 ἔστι δέ τις λισσὴ αἰπεῖά τε εἰς ἅλα πέτρη (*LSJ*, 1054, cites this example, with the translation: "a *smooth* rock running sheer into the sea"; also *Od.* 5.412 λισσὴ δ' ἀναδέδρομε πέτρη [= 10.3-4 description of Aeolian isle πᾶσαν δέ τέ μιν πέρι τεῖχος | χάλκεον ἄρρηκτον, λισσὴ δ' ἀναδέδρομε πέτρη]; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.384 λισσῇ ... νήσῳ; also 4.922 Σκύλλης λισσὴ ... πέτρη). On ὑπώρειαν, Gifford, 4.308, cites Hom. *Il.* 20.218 Schol. ὑπωρείας· τὰ κάτω μέρη τῶν ὀρῶν.

Gifford acknowledges the MSS tradition, but taking his lead from Grotius, who had emended ὑπὸ δ' ἔδρομεν to read ὑποδέδραμεν, prints ὑποδέδρομεν in his text, bracketed as a conjectural addition. He also acknowledges the emendations for αἰπύθεν suggested by Grotius (αἰπύον) and Scaliger (αἰπύεν), but retains the MSS reading.

In his translation, Gifford apparently takes ἀμφί with ὑπώρειαν, hence "around whose base," renders αἰπύθεν as "e'en from the summit," ὑποδέδρομεν as "runs," and apparently ἔρκος as "well-built wall." It is not clear how he understands τεῖχος λισσόν. Or, if "well-built wall" renders the latter phrase, it is not clear how he understands ἔρκος.

Precisely how Gifford envisions the wall to have run is not altogether clear. On the one hand, it looks as if he envisions the wall encircling the base of the mountain, somehow extending "e'en from the summit." Yet, if "the sacred town" is the antecedent of "around whose base," his translation conceivably suggests that the "well-built wall" encircles the "sacred town," and in some undefined manner extends "e'en from the summit." Conceivably the latter phrase could refer to the summit of the town, or the hill on which the town stood, rather than to the summit of the mountain, in which case he would appear to be suggesting that the town is surrounded with a well-built wall that protects even the highest point of the town.

4) Mras. The text adopted by Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 513, is as follows: . . . *ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος | λισσὸν ὑπώρειαν ὑποδέδρομεν αἰπύθεν ἔρκος*. As already noted, Mras acknowledges in his app. crit. that *ὑπ' ὤρειαν* is read by ON; that ION read *ὑπὸ δ' ἔδρομεν*; that Gifford conjectures *ὑποδέδρομεν*, which he prints in his text without brackets. By omitting the comma, he leaves open the question how to take *ὑπώρειαν*.

In his app. crit. he also suggests the following translation: "ringsum läuft als Umfriedung eine glatte Mauer am Fuß des Gebirges hin von der Höhe her," which might be rendered as follows: "round about (all around) there runs nearby (along) as an enclosure (fence) a smooth wall at the foot of the mountain away from the top (summit)."

It is not altogether clear whether Mras envisions the wall encircling the city or the mountain. Perhaps his translation is intended to convey the ambiguity of the text.

5) Jacoby. Interestingly, Jacoby, 692, prints Viger's original text: ... *ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος | λισσὸν ὑπώρειαν, ὑπὸ δ' ἔδραμεν αἰπύθεν ἔρκος*. In doing so, he basically follows the MSS tradition, adopting *ἔδραμεν* over against *ἔδρομεν* in IO and retaining *αἰπύθεν*. As noted earlier, he does suggest that a comma be placed after *λισσόν*, and *ὑποδέδρομεν* be adopted, which would perhaps yield something like "and around (the city ?) a smooth wall; and there ran (runs) at the base of the mountain a lofty enclosure."

6) Bull. As Bull correctly observes, "Notes," 224-26, the previous attempts by Viger, Gifford, and Mras to render the lines are not entirely successful.

A basic question, according to Bull, is to decide where the *τεῖχος λισσόν* actually ran. He insists that a "smooth wall" cannot have run around the base of either Ebal or Gerizim, as Gifford's translation seems to envision, because both mountains were far too large. Moreover, he observes that no archaeological remains of such a wall around the base of either

mountain have been found, nor that there is any archaeological evidence on either mountain that a wall ran from the summit down to the city, which Gifford seems to imagine. Even if so, he asks what purpose it would have served. He does acknowledge, however, that Neapolis coins from the 2nd-3rd cent. C.E. do show steps running up the side of Gerizim to its summit.

What Bull does find significant archaeologically, however, are the remains of *Tell Balatah*, specifically "the wall which runs around the ruins of the city of Shechem. This massive 'Cyclopean' structure which has formed part of the defense perimeter about Shechem at almost every stage of its history suggests itself as the *τεῖχος λισσόν* of Theodotus' description" (p. 225). Accordingly, he takes *ἀμφί* in line 17 adverbially, and *ἄστυ* in line 16 or *πόλιν* (implied) as its referent, thus yielding the translation "around (the city) runs a smooth wall..." Then, *ὑπώρειαν ὑποδέδρομεν* in line 18 is understood to locate the direction of the "smooth wall," i.e., it "runs in under the mountain's foot." Given the unusual location of the city of Shechem, which was not located on the top of a hill but on a "low shoulder or rock out-cropping at the foot of a mountain" (p. 225), Bull insists that this would appear to be a correct description. With the northern course of the city wall running alongside the steep southern slope of Mt. Ebal, "an observer, viewing the city from the high point of the pass, or from Mt. Gerizim, would see the slopes of Mount Ebal looming beside and above the city wall and it would appear to him that, in a sense, the wall ran 'in under the foot of the mountains" (p. 225).

As already noted, Bull takes *αἰπύθεν* in line 18, which literally means "from the heights," to modify *ἔρκος*, thus a "high or steep defense enclosure." He suggests that this would "serve as an apt description of a city defense wall seen from the point of view of an observer standing at the bottom of the city's defenses" (p. 225).

Thus in Bull's view, Theodotus is portraying the wall surrounding the city of Shechem. Adopting Mras's text, he reads lines 17b-18 as two clauses. Supplying "the city" as the understood object of ἀμφί, he takes τεῖχος λισσόν as the subject of the poetic perfect form ὑποδέδρομεν (which he renders appropriately, in keeping with the military use of the term, as "running in under"), and ὑπώρειαν as its object. The second clause, αἰπύθεν ἔρκος, he understands in apposition with τεῖχος λισσόν. This latter move is his most questionable move syntactically, since it requires him to understand αἰπύθεν adjectivally, and also because it requires a shift in perspective from the first clause. On this showing, as Bull acknowledges, 225, and as Fallon-Yarbro, 21, also note, the first clause would seem to presuppose a vantage point from high up in the mountain pass, or perhaps from Mt. Gerizim, where the observer, looking downward, across the pass, sees the "smooth wall" surrounding the city, "running in under the mountain's foot." The second clause, by contrast, would appear to presuppose a vantage point from below, where the observer, perhaps standing in the valley or on the plain, looking up at the massive defense wall, sees a "steep defense enclosure."

7) Kippenberg. In his treatment of Theodotus' description of Gerizim, Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 83-84, esp. 83, n. 126, adopts Mras's suggested translation verbatim. Especially noteworthy is the way he succinctly identifies the two essential problems of interpretation:

[1] Is ἀμφί to be understood with reference to the city or the foot of the mountain? Essentially, the two options are: either "and around the city is a smooth wall..." or "and around the foot of the mountain (ὑπώρειαν) runs a smooth wall..." He notes that Bull excludes the latter.

[2] How are we to understand αἰπύθεν? Is it to be understood as "from the top/summit of the mountain" (in which case the wall would seem to extend from the

top of the mountain to the base of the mountain), or simply "high" from the perspective of an onlooker (in which case as an impressively high, steep, or large defense fortification)?

While acknowledging the correctness of Bull's observation that a huge wall is known to have enclosed ancient Shechem, Kippenberg insists that Bull should have taken into account the later coins of the 2nd cent C.E., which show a wall at the foot of Gerizim as well as buildings on the slope of Gerizim.

Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 84, notes the importance of Theodotus, especially (our) lines 17-18, because from them we can surmise that already in his time (2nd cent. B.C.E.), below the Tell er-Ras, on which the old Samaritan temple stood, there ran a huge wall. He further insists that this enclosure corresponds to the pictures on the coins from the 2nd cent. C.E., which have as their object the pagan temple on Gerizim (cf. pictures in Montgomery, *Samaritans*, 89; Pummer, *Samaritans*, Plate XIa, discussion on pp. 32-33), from which 300 steps led into the plain. Kippenberg further observes that indeed the foot of the mountain was enclosed with a wall, and that obviously the old buildings and structures, which were destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 129/8 B.C.E., were later restored.

8) Walter. In his translation, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 165, follows Mras, but with some important differences: "ringsherum eine Mauer -- steil <zieht sie sich> unterhalb des Bergfußes hin als Umfriedung von der Höhe her," which might be rendered "round about (around, on all sides) a wall -- steep <does it extend> along (in under, near) under the foot of the mountain as an enclosure from the top."

Like Mras, Walter seems to leave open the question whether the wall actually encircled the city or the base of the mountain, although the antecedent of the phrase seems to be "die altehrwürdige Stadt" (in his line 7), thus "around the revered city a wall." But this is not specified.

But in a departure from the editorial tradition, Walter inserts a dash after "Mauer," indicating a sharp break at the end of (our) line 17. Moreover, rather than rendering λισσόν as "smooth," as Mras suggested ("glatte"), he renders it "steil," i.e., "steep," apparently on the grounds that the Homeric examples, which had been adduced by Ludwich, 6, n. 9, and to which he adds another (*Od.* 5.412 λισσὴ δ' ἀναδέδρομε πέτρη; *Od.* 20.357 κακὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν ἀχλύς; *h.Ap.* 284 κοίλη δ' ὑποδέδρομε βῆσσα; also *Od.* 10.3-4; also 3.293 ἔστι δέ τις λισσὴ αἰπεῖά τε εἰς ἅλα πέτρη), consistently use the term with reference to a (steep) cliff (cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 165, n. r). He also clearly distinguishes his translation from that of Riessler, which he regards as incorrect, "Als Mauer hat sie ringsum glatte Felsen, die in die Tiefe schützend fallen."

Still, his translation (line 9) of (our) line 18 appears to leave the question open: "steep (does it run) underneath the base of the mountain as an enclosure from on high."

Our translation attempts to render Mras's text, which we have adopted. Bull's proposal that "the city" be supplied as the object of ἀμφί seems defensible, especially in light of the clear archaeological evidence for such a massive defense wall surrounding the city in the 2nd cent. B.C.E. It also seems feasible to conceive the course of this "smooth wall" as running "(in) under the foot of the mountain," regardless of one's perspective. Given Bull's description of the topography and the archaeological evidence, this appears to be a topographical fact, wherever one is standing. Finally, the syntax seems to allow taking the final phrase in apposition with the preceding clause, but not necessarily in the sense Bull proposes, i.e., as a "steep defense enclosure," since this requires a forced translation of αἰπύθεν. Instead, Fallon-Yarbro's proposal, 21, that "αἰπύθεν refers to the mound upon which the city and wall rest

as viewed from below -- 'on high, a defense enclosure'" both retains the adverbial sense of αἰπύθεν, while at the same time making sense of the phrase syntactically. In this respect, our translation follows Fallon-Yarbro.

On the topography and archaeology of Shechem, besides Bull, "Note," cf. G. E. Wright, "Shechem: Part III: The Archaeology of the City," *Biblical Archaeologist* 20 (1957) 19-32; *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965); L. E. Toombs and G. E. Wright, "The Third Campaign at Balatah (Shechem)," *BASOR* 161 (1961) 11-54; K. Jaros, *Sichem. Eine archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Jos 24* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976); K. Jaros and B. Deckert, *Studien zur Sichem-Area* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 11a; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

31. This fragment continues the quotation concerning Jacob from Alexander Polyhistor. In the opening sentence, Polyhistor paraphrases Theodotus, after which he quotes again directly from *On the Jews*. For the general literary context of this fragment, cf. above, n. 1.

32. I.e., Theodotus.

33. The antecedent of αὐτήν is not stated, but the following fragment indicates that it is the "city" (πόλιν).

34. Gen 33:18-20 recounts Jacob's arrival in the city of Shechem and his purchase of land from Hamor's sons.

35. LXX Gen 34:2 Εμμωρ ... ὁ ἄρχων τῆς γῆς. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 337 Συχέμμης {ὁ} Ἐμμώρου τοῦ βασιλέως υἱός; ¶ 339 (Emmor) ὁ βασιλεύς. On the

possibility that Josephus' account of Gen 34 (and Judg 9) is dependent on Theodotus, cf. Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 56, n. 123. Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, n. a on Frg. 2. The language (*δυναστεύοντος*) is likely Polyhistor's (Fallon-Yarbro, 22). Later, the inhabitants of Shechem are described as Hamor and Shechem's "subjects" (Frg. 6, line 2, *τοὺς ὑποτασσομένους*).

36. LXX Gen 33:19 *Εμμωρ πατρὸς Συχεμ.*

37. The problematic character of *ποιμενόθι* (read in ION) has long been recognized. In a note, Viger, *PG* (21) 722, n. 65, characterizes the reading as "mendose," proposing instead the adverbial form *ποίμνηθεν*, "of or from a flock" (Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.491; cf. *LSJ*, 1430). In a similar vein, Heinichen proposes *ποιμενόθεν*, an adverbial form based on *ποιμήν*, "shepherd," thus "of or from a shepherd" (not cited in *LSJ*). Kuiper's proposal of a form ending with the suffix *-φι(ν)*, frequent in Homer (cf. Smyth, ¶ 280), is combined with his emendation of *ξένε*, to produce *ξὺν ποιμνιόφιν*, thus "with his herds (came Jacob)." With a slight variation, Mras proposes *ποιμενόφι*, which in his app. crit. he indicates is the equivalent of *ποιμένων*, "with or of shepherds." Our translation follows Mras's text and suggested translation. Similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, "in die Stadt <der Hirten>." Fallon, 791, also follows Mras, but prefers the singular rendering; thus, "Jacob came as a shepherd."

Ludwich, 7, n. 11, is much less satisfied with the received text, both because of the clearly corrupt form of *ποιμενόθι* and the defective meter. Accordingly, his emendation of the line is more thorough: *ἔνθεν δ' ἐξενέποιμεν, ὅθεν πόλιν ἤλυθ' Ἰακωβ*. Though he proposes the optative form of *ἐξενέπω*, "speak out," "proclaim" (*LSJ*, 590), he also conjectures that the subjunctive form might be used. As emended by Ludwich, the line would read "Now may we

proclaim from what city Jacob came." Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 363, see a similar style reflected in *Il.* 1.1-5 μῆνιν ἄειδε ... ἐξ οὗ κτλ.; *Od.* 1.10 τῶν ἁμόθεν γε ... εἰπὲ κτλ.; *Od.* 8.499-500 φαῖνε δ' ἀοιδὴν | ἔνθεν ἑλών κτλ.

Ludwich's emendation is adopted, for the most part, by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, though they prefer to read ὅθι, the poetic form of οὗ, "where."

The textual variants are also summarized in Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, nn. b and c on Frg. 2.

As to the form of direct address, Fallon, 791, n. a on Frg. 2, notes the difficulty of identifying the speaker and addressee, citing pertinent passages from Homer (*Od.* 6.255; 8.195). For ξενέ, cf. Ezekiel the Tragedian, Frg. 7, line 3 (v 83).

38. The LXX description of Shechem in Gen 33:18-20 is much more prosaic. The language here (εὐρεῖαν) clearly echoes Homeric usage, where εὐρύς is used of geographical locations, e.g., Lycia (*Il.* 6.173, 188, 210; 16.455, 673, 683; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.309) and Crete (*Il.* 13.453; *Od.* 13.256, 260), but especially in city encomium, e.g., of Troy (*Il.* 13.433; 24.256, 494, 774; *Od.* 1.62; 4.99; 5.307; 11.499; 12.189), Sparta (*Od.* 11.460), and Cnossus (*Il.* 18.591). Cf. *LSJ*, 731.

εὐρύς does not occur in LXX in the sense of "wide"; the three times it occurs (Exod 38:4, 10, 24) it translates צִיץ, "ring" for holding a stave; εὖρος, however, occurs frequently in its ordinary sense meaning "width," e.g., Exod 25:23 *etc.*

Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166 prefers to render Σικίμων as "Shechemites," thus "kam Jakob in die Stadt <der Hirten>, die geräumige, der Sikimer." Cf. above, nn. 3 and 4.

39. Homeric echoes are also heard in ἔτῃσιν, from ἔτης, ὁ, always in the plural in Homer, hence "clansmen," i.e., "kinsmen and dependents of a great

house" (*LSJ*, 703), e.g., *Il.* 6.262 ἀμύνων σοῖσιν ἔτῃσι; *Od.* 4.3 δαινύντα γάμον πολλοῖσι ἔτῃσιν; also, cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.305; 3.1126. The term does not occur in LXX.

Viger apparently regards the form as redundant, proposing two possible emendations: ἔτεσσιν, from ἔτος, "year," hence "illo tempore," and for τοῖσιν ἔτῃσιν he conjectures τοῖς σίντῃσι, from σίντης, -ου, ὁ (σίνομαι, "harm," "hurt," "do mischief"), hence "ravening" (*Il.* 11.481; 20.165; 16.353; *LSJ*, 1600), thus "and over these ravenous men ..." Ludwich, 7, n. 12, emends ἔτῃσιν to ἔτης ἦν in order to underscore the tribal solidarity of the peoples of that time, especially the Shechemites (citing Gen 14:14; 19:9; 23:4; 24:4, et al.). Presumably, his text would yield "and over these men were kinsmen, the ruler Hamor and his son Shechem." Lloyd-Jones and Parsons's conjecture ἔπῆσαν, Epic 3rd pl. impf. of ἔπειμι, "to come upon," "approach," has the advantage of supplying a verb, thus, "and to these men came Hamor the ruler with his son Shechem ..." Cf. *LSJ*, 614, ἔπειμι (B).

40. On the orthographical difference between Mras's text, which here follows Stephanus, and the MSS tradition, cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, n. e on Frg. 2.

41. The MSS reading ἀτηρέε, from ἀτηρής, -ές (= ἀτηρός, -ά, -όν), "blinded by ἄτη ("bewilderment," "infatuation"), "hurried to ruin"; also, "baneful," "mischievous" (*LSJ*, 270), "improvident" (Fallon, 791), appropriately depicts Hamor and Shechem, given the description of events in Gen. 34, especially their eventual destruction (Gen 34:26). It is not, however, a Homeric term, as is Scaliger's emendation ἀτειρέε, from ἀτειρής, -ές, "not to be rubbed or worn away," "indestructible," metaphorically "stubborn," "unyielding" (*LSJ*, 268), which is accepted by Gifford, 1.537 (bracketed) and Mras. Cf. *Il.* 3.60 αἰεί τοι

κραδίη πέλεκυς ὥς ἐστιν ἀτειρής; *Od.* 11.270 μένος αἰὲν ἀτειρής; *Il.* 15.697; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.26; 2.375; 4.1375 (though not with reference to persons). Neither ἀτηρής nor ἀτειρής occurs in LXX. Cf. Gifford, 4.308.

Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, opts for the former as more appropriate to the context of Gen 34, rendering it "verderbengeweiht alle beide Männer"; cf. also his n. g on Frg. 2; also, cf. Fallon, 791, n. b on Frg. 2.

Similarly, φῶτε, the dual form of φώς, "man," echoes Homer (e.g., *Il.* 5.572, 608; 17.377) and the poetic tradition. φώς occurs 4x in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, but not in the dual form. φώς does not occur in LXX. Cf. *LSJ*, 1968; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, n. h on Frg. 2.

Compare the characterization of Shechem and Hamor in Philo *Mut.* 193-95, 199-200: Shechem as ὁ ἔγγονος ἀνοίας, Hamor as ὄνος; also *Migr.* 223-25: Hamor as ὄνος, also ἄλογος φύσις.

As Fallon-Yarbro, 22, observe, Shechem and Hamor in the biblical account, far from being "stubborn," are in fact deferential towards Jacob.

van der Horst, *JHP*, 63, n. on line 12, notes here the beginning of the negative portrait of the Shechemites.

42. In this fragment, Polyhistor continues to draw on Theodotus' work *On the Jews*. In terms of the storyline, the poem goes back to an earlier portion of the Genesis narrative. In the introductory section, he summarizes Theodotus' treatment of events described in Gen 28-34. Then he quotes directly from Theodotus' poem (beginning with line 5), which picks up the biblical narrative at the point where Jacob journeys to Paddanaram and is received by Laban (Gen. 28). As Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, n. a on Frg. 3, notes, Theodotus is less concerned to unfold the history of Jacob than to treat events as they bear on Shechem, as will become evident in the following fragments. As his

summary shows, the treatment was quite cursory: arrival in Mesopotamia (Gen 29:1-3), marriage to Leah and Rachel (Gen 29:9-30), birth of his children (Gen 29:31-30:24), arrival from Mesopotamia to Shechem (Gen 33:18-20), thus apparently skipping over the events related in Gen 30:25-33:17. The focus appears to be directed towards the story of Jacob as it related to Shechem. On the overall literary context of the fragment within *P.E.*, cf. above n. 1.

43. I.e., Theodotus. Mras's decision to emend the MSS reading ἐπεὶ δὲ, which may have been part of the poem itself (so printed in Gaisford, 2.386, but not in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.693), and read εἶπε δέ, has the advantage of supplying an otherwise absent introductory formula (followed by Denis, *Frag.*, 205). Yet its form is conspicuously different from the more usual φησί (Frg. 1, lines 2 & 5; Frg. 2, lines 1 & 3; Frg. 4, lines 1 [and possibly 16]; Frg. 7, line 3; λέγει in Frg. 8, line 4); cf. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 363-64. Stephanus' emendation εἰς δ' is printed by Viger (followed by Heinichen, Gifford, Dindorf) as part of the first line of the poem: εἰς δ' Ἰακὼβ ... Ludwich, 4, reads ὡς δ', explaining, 7, n. 15, that "das unmetrische ἐπεὶ nur das Glossem von ὡς."

44. In keeping with the previous editorial tradition (though Gaisford and Heinichen read ἵκτο), Mras adopts Viger's emendation ἶκτο, non-thematic aorist of ἱκνέομαι (Hesiod *Th.* 481, *AnthGr* 6.217.4 [Simonides = Diehl, *Anth. Lyr. Graec.* 2.117, No. 158 (179).4]; Euphorion 2 [*CA*, 29, No. 2.1]; cf. *LSJ*, 826), "come," frequently in Homer with acc., "arrive at" a place (e.g., *Il.* 4.383; 18.150; 23.2; *Od.* 4.84; 14.257), e.g., Troy (*Il.* 18.67); cf. also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.608, 1298; 2.1213, 1260 *al.* The MSS tradition ἵατο I ε᾽ἵατο ON, impf. ind. mid. 3rd pl. of εἰμί = ἦντο (cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 166, n. 3 on Frg. 3),

yields little sense. *ἱκνέομαι* does not occur in LXX.

45. Initially, Jacob is said to have fled to Laban in Haran, which was in Mesopotamia (LXX Gen 27:43 *ἀναστὰς ἀπόδραθι εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν πρὸς Λαβαν τὸν ἀδελφόν μου εἰς Χαρραν*; cf. 28:2, 5, 6, 7, 10; 29:4; 31:18; 33:18; also 29:1). Here "Syria" designates Mesopotamia, where Jacob had fled from Esau. The term is apparently drawn from LXX Gen 33:18 *ὅτε ἦλθεν ἐκ τῆς Μεσοποταμίας Συρίας*. Thus this line describes his original journey to Haran in Mesopotamia (Gen 28:5). Fallon-Yarbro, 22, observe that Theodotus chooses *Συρίην* rather than the unmetrical *Μεσοποταμίαν*.

46. This description of the land perhaps reflects Gen 29:2-3, especially the use of *κτῆνος* in Gen 29:7; 30:29, 43; 31:9, 43; 33:13, 17; 34:5, 23. Cf., however, LXX Num 32:4 *γῆ κτηνοτρόφος ἐστίν*; also, Gen 4:20; 46:32, 34. *κτηνοτρόφος* does not occur in Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, Callimachus, other texts in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.* Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 22.

47. *εὐρὺ ῥεῖθρον*. Cf. *Il.* 2.849 *ἀπ' Ἀξιοῦ εὐρὺ ῥέοντος* (= 16.288); 21.157, 186, 304; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.401, 658; cf. 1.983.

48. *ποταμοῦ κελάδοντος*. Cf. Homer *Il.* 18.576 *πὰρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα*; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.132-33 *Λύκοιο, | ὅστ' ἀποκιδνάμενος ποταμοῦ κελάδοντος Ἀράξεω*; 1.501 *καὶ ὡς ποταμοὶ κελάδοντες*; Theocritus 17.92 *ποταμοὶ κελάδοντες*; Callimachus *Hym. Dian.* 3.107 *τὴν δὲ μίαν Κελάδοντος ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο φυγοῦσαν*; *κελαδέω/κέλαδος* in *Il.* 9.547; 18.530; *Od.* 2.421; Anonymous *Saltus Montanus* (*CA*, 185, No. 7.6). Cf. *κελαδεῖν* in LXX Aq Isa 49:13; 52:9; 54:1; 55:12.

LXX Gen 31:21 (Jacob) *καὶ διέβη τὸν ποταμὸν*. MT ויעבר את־הנהר. Where Theodotus derives *Εὐφρήταο* is not clear. Apparently envisioned here is Jacob's

crossing of the river en route to Haran (Gen 27:43; 28:6; 29:1). So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, n. f on Frg. 3; Fallon, 791, n. b on Frg. 3. Fallon-Yarbro, 22, "Incorrectly, from the biblical point of view, Jacob has come from the lower Euphrates rather than Beersheba (Gen 28:10)." Cf. Gifford, 4.308.

49. Literally, the poetic adverbial form κεῖθεν signifies "from that place," "thence" (*LSJ*, 505), but in light of the following clause the sense here seems to be that Jacob went "there," not that he came "from there." Accordingly, Ludwich reads κἀκεῖσε, from ἐκεῖσε, poet. κεῖσε, "thither," "to that place" (*LSJ*, 506). Cf. *Od.* 6.164 ἦλθον γὰρ καὶ κεῖσε (so, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364); cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 166, "er zog dort(hin)."

50. λιπὼν δριμεῖαν ἐνιπήν. On δριμεῖαν, from δριμύς, -εῖα, -ύ, "piercing," "sharp," "keen," cf. *Il.* 11.270; 15.696; 18.322; *Od.* 24.319; also Callimachus *Graph.*, Frg. 380.1. The term does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* Nor does it occur in LXX.

On ἐνιπήν, from ἐνιπή, "reproof," "rebuke" (*LSJ*, 568), cf. Homer *Il.* 4.402 αἰδεσθεὶς βασιλῆος ἐνιπὴν αἰδοίοιο; 5.492 κρατερὴν δ' ἀποθέσθαι ἐνιπήν; *Od.* 5.446; 10.448; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.615 λιπὼν ... ἐκ πατρὸς ἐνιπῆς; also 2.250; 3.677; 4.1209. Cf. Gifford, 4.308. ἐνιπή does not occur in LXX.

51. αὐτοκασίγνητος. Cf. Homer *Il.* 2.706; 3.238; 11.427; 13.534; 14.156; 16.718; *h.Cer.* 80, 85, 364; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.442; Λέσβου Κτίσις (*CA*, 7, No. 12.4); Moschus 2.122; feminine form in Homer *Od.* 10.137; *Hymni* 27.3; 31.5; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.642, 647, 741, 984; 4.369, 844; Nicaenetus Λύρκος (*CA*, 1-2, No. 1.9 *v.l.*). The term does not occur in LXX.

52. πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο. Cf. Homer *Il.* 9.480 ὁ δέ με

πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο; also 23.647; *Od.* 2.387; 14.54; 20.372; 23.314; *h.Cer.* 226. πρόφρων occurs in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 9x, but not with ὑποδέχομαι. πρόφρων does not occur in LXX; for ὑποδέχεσθαι, cf. Tob 7:7 BA; 7:8 S; Jth 13:13; 1 Macc 16:15; 4 Macc 13:17.

53. LXX Gen 29:13-14, esp. v 13 εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτου. Theodotus renders the biblical text in thoroughly Homeric terms: δόμονδε, cf. *Il.* 16.445; 24.717; *Od.* 1.83; 14.424; 20.239; 21.204; Euphorion (*SH*, 196, No. 413.8); not in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*; nor in LXX.

The text possibly reads δόμον δὲ (Ludwich). For δόμος in LXX, cf. 1 Esdr 6:24; 2 Esdr 6:4.

54. Scaliger's emendation of the MSS reading ἔτας, from ἔτης, ὁ, always plural in Homer (cf. above, n. 39), to ἔην, the Homeric form of ἦν (cf. Smyth, ¶ 768D), supplies an appropriate verb.

The biblical account does not use ἀνεφιός to describe the relationship between Laban and Jacob: Gen 29:13 Ιακωβ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀδελφῆς; 15 (Laban to Jacob) ἀδελφός μου εἶ. The term, however, is used in LXX (cf. Num 36:11; Tob 7:2; 9:6 [S]). Cf. Homer *Il.* 9.464; also Aeschylus *Pr.* 856; Herodotus 5.30; 7.82.

55. The readings given in our app. crit. follow Jacoby. Mras has τότ' οἷος B τότ' οἷος I τόθ' οἷος ON. The reading given for B appears to be in error, although no correction is supplied in *GCS* (43,2) 590. Were these the correct readings, we would have expected τοτ' οἷος BI and some explanation of the reading adopted in the text. If Mras has reported the textual evidence incorrectly, it is a rare instance, since he is consistently accurate in these matters. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 167, n. i on Frg. 3, however, reports that B and I read τοτ' οἷος. Perhaps his reporting is based on Gifford, 1.537: τότ' οἷος] B,

τότ' οἶος (sic) I, τόθ' οἶος O.

The substantive question is whether to read *οἶος*, "alone," "lonely" (*LSJ*, 1209), or *οἷος*, the relative and indirect interrogative pronoun, "such as," "of what sort." Clearly, editors have preferred the former as a more sensible reading; so, Mras; also Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 167, "allein"; Fallon, 791, "alone."

56. "Newborn," perhaps "just born," here renders νειηγενές, an emendation proposed by Stephanus and adopted by subsequent editors, including Mras. The MSS reading νεηγενές, from νεηγενής, -ες, Ionic for νεαγενής, conforms to Homeric usage (*Od.* 4.336 νεβροὺς κοιμήσασα νεηγενέας γαλαθηνούς; [= 17.127]) but is metrically unsuitable (cf. Fallon, 791, n. c on Frg. 3). The term does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, Callimachus, or other texts in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.* Nor does it occur in LXX. Cf. Gifford, 4.308.

Ludwich's εὐηγενές, the Homeric form of εὐγενής, "wellborn," "noble minded" (Homer *h.Ven.* 229; cf. *LSJ*, 708, 713), is less apt. The conjecture in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.*, 364, ξυνηγενές, "kindred" (so, Fallon, 791, n. c. on Frg. 3; not listed in *LSJ*, 1192; though, cf. ξυνήων, -ονος, ὁ, "joint-owner," "partner"), perhaps related to ἀνεψιός (line 9), seems redundant. Fallon, 791, n. c. on Frg. 3, prefers γαιηγενής, -ες, poetic form of γηγενής (Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.1186; *LSJ*, 335), thus rendering the phrase "since he was of [native] blood," which explains "why Laban ruled over Syria." Against Riessler, 1264 ("aus einem neuen Stamm"), Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 167, n. k on Frg. 3, prefers the sense "frisch," hence "jungfrisches Blut."

Who is being referred to? Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 167, n. k on Frg. 3, thinks Laban's daughters (perhaps only Rachel) are meant. Gifford, 4.308, however, thinks Laban's sons are in view (citing Gen 30:35; 31:1); hence, 3.458, "his sons as yet new-born." The

latter appears preferable since it makes sense of the received text: since Laban's sons were still young, he alone ruled over Syria, and thus welcomed his kinsman Jacob as an adult male colleague.

57. The following lines summarize events recorded in Gen 29:15-30:24.

τῷ δὲ γάμον κούρης. "Daughter" here renders *κούρης*, the Ionic form of *κόρη* used in Homer, "girl," "maiden," especially of a bride-to-be (*Il.* 9.388 *κούρην δ' οὐ γαμέω*; *Od.* 20.74), bride (*Od.* 18.279), young wife (*Il.* 6.247; Euripides *Or.* 1438); usually "daughter" when used with gen. of proper name (*LSJ*, 980). On *κούρη* as "girl," "maiden" in Apollonius of Rhodes, cf. *Arg.* 1.55, 136, 181, 269, 712 *al.*

κούρη does not occur in LXX; *κόρη* does occur, however, 8x, usually = אִישׁוֹן, pupil of eye, e.g., Deut 32:10 *etc.* Cf. Ezekiel the Tragedian, annotations, nn. 245-46.

μὲν ὑπέσχετο. Cf. Homer *Il.* 2.112 *al.*

καὶ κατένευσεν ὁπλοτάτης. Rachel was technically the "younger" (LXX Gen 29:16 *ὄνομα τῇ μείζονι Λεια, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ νεωτέρᾳ Ραχηλ*; also 29:26 *δοῦναι τὴν νεωτέραν πρῖν ἢ τὴν πρεσβυτέραν*), though here described with the superlative form *ὁπλότατος*, on which, cf. *Od.* 11.283 *ὁπλοτάτην κούρην*; also *ὁπλοτάτη θυγάτηρ* in *Od.* 3.465; 7.58; 15.364; also Hesiod *Th.* 946; cf. *LSJ*, 1240; *contra* Gifford, 4.308, after noting the frequency of the term in Hesiod, says "Homer uses only the comparative *ὁπλότερος*" (in *Iliad*). Also, cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.71 (though apparently of several sons); comparative 6x; comparative form also in Euphorion (*CA*, 44, No. 80.1); Rhianus (*CA*, 10, No. 1.20). *ὁπλότατος* does not occur in LXX.

58. The language is Homeric, but the syntax unusual. Ordinarily, *ἐπιμαίομαι*, "strive after," "seek to obtain," is used with the gen., e.g., *Il.* 10.401

μεγάλων δώρων δ' ἐπεμαίετο θυμός, "his mind *was set upon* presents"; also *Il.* 17.430 (*LSJ*, 644), or as "lay hold of," "grasp," with the acc., e.g., *Od.* 9.441; 11.531; *h.Merc.* 108. By contrast, the infinitive is more common with the simple form μαίομαι, "seek after," "seek for," e.g., Pindar *O.* 8.5; Sophocles *Aj.* 287, though the latter can take dir. obj., e.g., *Il.* 9.394; *Od.* 13.367 (so, *LSJ*, 1073). Also, cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.546; 3.816. Cf. Gifford, 4.308.

ἐπιμαίομαι does not occur in LXX; μαιοῦσθαι occurs 3x + 3x in versions; cf. esp. Job 38:8.

The accompanying infinitive τελέθειν, from τελέθω, poetic cognate with τέλομαι, τέλλω, meaning "come into being," "to be (so and so)," is also Homeric (*Il.* 7.282 *al.*; *Od.* 4.85 *al.*); also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.1576. Cf. *LSJ*, 1769. Gifford, 4.308, cites *Or. Sib.* 3.263 as an example of its use in a transitive sense. The term does not occur in LXX. Ludwich reads τελέειν, "to complete." Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 167, n. m on Frg. 3.

59. ἀλλὰ δόλον τολύπευσε. The phrase echoes Homer *Od.* 19.137 οἱ δὲ γάμον σπεύδουσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ δόλους τολυπεύω (so, Gifford, 4.308); τολύπευσε, from τολυπεύω, literally, "*wind off* carded wool *into a clew* for spinning," metaphorically "wind off," "achieve," "accomplish" (*Il.* 14.86; 24.7; *Od.* 1.238; 4.490; 14.368; 24.95; cf. *LSJ*, 1803). Inexplicably, Stephanus reads τολίπευσε, which Viger, *PG* (21) 723 n. a, corrects. τολυπεύω does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, Callimachus, or other texts in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.* Cf., however, Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.404 ἥδε δὲ συνθεσίη κρανέει δόλον; 421 μέγαν δόλον ἠρτύνοντο. Nor does τολυπεύω occur in LXX.

60. The description is clearly Homeric, as compared with the biblical account: LXX Gen 29:23 καὶ λαβὼν

Λαβαν Λειαν τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὴν πρὸς Ιακωβ, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὴν Ιακωβ.

λέχος, poetic noun, "bed," also "marriage bed," or simply marriage (*Il.* 15.39 "couch"; 1.31; 3.411; 8.291; 9.659-60; *Od.* 8.269; cf. 3.403; 7.347; cf. *LSJ*, 1043). Similarly, Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.1128; also 3.662; 4.1071; also Euphorion (*SH*, 198, No. 415.i.13); Matro Pitanaeus (*SH*, 261, No., 534.75); Moschus 2.39, 164; cf. Callimachus *Hym. Jov.* 1.14 λεχώιον. The term does not occur in LXX.

I reads λάχος, "allotted portion" (*LSJ*, 1033).

61. ἥ οἱ ἔην προγενεστέρη. LXX Gen 29:16 ὄνομα τῇ μείζονι Λεια; Gen 29:26 ἢ τὴν πρεσβυτέραν. Cf. Homer *Il.* 2.555 ὁ γὰρ προγενέστερος ἦεν; *Od.* 4.205 καὶ ὃς προγενέστερος εἴη; also *Il.* 9.161; 23.789; *Od.* 2.29; 7.156; 11.343; 19.244; 24.160. Cf. Callimachus *Hec.* (*SH*, 126, No. 287.11); Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.319; also 1.165. Cf. Gifford, 4.308; *LSJ*, 1472.

προγενής/προγενέστερος do not occur in LXX.

62. ἀλλ' ἐνόησε κακορραφίην. LXX Gen 29:25 (Jacob to Laban) Τί τοῦτο ἐποίησάς μοι; οὐ περὶ Ραχηλ ἐδούλευσα παρὰ σοί; καὶ ἵνα τί παρελογίσω με; Cf. Homer *Od.* 2.235-36 ἀλλ' ...| ἔργα βίαια κακορραφίῃσι νόοιο; also *Il.* 15.16; *Od.* 12.26. Cf. *LSJ*, 863; Gifford, 4.308. κακορραφία does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, Callimachus, other texts in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*; nor does it occur in LXX.

63. ἐμίγη, from μείγνυμι or μίγνυμι, frequently in Homer and Hesiod, "to have intercourse with," "to lie with," "wed" (*LSJ*, 1092 [II.B.4]), e.g., Hesiod *Th.* 920 (cf. Homer *h.Merc.* 4; also Anonymous *Hymnus in Dactylos Idaeos* [*CA*, 171, line 1]); absolute use, *Il.* 9.275; more frequently, of the man (*Il.* 6.25, 165), also of the woman (*Il.* 6.161; *Od.* 1.73); also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.1115, 1164, 1495, 1737; Ναυκράτεως Κτίσις (*CA*, 6, No. 7.2) φιλότητι μιγεῖσα;

Paean Erythraeus (*CA*, 136, line 5) *μιχθεὶς ἐμ φι[λότητι Κορ]ωνίδι*; *SH*, 306, No. 640.4. The term is not used in this sense in LXX (cf. Gen 30:40; Exod 30:35; 2 Kgs 18:23; Prov 14:16; Isa 36:8; perhaps Ps 105:35).

64. *ὁμαίμος, -ον*, "of the same blood," "related by blood"; usually substantively, "brother" or "sister," e.g., Aeschylus *Th.* 681; *Eu.* 605 (*LSJ*, 1220); so translated by Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 167, "den Schwestern," who also observes, n. p, that the term occurs in Herodotus and the tragic poets, but not in Homer; nor does it occur in LXX. Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 22. The emendation by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 361, *συνομαίμοσιν*, from *συνομαίμων, -ον*, "of the same blood," "kindred" (Pseudo-Phocylides 206), as substantive, "brother," "sister" (Aeschylus *Pr.* 410; Euripides *Hel.* 640; *IT* 848; cf. *LSJ*, 1722; not in LXX), effectively eliminates the otherwise intrusive *σύν*. Even so, *ἧσι*, Epic form of *ἥ*, 3 sing. 2 aor. subj. of *ἵημι*, "send," "put in motion," "set about to do," remains problematic. Still, *συνομαίμων* is not attested in Homer; cf. Anonymous *Paean Delphicus I in Apollinem* (*CA*, 141, Frg. i.3) *συνόμαιμον ... Φοῖβον*.

65. *τῷ δ' υἱεῖς ἐγένοντο*. Cf. *Od.* 15.248 *τοῦ δ' υἱεῖς ἐγένοντ'* (so, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364).

66. *πεπνυμένοι*, from *πνέω*, "to have breath or soul," metaphorically, "to be wise," "discreet," "prudent"; in participial form, adjectivally, "wise," "sage," "sagacious" (*LSJ*, 1424-25); cf. *Il.* 24.377 *πέπνυσαί τε νόῳ* (so, Gifford, 4.308); also *Od.* 23.209 *ἐπεὶ τά περ ἄλλα μάλιστα | ἀνθρώπων πέπνυσο*.

67. On *κούρη*, cf. above n. 57.

68. *περικαλλὲς ἔχουσα εἶδος*. The description of Dinah

here is slightly reminiscent of the biblical description of Rachel in LXX Gen 29:17 καλὴ τῷ εἴδει καὶ ὡραία τῇ ὄψει (Fallon-Yarbro, 22). In Homer περικαλλής is used of women (e.g., *Il.* 5.389; *Od.* 11.281; *h.Cer.* 405; also cf. Moschus 2.40, 62), with κούρη, e.g., *Il.* 16.85 περικαλλέα κούρην; *Hymni* 13.2 κούρην, περικαλλέα Περσεφόνειαν (= *h.Cer.* 493); also Apollonius of Rhodes Ναυκράτεως Κτίσις (*CA*, 6, No. 7.1) περικαλλέα κούρην; Epyllium Diomedis (*CA*, 73, No. 2.10-11) π[ερικαλλέος εἵνεκα κούρης] | Αἰνελένης. Cf. *LSJ*, 1375. περικαλλής does not occur in LXX.

Also, cf. Bion 1.30 καλὸν εἶδος.

On εἶδος with δέμας, cf. *Il.* 24.376 οἷος δὴ σὺ δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἀγητός; also *Od.* 5.213; 14.177; 18.251; 19.124; *h.Ven.* 241; cf. esp. *Od.* 11.469-70 (Aias) ὃς ἄριστος ἔην εἶδός τε δέμας τε | τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα (= 24.17); similarly, *Od.* 8.116-18 εἶδός τε δέμας ... | μετ' ἀμύμονα ... | ἀμύμονος. This combination does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* Cf. below, n. 69.

69. ἐπίστρεπτον δὲ δέμας. Heinichen's emendation (also attributed by Ludwich, 7, n. 21, to Düntzer) ἐπίστρεπτον, from ἐπίστρεπτος or -τός, "to be turned outwards," "looked at and admired" (Aeschylus *Ch.* 350; *Supp.* 997 ὥραν ἐχούσας τήνδ' ἐπίστρεπτον βροτοῖς; so *LSJ*, 661; also cf. Gifford, 4.308; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364; not in LXX), is rendered by Fallon, 791, "admirable," hence "an admirable frame." The problematic nature of the MSS tradition was early recognized. Accordingly, Seguier, *PG* (21) 1573, proposes εἶδος ἐπίπρεπον ἠδὲ δέμας, καὶ ἀμυμονα θυμόν, perhaps "a conspicuous form and frame, and noble soul"; even so, ἐπίπρεπον remains problematic; cf. Ludwich, 7, n. 21. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 167, "mit <wohlansehnlicher> Figur."

Also, cf. above, n. 68.

70. ἀμύμονα, from ἀμύμων, -ον, "blameless," "noble,"

"excellent"; e.g., *Il.* 16.119 γνῶ δ' Αἴας κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα; *Od.* 10.50 κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα (also 16.237); 19.332 ὃς δ' ἂν ἀμύμων αὐτὸς ἔῃ καὶ ἀμύμονα εἰδῇ; also *Od.* 4.187; cf. *LSJ*, 87. Cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.190; Rhianus (*CA*, 14, No. 31) ἀμύμονας Ὀμφαλιῆας (also cf. No. 35); Moschus 2.93 ἀμύμονος Εὐρωπείης. The term does not occur in LXX.

71. In this fragment, Eusebius continues to quote Polyhistor's summary of Theodotus' work. For the most part (¶¶ 4-5), the fragment consists of Polyhistor's summary, although it concludes (¶ 6) with a three-line direct quotation from Theodotus' poem. The focus of the fragment is Gen 33:18-34:19. For the general literary context of the fragment, cf. above, n. 1.

Polyhistor's summary (¶¶ 4-5) is distinguished by the high percentage of non-Homeric terms that are used, e.g., μέρος, γεωμορέω (cf. below, n. 76), ἐριουργέω (cf. below, n. 77), πανήγυρις (cf. below, n. 79), διακομίζω (cf. below, n. 80). Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 23.

72. The change in spelling from Ἐϋφρήταο (Frg. 3, line 6), which occurs in direct quotation from Theodotus, to Εὐφράτου, which occurs in this summary by Polyhistor, Fallon-Yarbro, 17, adduce to illustrate how Polyhistor consciously alters the authors whom he quotes: "That Al(exander) Poly(histor) would alter spelling is indicated by his change of the epic genitive ending and epic η for α in Ἐυφρήταο (Frg. 3, line 6) to Ἐυφράτου."

"Euphrates" serves as his shorthand expression for "Mesopotamia of Syria," = Paddanaram (LXX Gen 33:18 ὅτε ἦλθεν ἐκ τῆς Μεσοποταμίας Συρίας). Cf. above, n. 45.

73. I.e., Theodotus; cf. above, n. 43.

74. LXX Gen 33:18 καὶ ἦλθεν Ιακωβ εἰς Σαλημ πόλιν

Σικιμων, ἥ ἐστιν ἐν γῇ Χανααν.

75. In the biblical account, rather than "being received hospitably" and being given an allotment of land by Hamor, Jacob buys a piece of land from the sons of Hamor for "100 pieces of money" (Gen 33:19). Theodotus does not mention the altar Jacob erected there (Gen 33:20; so Fallon-Yarbro, 23).

76. The basis for making this occupational distinction is not clear. In the previous biblical narrative, Jacob is presented as a cowherd and shepherd (Cf. Gen 30:29, 31-43; 31:4-19, 38-41, 43; 32:5, 7, 14-15; 33:13-14, 17; also 34:5); similarly, in the subsequent narrative (e.g., 37:1, 12; esp. 46:32-34; 47:1-6); cf. Gen 4:2.

This is the only instance of the verb form γεωμορεῖν cited in *LSJ*, 347. Cf. γημόρος (Attic γεωμόρος), "one who has a share of land," "landowner" (e.g., Herodotus 7.155 γαμόρους; Aeschylus *Suppl.* 613 γαμόρων; Plato *Lg.* 5.737E [*LSJ*, 348]). Gifford, 4.308, also cites Thucydides 8.21; Plutarch *Moral.* 303E.

Cf. Demetrius, Frg. 2.13 (*FHJA* 1.70-71, 84, n. 32).

Also, cf. Theodotus, Frg. 2, line 4, where Shechem is called the "shepherd's city." Cf. above, n. 37.

77. This is another unbiblical detail, although a reasonable assumption. The language (ἐριουργέω) seems to be Polyhistor's rather than Theodotus'; at least, it appears not to reflect the epic tradition; cf. Xenophon *H.G.* 5.4.7.; Dio Cassius 80.7.3; Athenaeus 14.618e. Cf. *LSJ*, 689. The term does not occur in LXX.

78. LXX Gen 34:3 καὶ ἠγάπησεν τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐλάλησεν κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν τῆς παρθένου αὐτῇ. Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 337 τὴν κόρην. According to *Jub.* 30:2, Dinah was "little ... only twelve years old," although

internal calculations suggest that she was under nine years old. Cf. J. C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubiless* (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1982) 189-93. According to *Gen. Rab.* 80:10, R. Simeon b. Eleazar says Simeon and Levi were thirteen years old when they murdered the Shechemites.

79. The mention of a festival (*πανηγύρεως*) and Dinah's desire to see the city are unbiblical details. In Gen 34:1 Dinah is said to have gone out "to visit the women of the land" (*καταμαθεῖν τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἐγχωρίων*). This same tradition is preserved in Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 337, who not only mentions the festival (*ἑορτήν*), but says that Dinah went into the city "to see the finery of the women of the country" (*παρῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὀψομένη τὸν κόσμον τῶν ἐπιχωρίων γυναικῶν*). The mention of the festival by both Theodotus and Josephus is one of the main reasons Kippenberg, *Garizim*, 56, n. 123, thinks Josephus is dependent on Theodotus for his treatment of Gen 34. Neither festival nor finery is mentioned in *Gen. Rab.* 80:1-2, but Dinah is blamed for "going out," i.e., "awhoring."

The term *πανήγυρις* occurs in the poetic tradition (Aeschylus *Ag.* 845; Pindar *O.* 9.96), but not in Homer; esp. in non-poetic use (Herodotus 2.58, 59; Isocrates *Pan.* 4.1; Xenophon *Cyr.* 6.1.10; cf. *LSJ*, 1297). It is likely Polyhistor's term.

Cf. LXX Hos 2:11; 9:5; Amos 5:21; Ezek 46:11.

80. Lines 9b-11 essentially paraphrase LXX Gen 34:2-3, but in distinctively different language: *καὶ εἶδεν αὐτὴν Συχεμ ὁ υἱὸς Εμμωρ ὁ Χορραῖος ... καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὴν ἐκοιμήθη μετ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτήν. καὶ προσέσχεν τῇ ψυχῇ Δινας τῆς θυγατρὸς Ιακωβ καὶ ἠγάπησεν τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐλάλησεν κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν τῆς παρθένου αὐτῇ*; also, 34:13 *ἐμίαναν Διναν...* As Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 168, n. e, observes, Theodotus'

description of both the attitude and action of Shechem is more negative than the biblical account. The language of Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 337 (*θεασάμενος δ' αὐτὴν Συχέμμης [ὁ] 'Εμμώρου τοῦ βασιλέως υἱὸς φθείρει δι' ἁρπαγῆς καὶ διατεθεὶς ἐρωτικῶς...*) suggests that he may have drawn directly on Theodotus, or at least a common exegetical tradition. Cf. Fallon, 792, n. c on Frg. 4.

On whether this description represents Polyhistor's summary, or whether he is drawing upon Theodotus' own language, the following observations may be offered (expanding on Fallon-Yarbro, 23):

ἔραμαι, Epic *ἔρασσαι*, *ἔρασαι*, in Homer *Il.* 16.182, 208; Hesiod *Th.* 915; Pindar *P.* 2.27; used with gen. pers. (as here), in Homer always of sexual passion (*Il.* 3.446; cf. 20.223, etc.; cf. *LSJ*, 680). Cf. LXX 1 Esdr 4:24; Esth 2:17; Prov 4:6.

ἁρπάζω, in Homer *Il.* 3.444; 17.62; 22.310; *Od.* 10.48; cf. 5.416; in sense of "captivate," "ravish," in Jdt 16:9; Plutarch *Ant.* 28.1; cf. *LSJ*, 245-46. The term occurs frequently in LXX, sometimes in this sense; cf. Judg 21:21.

διακομίζω, Thucydides 1.89.3; 136.1; 3.75.5; Herodotus 1.31; Plato *Lg.* 10.905B; cf. *LSJ*, 398; however, *κομίζω*, frequent in Homer and epic poets in this sense, e.g., *Il.* 2.875; 11.738; cf. *LSJ*, 975. Cf. LXX Josh 4:3, 8; 1 Esdr 2:14; *etc.*

φθείρω, "destroy" (*Od.* 17.246), but in Homer not in the sense "seduce" a woman (cf. Dio Chrysostom 11.153; Artemidorus 5.17; cf. *LSJ*, 1928; for *διαφθείρω* in this sense, cf. Lysias 1.4, 8, 16, *al.* *φθορά*, "rape," Strabo 6.1.6; cf. Plutrach *Moral.* 7.712C; cf. *LSJ*, 1930. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 1.2.1 ¶ 339 *τὴν φθορὰν τῆς ἀδελφῆς*; also Demetrius, Frg. 2.9 (*FHJA* 1.66-690), *καὶ φθαρῆναι τὴν 'Ισραὴλ θυγατέρα Δείναν ὑπὸ Συχὲμ ... διὰ τὴν Δείνας φθοράν.* In LXX, the term occurs frequently, usually in its ordinary sense; cf., however, Ezek 16:52.

81. LXX Gen 34:4 (Shechem to Hamor): *λαβέ μοι τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην εἰς γυναῖκα*. The efforts of Hamor in Shechem's behalf, including his proposal for a general policy of intermarriage, and Shechem's own plea, are described in Gen 34:8-12. In Josephus *Ant.* 1.2.1. ¶¶ 337-38, Jacob is sensitive to questions of social protocol and asks the sons to formulate a response; the drastic actions of Simeon and Levi, however, occur without Jacob's knowledge (¶ 340). Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 168, n. f.

Theodotus also omits the brothers' anger (Gen 34:7) and their deceit (Gen 34:13).

82. Jacob's refusal and insistence on circumcision for the sons of Hamor as a prerequisite for intermarriage between the two peoples and Shechem's marriage to Dinah are described in Gen 34:13-17.

The most remarkable expression here is *Ἰουδαΐσαι*, from *Ἰουδαΐζω*, "side with," or "imitate the Jews" (*LSJ*, 832); "live as a Jew, according to Jewish customs" (*BAG*^{2}, 379; cf. Esth 8:17; Gal 2:14; Josephus *J.W.* 2.17.10 ¶ 454 (Metilius) *καὶ μέχρι περιτομῆς ἰουδαΐσειν*; also 2.18.2 ¶ 463; Plutarch *Cic.* 7.6 ¶ 864c; *Acts Pil.* A 2, 1; Ignatius *Magn.* 10:3. Whether the term is Theodotus' or Polyhistor's is uncertain; cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 168, n. g. The fact that within the poem itself Theodotus uses the term *Ἑβραῖοι* and not *Ἰουδαῖοι* suggests that this verb form is Polyhistor's term (so, Fallon-Yarbro, 18; Collins, "Epic," 95). If the term stems from Theodotus, it raises questions about his Samaritan identity (so, Ludwich, 7, n. 22); on *Ἰουδαΐζω*, *Ἰουδαϊσμός*, cf. Hengel, *Aspects*, 77-78, 159, n. 37.

On the form of *περιτεμνομένους*, which might be rendered "by having themselves circumcised" (*BAG*, 652), the textual tradition shows some variety. O and N (albeit with a mystifying break in the middle of the word) prefer the 2nd aor. mid. form of the participle, and B the aor. pass. part. (perhaps influenced by

περιτμηθῆναι in Gen 34:15 LXX). The present form of the participle in I, read by Mras, conforms to the present inf. περιτέμνεσθαι in line 17, which is also read in Gen 34:17.

83. This reference to Hamor's willingness to "persuade" those living in Shechem summarizes Gen 34:20-23.

84. I.e., Jacob; φησί also occurs in line 1 above. Ordinarily, it is used to introduce what Theodotus says, although here it is used to introduce a speech by Jacob that occurs in Theodotus' poem. Cf. above, nn. 43 & 73.

In Gen 34:14-17, it is Simeon and Levi who speak (cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 25; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364).

85. Polyhistor may have cited the following passage verbatim from Theodotus in order to clarify for his Roman readers the significance of circumcision in Judaism (so Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 168, n. h).

86. τέτυκται, perf. of τεύχω, frequently in Homer = γίγνεσθαι, εἶναι (*LSJ*, 1784, III). Cf. *Il.* 4.84 (= 19.224); 14.246; 17.690; 22.30; *Od.* 8.546; also *Il.* 5.402; 8.163; 16.622; *Od.* 21.231; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.292, 717, 1018, 1133; 3.89, 209, 545, 727; 4.61, 84, 407, 651, 694, 936, 1476. τεύχω does not occur in LXX.

87. οὐ γὰρ δὴ θεμιτόν. Cf. Homer *h.Cer.* 207 οὐ γὰρ θεμιτόν; Theocritus 5.136; *Od.* 10.73 οὐ γάρ μοι θέμις ἐστὶ. So, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364.

88. ποτὶ δῶμα. Cf. Homer *Od.* 3.488 ποτὶ δῶμα |; *Il.* 16. 190 ἠγάγετο πρὸς δώματ'; cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.239. So, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364.

89. The translation here follows the suggestion of Mras, who adopts (and further refines) the emendations of earlier editors, especially Stephanus. Specifically, Stephanus sees the clear difficulty of reading *γένυους* (ION) or *γένοιος* (B), reading instead *γε νυοὺς*, from *νυός*, ἡ, "daughter-in-law" (*Il.* 3.49; 22.65; 24.166; *Od.* 3.451; *h.Ven.* 136; cf. *LSJ*, 1185); also Theocritus 15.77; 18.15; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.815; *Λέσβου Κτίσις* (*CA*, 7, No. 12.15); *SH*, 464, No. 961.20. Cf. Gifford, 4.308. *νυός* does not occur in LXX.

Similarly, *τεταγμένη* (BON), *-μενής* (I), Stephanus emends to *ἀγέμεν*, Epic form of *ἄγειν*. Finally, he emends *ὅτι* (BION) to *ποτὶ*, Doric form of *πρός*. Mras refines Stephanus by reading *τ' ἀγέμεν*, and in his app. crit. provides the clarifying equivalent: *γαμβροὺς νυούς τε εἰσάγειν πρὸς δῶμα*. Hence, the translations "to bring home (from another place) sons-in-law and daughters-in-law" (also Fallon, 792), as opposed to Gifford, 3.458, "to bring a bridegroom to our daughters' home," which appears to render *εἷς* explicitly (contested by Fallon-Yarbro, 27).

Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 168, nn. k & l on Frg. 4.

It should be noted that the report of the textual evidence by Ludwich, 7, n. 23, differs in certain respects from that of Mras; specifically that *γε νυοὺς* was read by I before Steph. suggested it (similarly reported in Gifford, 1.538); the additional reading in C that provides variants other than those reported by Mras: *γεννοὺς ι. τεταγμένους ὅτι*.

90. Since *ἐξεύχομαι* does not occur in Homer, Fallon, 792, n. f on Frg. 4, prefers to read *ἓξ εὔχεται*, following Düntzer, apud Ludwich, 4, 7, n. 25; similarly, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 361, who refer to *Il.* 6.211 *ταὐτης τοι γενεῆς ... εὔχομαι εἶναι*; *Od.* 1.406 *ποίης δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι | γαίης*;

This line summarizes, albeit in different terms, the sentiments of Gen 34:14, which designates a non-Jew as ὃς ἔχει ἀκροβυστίαν.

91. This fragment, in which Polyhistor continues to summarize and quote from Theodotus, occurs a few lines after Frg. 4. The mention of circumcision as that which distinguished Jews from non-Jews (Frg. 4.5) appears to have prompted Theodotus to include in his poem an account of the covenant of circumcision God made with Abraham (Gen 17:9-14; also vv 22-27). Conceivably, Theodotus stresses its divine origin because the practice had been discontinued among certain Jews or Samaritans (so, Fallon-Yarbro, 28). Or, it may just as easily have been included because of the common practice in this form of epic poetry to account for the causes of certain practices and customs among the people who are being treated (so, Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 168, n. m).

For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

92. The words of the following quotation are perhaps attributable to Jacob, as was the case with Frg. 4.6; so, Fallon, 792.

93. I.e., God.

94. *δῖον* 'Αβραάμ. On ἐξήγαγε *δῖον* 'Αβραάμ, cf. Homer *Od.* 8.494 ἤγαγε *δῖος* 'Οδυσσεύς. The epithet *δῖος* is frequent in Homer, "heavenly," especially "resplendent" (*Il.* 2.820; 3.389; 10.290 *al.*); when used of mortals "noble," "excellent," "illustrious" (*Il.* 1.7, 145; 2.57, 221 *al.*; *Od.* 1.196, 284, 298 *al.*); also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.949, 1213; 2.1037; Callimachus *Hym. Lav. Pall.* 5.97, 103; Matro Pitanaeus (*SH*, 268, No. 540.2) Εὔβοιός τε καὶ 'Ερμογένης *δῖοί* τε Φίλιπποι; also *SH*, 517, No. 1000. In tragedians, of Zeus (Aeschylus *Pr.* 619, 654, 1033).

The term does not occur in LXX. Cf. *LSJ*, 434-35; Fallon-Yarbro, 29.

An interpretive question worth considering is whether Theodotus merely employs stock epic language to glorify Abraham, or whether the term is to be understood more literally as enhancing his status beyond the human; more likely the former. Cf. Artapanus, Frg. 3.6 (*FHJA* 1.210-11, 234, nn. 54 & 55); Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*.

95. The beginning of the line is corrupt. The MSS reading *ποτ' ἐπὶ* was early recognized as problematic. The indefinite particle *ποτε* following the relative pronoun, defining a point of time in the past, thus "once," "at one time," is acceptable enough (cf. *Il.* 2.547; 8.108; also 14.45; *LSJ*, 1454), but *ἐπί* with *πάτρης* would yield "to or towards the fatherland," which is clearly nonsensical (so, Fallon-Yarbro, 29). Stephanus' emendation *ποθ' ἑῆς*, with the latter taken as the gen. fem of *ἑός*, "his," (*LSJ*, 478), thus yielding, "He who once led the noble Abraham out of his own fatherland ..." is suitable enough; thus read by Jacoby, *FGrH*, 694. Ludwich, 7, n. 26, however, proposes *ποτ' ἐπεὶ*, which is accepted by Mras; this improves on the MSS reading, but is not necessarily preferable to Stephanus' emendation. It yields a translation such as that of Fallon, 792, "Once (God) himself, when he led the noble Abraham out of his native land, ..." Similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 168, "Dieser (= Gott), <als> er den hehren Abraam aus (seinem) Vaterhaus herausführte..."

The *v.l.* for *ἐξήγαγε* in I is inconsequential materially: *ἐξή* is read because *γαγε* is omitted in the transition to a new line (so Mras).

96. *οὐρανόθεν*, "from heaven," "down from heaven," (*LSJ*, 1273). Cf. *Od.* 5.294; Hesiod *Th.* 761; in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 9x; also cf. Callimachus *Hym. Del.* 4.38. Cf. LXX 4 Macc 4:10 hapax.

ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν *Il.* 8.365; 21.199; *Od.* 11.18; 12.381; Hesiod *Sc.* 384; Eratosthenes (*CA*, 62, No. 16.11) ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν; cf. *Il.* 17.548 Ζεὺς ἐξ οὐρανόθεν (Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364).

97. ἀποσυλῆσαι, from ἀποσυλάω, "to strip off," esp. spoils (Pindar *P.* 4.110 ἀποσυλᾶσαι). The term does not occur in Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, Callimachus, other texts in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*; nor does it occur in LXX.

98. πόσθη, ἡ, "*membrum virile*," (Aristophanes *Nu.* 1014), "foreskin" (Dioscorides [Medicus] 4.153; Rufus *Onom.* 102; Oribasius *Fr.*; references cited in *LSJ*, 1452); not in Homer or LXX. Cf. LXX Gen 17:11 καὶ περιτμνηθήσεσθε τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας ὑμῶν; also vv 14, 23-25.

99. ἐτέλεσσεν, epic aorist of τελέω (*Il.* 12.222; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.252; Callimachus *Hym. Dian.* 3.86). Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 29.

100. ἀστεμφής, ές, "unmoved," "unshaken," *Il.* 2.344; 3.219; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.1375; Theocritus 13.37; Nonnus *D.* 40.324. Cf. *LSJ*, 261; Gifford, 4.308; Fallon-Yarbro, 29; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364. The term does not occur in LXX.

101. ἔειπεν, epic and lyric form of εἶπεν, frequent in Homer (*Il.* 2.59 *al.*; *Od.* 2.108 *al.*); cf. Pindar *O.* 4.27; Callimachus *Hym. Ap.* 2.107; *Hym. Dian.* 3.103; Simias (*CA*, 115, No. 21.1); The form does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 29.

102. This fragment continues Polyhistor's summary of Theodotus (¶ 8), concluding with a brief direct quotation in which Simeon speaks to Levi (¶ 9). It picks up where Frg. 5 left off -- the return of Hamor

(and Shechem) to the city (Gen 34:20) and their proposal to the men of the city to submit to circumcision (Gen 34:21-23). The central focus of this fragment is Simeon and Levi's plan to avenge the defilement of Dinah, in particular the divine justification for their act. For parallel accounts, cf. Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶¶ 337-40; Jdt 9:2-4; *T. Levi* 5-6; *Jub.* 30:1-25; on which, cf. Collins, "Epic," 95-99; also, cf. Philo *Migr.* 223-25; *Mut.* 193-200; Pseudo-Philo *Bib. Ant.* 8.7; on which, cf. Pummer, "Genesis 34," 178-79; also *Joseph and Asenath* 23:13; *Gen. Rab.* 79:1-80:12, 97:6; on which, cf. van der Horst, *JHP*, 60; also J. Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah. The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis. A New American Translation. Vol. III. Parashiyyot Sixty-Eight through One Hundred on Genesis 28:10 to 50:26.* (Brown Judaic Studies 106; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

On the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

103. In Gen 34:20 both Hamor and Shechem return to the "gate of their city," i.e., Shechem (cf. Gen 33:18).

104. This line summarizes the speech of Hamor (and Shechem) in Gen 34:21-23. Neither here nor in subsequent fragments does Theodotus report, as does the biblical account (Gen 34:24), that the Shechemites actually submitted to circumcision (cf. Collins, "Epic," 95); nor does he indicate that Simeon and Levi attacked them while recovering (Gen 34:25; cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 30; Fallon, 792, n. a on Frg. 6). Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶¶ 337-40 also omits these details, reporting instead that Simeon and Levi attacked the Shechemites while the latter "during a feast" were engaged in "indulgence and festivity." The Shechemites' circumcision is also omitted in *Jub.* 30, whereas *T. Levi* 6:6 records it; similarly *Gen. Rab.*

80:8-9. It is mentioned cryptically by Philo *Migr.* 224.

Referring to the Shechemites as Hamor's "subjects" (*τοὺς ὑποτασσομένους*) is consistent with the earlier depiction of Hamor as "king" (cf. Frg. 2, lines 2 & 6).

105. In Theodotus' account, responsibility for plotting the revenge lies with Simeon; similarly, Jdt 9:2, which mentions Simeon exclusively. In Gen 34:25-26, 30, though Simeon is mentioned first (since he was the elder, cf. Gen 29:33-34), both brothers act together and are jointly censured by Jacob (v 30; similarly Gen 49:5-7); similarly, *Gen. Rab.* 80:2-3, 9, although 80:10 emphasizes that each decided independently. Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 340 follows the biblical account in depicting their joint responsibility: "...born of the same mother, mutually agreed upon the following course"; similarly, Philo *Migr.* 224, esp. *Mut.* 200, stressing that they were "one in will," even explaining Levi's eventual prominence and Simeon's absence from the list of tribes blessed by Moses (Deut 33:8-11) as owing to Simeon's being "compressed ... into Levi." *Jub.* 30:4-6, following the biblical account, makes Simeon and Levi jointly responsible, though subsequently vv 18-23 justify the choice of Levi's family for the priesthood because of his zeal in avenging Dinah. In *T. Levi* 5:3-4; 6:1-8, Levi's initiative is especially underscored, although he is said to have murdered Shechem while Simeon destroyed Hamor; the remaining brothers then destroyed the city (*T. Levi* 6:4-5). Fallon, 792-93, n. c on Frg. 6, attributes the emphasis in the latter two documents to their probable origin in priestly or Levitical circles, while its absence elsewhere, especially in Theodotus, suggests lack of sympathy for priestly or Levitical groups.

106. *ἀνελεῖν*, from *ἀναιρέω*, "make away with,"

"destroy" men, i.e., "kill" (Herodotus 4.66; Aeschylus *Ch.* 1004; Euripides *Andr.* 518; cf. *Od.* 3.453; *LSJ*, 106); LXX Gen 34:25-26 *καὶ ἀπέκτειναν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν· τόν τε Εμμωρ καὶ Συχεμ ... ἀπέκτειναν ἐν στόματι μαχαίρας* ... Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 340 ... *κτείνουσι κοιμωμένους ... ἀναιροῦσι πᾶν ἄρρεν καὶ τὸν βασιλέα σὺν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ* ... (which may suggest, as above, that Josephus is dependent on Theodotus; cf. above, nn. 79 & 80). The same term occurs below, line 9; cf. below, n. 114, also n. 131.

107. *πολιτικῶς*, from *πολιτικός*, "befitting a citizen," "civic," "civil," hence adverbially "civilly," "courteously" (Polybius 18.48.7 *πρᾴως καὶ πολιτικῶς μεμφιμοιρεῖν*; cf. also 23.5.7. Cf. *LSJ*, 1435; Gifford, 4.308; Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 169, n. b on Frg. 5).

Neither the adjective nor adverb form occurs in LXX.

108. *ὕβρις*, "wanton violence," or "insolence," as frequently in *Od.*; as equivalent of *ὕβρισμα*, "outrage," (*Il.* 1.203, 214; *Od.* 24.352; also 15.329); specifically, "an outrage on the person," i.e., "rape" (Pindar *P.* 2.28; Lysias 1.2, 4; Isocrates *Pan.* 4.114; Polybius 6.8.5 *ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν ὕβρεις καὶ παίδων ἁρπαγάς*; Aeschines 1.116, 188, also 29; Aristotle *Rh.* 1.12.35 (1373^{a}); also *E.N.* 5.1.14 ($1129^{b}22$); 7.5.3 ($1148^{b}30$); *Pol.* 5.8.12-13 ($1311^{b}19$-25); also cf. Josephus *J.W.* 4.9.10 ¶ 560; 7.8.7 ¶ 377); Cf. LSJ, 1841; G. Bertram, *TDNT* 8 (1972) 295-307.

ὕβρις occurs frequently in LXX, often = גאוה, "pride."

While *Gen. Rab.* certainly understands Shechem's action against Dinah as an outrage (cf. 80:4.7, 6, 8), it nevertheless blames Dinah for "going out," i.e., "going awhoring" in the first place; in fact, it blames Leah: "like mother, like daughter" (80:1-2, 4); in 80:11, much is made of the fact that her brothers had to "drag her away."

109. As Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169, n. c on Frg. 5, notes, presumably one could take Λευίν as an accusative belonging to the preceding phrase, thus "And Levi having also decided [on this course of action], made common cause with his brother [Simeon]," in which case the reponsibility for the action would be more equally distributed, in closer conformity to the biblical account. This possibility is rendered less likely by B: ταῦτα δὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ Λευὶν κοινώσασθαι. Part of the problem is the indeclinable form of the proper name (Λευίν) consistently used by Theodotus (and Polyhistor); cf. below, line 11 (cf. however τῷ Λευὶ B); also Frg. 8, lines 1 & 12. The following lines, however, support our translation; similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169, "Nachdem he das beschlossen hatte, habe er seinen Bruder Levin (in den Plan) eingeweiht."

110. συγκάταινος, -ον, "agreeing with," "consenting" τινι (Philip, apud Demosthenes *Cor.* 18.167 ¶ 284 βουλόμενοι ὑμᾶς συγκαταίνους γενέσθαι; Diodorus Siculus 15.92.4; Josephus *Ant.* 4.8.23 ¶ 251 εἰ μὲν πείσας καὶ πρὸς τὴν φθορὰν συγκάταινον λαβών [*LSJ*, 1663]). Gifford, 4.309, literally "one who joins in approval," citing Demosthenes as above. The derivation of the reading in I σῦν κατ' αἶνον is not clear; perhaps οὖν κατ' αἶνον (so, Gifford, 1.538); thus, "therefore according to the resolution, or decree," i.e., his decision.

The term does not occur in LXX.

111. παρορμῆσαι, from παρορμάω, "urge on," "stimulate," "incite," e.g., Xenophon *Cyr.* 8.1.12 παρορμᾶν ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ ἔργα (*LSJ*, 1343). Similarly, the simple form in B ὁρμῆσαι, "set in motion," "urge on," "cheer on" (Plato *Lg.* 9.875B; *Ion* 534C; Euripides *Ph.* 1064; *LSJ*, 1252). Cf. LXX 2 Macc 15:17; 4 Macc 12:6.

112. προφέρω, "bring before/to one," "present" (*Il.* 9.323; 17.121; Thucydides 6.69.2), "bring forward, "cite" (*LSJ*, 1539); similarly, προσφερόμενον, as proposed by Stephanus.

113. λόγιον, τό, "oracle," especially one preserved from antiquity (Herodotus 4.178, 203; 8.60; Plutarch *Thes.* 26.4 ¶ 12; *Lys.* 22.6 ¶ 446); more frequent in plural (Herodotus 1.64; 8.62, 141; Euripides *Heracl.* 405; Aristophanes *Eq.* 120; Plutarch *Fab.* 4.4 ¶ 176; *Marc.* 3.4 ¶ 299; Thucydides 2.8.2 distinguishes λόγια from χρησμοί [*LSJ*, 1056]).

Cf. also Polybius 3.112.8; 8.28(30).6; Diodorus Siculus 2.14.3; 2.26.9; 4.65.3; *Ep. Arist.* 177; Philo *Cong.* 134; *Fuga* 60; *V. Mos.* 2.262; *Praem.* 1; *V. Contempl.* 25; Josephus *J.W.* 6.5.4 ¶ 311. So, *BAG*^{2}, 476. The term occurs frequently in LXX.

Interestingly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169, n. e, adduces the instance reported in Philo of Byblos *Phoenician History* (= *P.E.* 1.10.18-20; in Attridge-Oden, *Philo of Byblos*, 46-49), where Hermes Trismegistos employed magic spells (λόγους μαγείας) to incite the allies of Kronos to fight against Ouranos.

This appears to be an instance in which Polyhistor, in his summary of Theodotus, has substituted a prose term (λόγιον) for Theodotus' poetic term, in this case, μῦθον; so, Fallon-Yarbro, 31, with other examples.

Apart from the question of the terminology employed by Theodotus, we should note the significance of the oracle's function. It is introduced to provide divine warrant for the act of revenge against Hamor and Shechem; indeed, Simeon appears to cite the oracle as convincing proof for Levi to assist him in the act. As Fallon, 793, n. d on Frg. 6, notes, this emphasis in Theodotus conforms to the tendency in other Jewish traditions to justify the actions of Jacob's sons as being according to God's will (Jdt 9:2; *Jub.* 30:6, 17-19; in *T. Levi* 5:3-5, Levi is commissioned by God

through an angel to "perform vengeance on Shechem for the sake of Dinah"; in spite of Jacob's disapproval, the brothers' action is seen as acting out God's guilty verdict [6:8]; indeed, they became instruments of "the wrath of God" [6:11; cf. 1 Thess 2:16]). In a similar vein, Philo *Migr.* 225, also *Mut.* 194-200, emphasizes that Simeon and Levi were instruments of divine justice (*δίκη*). Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶¶ 337-40, by contrast, offers no such divine justification for the deed. Nor does *Gen. Rab.* 80, although Simeon and Levi's actions are defended as justifiable retaliation (cf. 80:2).

114. Our translation here follows the suggestion of Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 515, n. on line 11, that *ἀνελεῖν* should be taken in the sense, "to give a judgment," "make a determination." Similarly, *LSJ*, 106, on *ἀναιρέω* (III), "appoint," "ordain," of an oracle's answer to an inquiry (Thucydides 1.25.1; Plato *Lg.* 9.865D; cf. 1.642D; Xenophon *An.* 3.1.6); also *ἀνελεῖν τι περί τινος*, "*give an oracle* about a thing" (Plato *Lg.* 11.914A). Yet, as Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169, n. f on Frg. 5, notes, *ἀνελεῖν* would then be used in a different sense from its other two usages (line 4 above and Frg. 8, line 3; also cf. line 5). Fallon-Yarbro, 31-32, however, understand *ἀνελεῖν* here in the sense "destroy," thus probably yielding, "citing an oracle saying that God would give ten peoples to the descendants of Abraham (for them) to destroy." Later, however, Fallon, 792-93, opts for the former: "by producing an oracle which said that God had determined to give ten peoples to the descendants of Abraham."

Also, cf. notes 106, 131.

115. The motif of ten nations being promised to the descendants of Abraham appears to be derived from Gen 15:18-21 (so, Fallon, 793, n. e on Frg. 6). Though the biblical account nowhere indicates that these events fulfill the promise of Gen 15, more than likely the

mention of Canaanites and Perizzites in Gen 34:30 made the connection possible (cf. Gen 15:20-21; also cf. Jth 5:16). Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169, n. i on Frg. 5, suggests that the reference might be a variation of God's promise to Abraham in Gen 12:3 (similarly Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364, citing LXX Gen 12:7), or even Gen 17:4-5. In either case, Freudenthal's suggestion, 99-100, that it refers to the ten lost tribes of Israel appears unfounded (so, Fallon, 793, n. e on Frg. 6). Collins, "Epic," 100, however, views Freudenthal's suggestion more positively, and links this promise with Hyrcanus' expansionist policies. Cf. notes to Introduction, n. 27.

116. Our translation here follows the editorial tradition adopted since Stephanus: *πεπυσμένος*, from *πυνθάνομαι*, "learn by hearsay or inquiry" (*Od.* 11.505; 11.494; *LSJ*, 1554). The MSS reading *πεπεισμένος*, from *πείθω*, "persuade," in perf. "believe," "trust in," would yield "For well have I trusted in (perhaps, obeyed) the word of God." The MSS reading seems perfectly suitable (so, Fallon-Yarbro, 33).

Cf. LXX Gen 25:22 *etc.*

117. *μῦθος*, *ὁ*, "word," freq. in Homer (*Il.* 1.25 *al.*; *Od.* 1.28 *al.*) and Hellenistic epic (Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.479 *al.*; Callimachus *Aet.* Frg. 75.77; *Hym. Lav. Pall.* 5.56; Theocritus 2.94; 25.65; Bion 5.3, 9; 6.7. Cf. *LSJ*, 1151. Cf. LXX Wis 17:4; Sir 20:19; also Bar 3:23 *μυθολόγος*).

Ludwich's emendation *μύθοιο* supplies a genitive form, modified by *θεοῖο*, appropriate with *πυνθάνομαι* (cf. *LSJ*, 1554, I.3). The expression *μῦθον* ... *πεπυσμένος* (or even *πεπεισμένος*) ... *θεοῖο* is unusual. Cf. *Il.* 2.335 *μῦθον* ... *Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο*. Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 33.

118. *δώσειν*. Cf. Homer *Od.* 24.342. So, Lloyd-Jones and

Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364.

119. Following directly on the previous fragment, this fragment provides further justification for the killing of the Shechemites. Apparently, there was little or no intervening material between these two fragments.

For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

This fragment is the focus of Pummer-Roussel, "Note," which provides comparative translations (p. 178), their own analysis, in light of Homeric parallels, and fresh translation (p. 182).

120. ἐμβάλλω, "throw in," frequently of the mind (*LSJ*, 539 [I.3]), *Od.* 19.10 ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἔμβαλε; Plutarch *Tim.* 3.2 ¶ 237 εἰς νοῦν τινί; *Il.* 3.139; 16.529; also, in middle, metaphorically (III.2), cf. *Il.* 10.447; 23.313; Demosthenes *Cor.* 18.68 ¶ 247 καὶ τοῦτ' εἰς τὸν νοῦν ἐμβαλέσθαι. Since τὸν νοῦν ἐμβαλεῖν is not a Homeric, or poetic, expression, it appears to be Polyhistor's own formulation.

To say that God actually inspired Simeon and Levi to take revenge obviously goes well beyond the biblical account (so, Collins, "Epic," 95), which portrays their actions as unilateral (Gen 34:13, 25, 30) and unjustifiably vindictive (Gen 49:5-7). This fits, however, with Theodotus' understanding of the divine oracle mentioned in Frg. 6, in which the destruction and subjugation of the Shechemites is seen as the fulfillment of the divine promise made earlier in Gen 15:18-21. Accordingly, the following quotation actually attributes the destruction of the Shechemites to God (line 4).

Clearly, Theodotus belongs to a tradition of interpretation that was embarrassed by the unnecessarily vindictive actions of Jacob's sons depicted in Gen 34 and consequently sought to present it more favorably not only as an appropriate response,

given the circumstances, but as willed, assisted, and therefore approved by God. Thus, in Theodotus, God actually "plants the idea" in the boys' minds, indeed executes the action, thereby fulfilling a divine oracle.

In Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1-2 ¶¶ 337-41, the brothers' actions are presented as fully justified: no mention is made of the Shechemites' submitting to circumcision, nor of their being attacked while still sore. Josephus does mention that they acted "without their father's sanction" (¶ 340). Though omitting Jacob's words of censure (Gen 34:30), Josephus notes his incredulity and anger at them, observing, however, that God placated him (¶ 341).

In Jdt 9:2-4, Judith praises God as the one who actually gave the "sword of revenge" to Simeon and thus handed over "their rulers to be slain" and their wives, daughters, and city to be plundered.

In *Jub.* 30:5, the judgment against Shechem is said to have been "ordered in heaven" in response to the shame they caused Israel; similarly, the Shechemites were "handed over by the Lord" to the sons of Jacob (v 6). In *Jub.* 30:17 a word of the Lord actually presents the Shechemites as an example of what happens when a "daughter of Israel" marries a foreigner. In addition, killing the Shechemites is said to have been accounted as "righteousness for them (i.e., Simeon and Levi)" and "written down for them for righteousness" (v 17); their actions of "righteousness, judgment, and vengeance" were recorded in heaven "for a blessing" (v 23). Moreover, as a reward for his zeal "to do righteousness and judgment ... and (take) vengeance against all who rose up against Israel," Levi and his seed are chosen for the priesthood and Levitical orders (vv 18-19).

In *T. Levi* 5:3-5, Levi is actually instructed by God through an angel to "perform vengeance on Shechem for the sake of Dinah," and he acted accordingly. In *T. Levi* 6:3, Levi urges the Shechemites not to be

circumcised, presumably so that his actions would not be against a people who had been incorporated into Israel; in vv 6-7 Levi notes Jacob's disapproval and subsequent passing over of himself and Simeon in the blessing (Gen 49:5-7), and admits that the action was sinful. Yet, at the same time, he sees his (and Simeon's) actions as having implemented God's guilty verdict against the Shechemites, not only for their actions against Dinah but for their more widespread harrassment of Israel; consequently, their fate was the result of the "wrath of God" (vv 8-11).

Gen. Rab. 80 also reinterprets the story but along slightly different lines. The actions of the Shechemites are presented as heinous, and in certain senses the actions of Simeon and Levi are justified. The latter's deceit (Gen 34:13) is explained away (80:8.1). The Shechemites, by contrast, intended to cheat Jacob's family all along (80:8.4). Simeon and Levi's actions are defended as justifiable retribution (80:2). While Jacob does not approve initially, he later sides with Simeon and Levi, even defending them against reprisals (80:10.5). Their action is nowhere said to have been motivated or initiated by God directly. Perhaps the most striking deviation from the biblical text in *Gen. Rab.* is the blame assigned to Dinah for "going out" (80:1-2) and "parading in public" (80:4.5) and to Leah, who also must bear responsibility for her whoredom (80:1). Dinah finally has to be dragged away from the Shechemites, because, as R. Huniah said, "A woman who has sexual relations with an uncircumcised man finds it hard to leave" (80:11).

Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169, n. k; Fallon, 793, n. d on Frg. 6.

121. This characterization of the Shechemites as "godless" or "wicked" (ἀσεβεῖς) is not found in Gen 34 (cf. Collins, "Epic," 95). To be sure, the biblical account underscores the heinousness of Shechem's

defilement of Dinah (vv 2, 5, 7, 13-14, 27, 31); and, in a sense, the slaughter of the entire male population (v 25) and the subsequent plunder of the city (vv 27-29) implicate the people as a whole. Yet, for all that, there are positive features in the portrayal of the Shechemites in Gen 34: their hospitality, and deference generally to Jacob's family (vv 9-10, 21; cf. Gen 33:19); Shechem's love for Dinah (vv 3, 8, 11-12, 19); and their willingness to undergo circumcision (vv 15, 22, 24). It is against this background of a generally favorable portrait of the Shechemite people that the action of Shechem himself is set, and it is seen to be exceptional. By contrast, the brothers are depicted as acting deceitfully (v 13), angrily (vv 14-17), and vindictively (vv 25-29) -- all of which underscores Jacob's sharp rebuke (v 30). Given the circumstances of this particular case, the overall portrait of the Shechemites and the contrasting portrait of Jacob's sons, the latter's actions are clearly presented as a case of overkill -- literally; hence, wholly unjustifiable in Jacob's eyes.

If there is a link between ἀσεβεῖς and the biblical account, it is perhaps the characterization of the Shechemites as "uncircumcised" (Gen 34:14). Accordingly, their status as Gentiles or "foreigners" is a primary feature in certain traditions (e.g., Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶ 338 Shechem as ἀλλόφυλος; Jdt 9:2 ἀλλογενής; *Jub.* 30:7, 12-14 Shechemites as Gentiles; possibly Pseudo-Philo *Bib. Ant.* 8.7); on the assessment of their "Gentile" status, cf. Collins, "Epic," 98; Pummer, "Gen 34," 182-87.

Theodotus' negative portrayal of the Shechemites may be compared with other traditions. In *T. Levi* 6.8-11 the Shechemites as a whole are similarly assailed. In particular, *T. Levi* 7 underscores the folly of the Shechemites: because of the defilement of Dinah the city of Shechem would be called "city of the senseless" (v 3; cf. also Sir 50:25-26; perhaps CD

13:23-14:2; on which, cf. J. D. Purvis, "Ben Sira and the Foolish People of Shechem," *JNES* 24 [1965] 88-94, reprinted in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* [HSM, 2; Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1968] 119-29; on their depiction as "doers of violence" in the Aramaic Cambridge Fragments of *T. Levi*, cf. Collins, "Epic," 96, n. 12). Josephus *Ant.* 1.21.1 ¶¶ 337-40 does not depict them as "godless," although he does report that the slaughter took place "during a feast ... (while they) were given up to indulgence and festivity" (¶ 340). In Philo *Migr.* 224, the action of Shechem is depicted as shameless folly, understandable since he was the son of an "irrational being," Hamor, which means "ass"; similarly, *Mut.* 193, where Shechem's action typifies the vicious man. In both passages, however, it is the action of Shechem and Hamor as individuals that Philo assails, and treats allegorically; in neither case are the Shechemites as a whole maligned. It is not at all clear, for example, that those engaged in "the pleasure-loving, passion-loving, toil of the uncircumcised" (*Migr.* 224) are the people of Shechem; in fact, the context suggests that the particular reference is to Shechem and Hamor alone.

122. I.e., Theodotus; on this introductory formula, cf. above, n. 43.

123. The translation here follows the suggestion of Pummer-Roussel, 179-80, that βλάπτε be understood as an epic imperfect rather than an imperative (so, Collins, "Epic," 95). In Homeric usage, its sense is "disable," "hinder," also "distract," "pervert," "mislead," and after Homer means "damage," "hurt" (so, *LSJ*, 317). Cf. Pummer-Roussel's discussion of the text with reference to *Il.* 9.502-12; 19.90-94; 23.571, 774. 782; also 6.39; the connection to allegory seems forced. "God was in the process of maiming..." seems unduly literal. The clear sense is that God brought

low the Shechemites; hence, "disabled," perhaps "crippled" seems adequate.

On βλάπτε, cf. *Il.* 15.724 βλάπτε φρένας ... Ζεύς; 22.15 (Achilles) "ἔβλαψας μ', ἐκάεργε, θεῶν ὀλοώτατε πάντων"; so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364; also, possibly Chares (*CA*, 225, No. 4.42). The term does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*; nor does it occur in LXX.

124. *οἰκήτωρ* is not attested in epic poetry. Cf. LXX 1 Chr 4:41 A; Prov 2:21 A,S; Wis 12:3.

125. Our translation renders Mras's text, which prefers ἔτιον (ON) over αἴτιον (BI). The latter makes no sense here. Neither does the unusual form ἄατος (= ἄητος) read by Stephanus (so Ludwich, 8, n. 32; cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus 1.217; *Il.* 21.395 θάρσος ἄητον; *LSJ*, 1, 30).

Assuming that the verb form is the original reading, ἔτιον can be read as impf. of τίω, poetic verb, common in Homer, equivalent to τιμάω, "honor," "revere" (*Il.* 9.238; *Od.* 13.129; 22.370 σὲ δὲ νήπιοι οὐδὲν ἔτιον), esp. between human beings, e.g., guests (*Il.* 5.467 [impf.]; cf. 9.142, also 9.303, 603; 13.176; *Od.* 15.543; *LSJ*, 1800); hence, translated "they honored." So, Fallon, 793, "for they did not honor whoever came to them ..."

On οὐ γὰρ ἔτιον κτλ., cf. esp. *Il.* 1.244 ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισας; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.988-89 οὐδὲ θέμιστας | τίουσαι; 4.784; Callimachus *Hym. Ap.* 2.96; *Aet.*, Frg. 59.20 (also = *SH*, 108, No. 265.20); *Hec.*, Frg. 231.1. Cf. Gifford, 4.309; Fallon-Yarbro, 35. τίω does not occur in LXX.

Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169, n. 1 on Frg. 5, however, prefers to understand ἔτιον as deriving from τίνω, "pay a price" (*LSJ*, 1795-96). He notes *LSJ*'s observation that the future (τίσω) and aorist (ἔτισα) forms of τίνω and τίω are confused, esp. in Homer, but does not explain convincingly why this *imperfect* form

should be derived from *τίνω*. In any case, he renders the phrase "Denn nicht mußte (bei ihnen) büßen, ..."

Since the former yields a sensible meaning, Walter's proposed alternative seems unnecessary.

126. *μόλῃ*, 2 aor. subj. 3 sing., based on 2 aor. inf. *μολεῖν*, from *βλώσκω*, "go," "come," mostly poetic, frequent in Homer (*Il.* 24.781; cf. 6.286; *Od.* 3.44; *LSJ*, 319), also in Hellenistic epic (cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.704; 2.1223; 4.759, 1433; Callimachus *Hym. Dian.* 3.73; *Aet.*, Frg. 80.22 [= 82.4]; *Aet.*, Frg. 178.7; *Hec.*, Frg. 304.2; Zeno Citiensis [*SH*, 396, No. 852A.2]; Rhianus [*CA*, 20, No. 71.11]; not in LXX), read by BI, is accepted by Mras; preferable to *μόλει* (?), read by ON. On the general conditional relative clause with the subjunctive mood with *ἄν* or its equivalent (here *κε*), cf. Smyth ¶ 2567. Gifford, 4.309, proposes the optative form *μόλοι* (read by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 362) as appropriate with *ὅστις* (cf. Smyth, ¶ 2545d on the use of the optative in relative clauses to express generality in past time).

127. Our translation follows the suggestion of Pummer-Roussel, 181, that *κακός* be understood not as "evil" in the sense of "morally bad," but rather as "ill-born," thus an appropriate counterpart to *ἐσθλός*, "noble" (cf. *Od.* 6.284; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.58, 106, 107, 131; 3.917, 918 *al.*; Callimachus *Hym. Ap.* 2.9; *Epigr.* 6.11; 51.1; not in LXX); hence, "neither low-born nor high-born." They cite Homer *Od.* 22.414-16 *οὔ τινα γὰρ τίεσκον ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων, | οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλόν, ὅτις σφέας εἰσαφίκοιτο· | τῷ καὶ ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐπέσπον* (= *Od.* 23.65-66; cf. 67; also cf. 9.188-89) as the closest parallel (similarly, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364); also, cf. Archestratus Gelensis (*SH*, 69, No. 183) *κακὸς ἰχθὺς οὐδέ ποτ' ἐσθλός* (cf. Hesiod *Op.* 640). So understood, the line refers to the Shechemites'

inhospitality: they refuse to welcome anyone, whether illbred or wellbred. The Homeric parallel reinforces the likelihood that κακός is the original reading rather than καλός (I; similarly editors since Stephanus; cf. Ludwich, 8, n. 33, who observes that the Shechemites' refusal to honor a "zureisenden Bösewicht" (κακός) would have been unobjectionable!).

The Shechemites are also portrayed as xenophobic in *T. Levi* 6:9-10 (so, Fallon, 793, n. a on Frg. 7). For similar charges against Jews, cf. Josephus *Ag.Ap.* 2.10 ¶ 121; Tacitus *Hist.* 5.5 (=Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2.26, 39, n. on 5:1); Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.100-104 (=Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2.102-103, 107); generally, G. Stählin, ξένος κτλ., *TDNT* 5 (1967) 1-36, esp. 11-12.

Conceivably, when the Samaritans asked Antiochus IV Epiphanes to rename the temple on Mt. Gerizim Ζεὺς Ξένιος (2 Macc 6:2; also Josephus *Ant.* 12.5.5 ¶¶ 261-64), they not only wanted to distinguish it from the Jerusalem temple, but also intended to counter this negative reputation; accordingly, their central sanctuary would be viewed by pagans as dedicated to Zeus, Friend of Strangers. Cf. Fallon, 786, n. 11; also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.294; 2.195-96, n. 234. On the hospitality extended to Abraham by "the city at the temple Argarizin," cf. Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.5 (*FHJA* 1.172-73, 182-83, nn. 20-21).

Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 169-70, understands lines 4b-5 (his lines 37b-38) in a completely different sense: "(God sent disaster to the inhabitants of Shechem) because they were not obliged to make atonement, or expiation, when one was brought to them as wicked and ignoble"; that is, they did not take the appropriate action when one of their own (Shechem) committed a crime. Apparently, Walter follows Mras in reading κακός, which he renders "Schlechter," i.e., evil-doer in the moral sense, and he takes οὐδὲ as negating ἐσθλός, hence "Unedler." This interpretation fits well with the following line, which charges the

Shechemites with being lawless.

128. *οὐδὲ δίκας ἐδίκαζον ... οὐδὲ θέμιστας*. Cf. Homer *Od.* 9.215 (of Cyclops) *ἄγριον, οὔτε δίκας ἐὺ εἰδότα οὔτε θέμιστας* (so, Ludwich, 8, n. 35; Pummer-Roussel, 181; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364). On *δικάζω* with *δίκη*, cf. Hesiod *Op.* 39 *δίκην ... δίκασσαι*; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.1026-27 *βασιλεὺς ... | δίκας λαοῖσι δικάζει*; or, Herodotus 5.25 *ἐδίκασε δίκην ἄδικον*. For the expression in LXX, cf. Ps 42:1; 73:22; Lam 3:58. Cf. *LSJ*, 428, 789. Also, cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.987-88 (Amazons) *μάλ' ἐπήτιδες, οὐδὲ θέμιστας | τίουσαι*. For *θέμις* in LXX, cf. 2 Macc 6:20; 12:14.

ἀνὰ πτόλιν. Cf. *Il.* 8.55; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.653, 838; 3.573, 749; 4.1174, 1281; Epyllium: Anus Pauperata (*CA*, 79, No. 4.21); on *ἀνὰ ἄστυ*, cf. *Il.* 3.245; 6.505 *al.*; *Od.* 7.72; 8.7 *al.* Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 35.

129. Homeric echoes are heard in this line as well. Gifford, 4.309, sees it as combining two lines from Homer: *Il.* 1.518 *ἦ δὴ λοίγια ἔργ'* and *Il.* 18.497 *ἔνθα δὲ νεῖκος ὠρώρει* (contested by Pummer-Roussel, 181-82); cf. also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.989 (of the Amazons) *ἀλλ' ὕβρις στονόεσσα καὶ Ἄρεος ἔργα μεμήλει*.

On *λοίγια ἔργα*, "pestilent, deadly works," cf. *Il.* 1.518, 573; also *λοίγιον* in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.469. Cf. *LSJ*, 1060; Fallon-Yarbro, 35. *λοίγιος* does not occur in LXX.

Here, *ὠρώρει*, pluperfect mid. of *ὄρνυμι* (*Il.* 18.497 [cf. above]; Aeschylus *Ag.* 653; Sophocles *OC* 1622), "stir," "stir up," in middle, "move," or "make to arise"; in middle "arise," is understood as the equivalent of *ἦν* (esp. frequent in Apollonius of Rhodes, e.g., 1.713; 2.473; 3.457; so *LSJ*, 1254-55 [4]; not in LXX); similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 170, n. n; so rendered by Fallon, 793. On *ὠρώρει*, cf. below, n. 138.

130. Following closely upon the previous fragment, this fragment continues Polyhistor's rehearsal of Theodotus' poem. The first part of the fragment consists of Polyhistor's summary of Gen 34:25-26 (¶ 10), which introduces a quotation from the poem that depicts in vivid, Homeric style, Simeon and Levi's slaughter of Hamor and Shechem. As Collins, "Epic," 99, notes, Theodotus' exceptionally detailed account of the death of Hamor and Shechem distinguishes it from the parallel accounts treating this episode (cf. above n. 102). Then follows Polyhistor's summary of Theodotus' treatment of the brothers' plunder of the city (Gen 34:27-29).

On the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

131. This summary follows closely LXX Gen 24:25 *ἔλαβον ... ἕκαστος τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀσφαλῶς καὶ ἀπέκτειναν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν.* Typically, Polyhistor employs Hellenistic prose rather than following LXX. He reverses the biblical order of Simeon and Levi, but more importantly, omits the reference to its being the third day after the Shechemites' circumcision and their being sore. Nor does Theodotus confine the slaughter to "all the males," but rather "those whom they met."

Instead of *μάχαιραν λαβεῖν*, Theodotus (more likely, Polyhistor) uses *καθοπλίζω*, "equip," "arm fully," middle, "arm oneself fully" (Plutarch *Phil.* 9.3 ¶ 360; also 4 Macc 3:12; 7:11; *Ep. Arist.* 14; Xenophon *Cyr.* 2.1.11; Diodorus Siculus 19.27.6).

On *ἀναιρεῖν*, cf. above nn. 106 & 114.

132. *ὥρουσεν*, from *ὀρούω*, "dart," "rush forward," a Homeric term, especially used in combat scenes; cf. *Il.* 14.401 (Trojans and Achaeans) *ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ὄρουσαν*; also *Il.* 11.92, 217; 15.726; 16.258; *Hymni* 28.8-9 *ἣ* (Athena) ... *ἐσσυμένως ὥρουσεν ... σείσασ'*

ὀξὺν ἄκοντα; Hesiod *Sc.* 412, 436; also (but not of fighting) Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.1245, 1708; Simias (*CA*, 119, No. 26.18). Cf. *LSJ*, 1256. ὀρούω does not occur in LXX.

133. Theodotus agrees with *T. Levi* 6:4 in reporting that Simeon killed Hamor and that Levi killed Shechem, although *T. Levi* reverses the order, in keeping with the prominence it gives to Levi. Cf. Fallon, 793, n. c on Frg. 8; also Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 171, n. i.

134. πλῆξε τέ οἱ κεφαλήν. cf. *Od.* 12.412 ἱστὸς ... πλῆξε κυβερνήτεω κεφαλήν; also cf. *Il.* 15.433 τὸν ῥ' ἔβαλεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ οὔατος ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ (so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364). On πλῆξε, epic aor. of πλήσσω/πλήττω, cf. *Il.* 2.266; also Herodotus 3.64; Josephus *Ant.* 4.8.33 ¶ 277; with κεφαλήν, Herodotus 3.14, as a sign of grief. Also, πλῆξεν, of human combat, cf. Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.1033; 2.107; 4.469; also 1.428; 2.1045. Cf. *LSJ*, 1421. Cf. LXX 1 Sam 11:11 *al.*

135. δειρὴν δ' ἔλεν. On δειρή, "neck," "throat," especially in contexts of fighting, cf. *Il.* 3.371; 13.202; 14.412; 18.177; *Od.* 22.472; also (though not as object of attack) Apollonius of Rhodes, *Arg.* 1.673; 4.127; Theocritus 18.57. Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 38. The term does not occur in LXX.

136. ἐν χερὶ λαιῇ. Instead of λαιός, "left," Homer uses ἀριστερός. Cf., however, Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.120 λαιῆς ... χειρὸς; also 1.495, 1237; 2.678, 1036; 3.1160; 4.44, 179, 1519. The term does not occur in LXX.

137. λεῖψε δ' ἔτι σπαίρουσαν. Cf. Nonnus *D.* 22.318 τὸν δὲ λιπὼν σπαίροντα; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.874 παῖδα φίλον σπαίροντα διὰ φλογός (so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364). σπαίρω, "gasp," "pant,"

"quiver," does not occur in Homer; used of dying fish in Aristotle *Resp.* 3 (471^{a}30); cf. also *AnthGr* 6.30.7 (Macedonius); 7.430.9 (Dioscorides). 12.132.4 (Meleager). Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* 2.620, commenting on *AnthGr* 12.132a, note that σπαίρεις used for ἀσπ- is "very rare," also citing Nicander *Al.* 318. Cf. LXX 4 Macc 15:15.

By contrast, ἀσπαίρω, "gasp," "pant," of the dying, is used in Homer, e.g., *Il.* 12.203 ζωὸν ἔτ' ἀσπαίροντα (so, Gifford, 4.309); *Od.* 8.526 ἡ μὲν τὸν θνήσκοντα καὶ ἀσπαίροντα ἰδοῦσα; also cf. *Il.* 3.293; 10.521; 13.443, 571, 573; *Od.* 12.254-55; 19.229. Cf. *LSJ*, 259. The term does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* Nor does it occur in LXX. Accordingly, Fallon, 793, n. b on Frg. 8, suggests that the text be emended to ἔτ' ἀσπαίρουσαν, hence, "then let it (throat) go gasping its last breath."

138. ἐπεὶ πόνος ἄλλος ὀρώρει. Cf. *Il.* 12.348 πόνος καὶ νεῖκος ὄρωρεν (so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364); also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.434 ἐπεὶ μέμονάς γε πόνοιο; also 1.246; 2.649; 3.509, 1401.

On ὀρώρει, plupf. of ὄρνυμι, cf. above, n. 129.

139. μένος ἄσχετος. Cf. *Od.* 2.85 μένος ἄσχετε (= *Od.* 2.303; 17.406); 3.104 μένος ἄσχετοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν; 20.19 (Cyclops) μένος ἄσχετος; also *Il.* 5.892 μένος ἐστὶν ἀάσχετον.

ἄσχετος (though not with μένος) in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.1334; 3.606, 1048, 1322; 4.622, 742, 1087, 1738; also Bion 1.40. Cf. Homer *Il.* 16.548-49 πένθος | ἄσχετον.

Neither μένος nor ἄσχετος occurs in LXX.

Cf. Gifford, 4.309; Fallon-Yarbro, 39; Walter *JSHRZ* (4.3), 170, n. e; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 364.

140. ἔλλαβε χαίτης. On χαίτη, ἡ, "loose, flowing hair," cf. *Il.* 14.175; 23.141; also 10.15; *Od.* 10.567;

Pindar *N.* 1.14; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.1057; 3.50; 4.1366, 1533, 1605; Callimachus *Hym. Dian.* 3.76; Theocritus 20.23; Bion 1.81. Cf. *LSJ*, 1970; Fallon-Yarbro, 39. Cf. LXX Job 18:16 Sm; Ps 79 (80):12 Sm.

141. *γούνων ἁπτόμενον.* The scene recalls features of Achilles' slaying of Lycaon, *Il.* 21.64-135, esp. 21.65 *γούνων ἅφασθαι μεμαώς* (i.e., Lycaon clutching the knees of Achilles his slayer); 21.68-69 (Lycaon dodging Achilles) *λάβε γούνων | κύφας*; 21.71 *αὐτὰρ ὁ τῇ ἑτέρῃ μὲν ἑλὼν ἐλλίσσετο γούνων*; (also 21.74, 115). Also, cf. *Il.* 20.463, 468-69. Cf. Gifford, 4.309; also below, nn. 143 and 144.

On clinging to the knees of one's enemy as a position from which one pleads for mercy, cf. *Il.* 24.357; *Od.* 22.339, 342-43, 365-66; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.82, 1013.

142. *ἄσπετα μαργήναντα. ἄσπετα*, from *ἄσπετος, -ον*, "unspeakable," "unutterable," chiefly epic adjective, frequent in Homer, here adverbially; cf. *Il.* 17.332 *τρεῖτ' ἄσπετον*, "tremble *unspeakably*" (so, *LSJ*, 259; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 365); also frequent in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* (24x); also, cf. Callimachus *Galatea*, Frg. 378.2; Moschus 2.128 (so, Fallon-Yarbro, 39). The term does not occur in LXX.

μαργήναντα, from *μαργαίνω*, "rage furiously" (cf. *Il.* 5.882), read by B, whereas ION read *μάργην ὄντα*. The former is preferred even though *LSJ*, 1080, report that *μαργαίνω* occurs only in the present (cf. Democritus 147; Coluthus 198; also Tryphiodorus 434 *καὶ ἄγρια μαργαίνουσα*; cf. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 365). The feminine form of *μάργος*, "mad," "furious" (cf. Homer *Od.* 16.421; 18.2; 23.11; *Epigr.* 4.4; Callimachus *Iamb.* Frg. 193.38) in ION is inexplicable (so, Fallon-Yarbro, 37). *μαργαίνω* does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*; cf. Callimachus *Iamb.*, Frg. 195.27 *μαργῶντας ἵππους*. The term does not occur in LXX.

143. ἤλασε δὲ κληῖδα μέσην. κληῖς, Ionic form (used by Homer) of κλείς, "bar," "bolt," by extension "hook," "tongue," thus "collarbone" (*LSJ*, 957). Cf. *Il.* 17.309 τὸν βάλ' ὑπὸ κληῖδα μέσην; also *Il.* 5.146, 579; 8.325; 21.117; 22.324 (all combat scenes). The term does not occur in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* or Callimachus in this sense. Cf. LXX Judg 3:25; 1 Chr 9:27; Job 31:22; Isa 22:22; Bel 12, but meaning "key." Cf. Gifford, 4.309; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 365; also below, n. 144.

144. δῦ δὲ ξίφος ὀξύ. Cf. *Il.* 21.116-18 Ἀχιλεὺς δὲ ἐρυσσάμενος ξίφος ὀξὺ | τύψε κατὰ κληῖδα παρ' αὐχένα, πᾶν δέ οἱ εἴσω | δῦ ξίφος ἄμφηκες (so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 365); also *Il.* 16.340 πᾶν δ' εἴσω ἔδυ ξίφος (so, Gifford, 4.309).

On ξίφος ὀξύ, cf. Homer *Il.*4.530; 12.190; 14.496; 20.284; 21.116; also *Od.* 2.3 (= 4.308; 20.125); 9.300; 10.294, 535 (= 11.48); 14.528; 21.34, 119, 431; cf. Wis 18:16. ξίφος in Callimachus *Epigr.* 26.3; frequent in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, but not with ὀξύς. Cf. LXX Josh 10:28 *etc.*

145. σπλάγχνα διὰ στέρνων. This expression is unusual in that σπλάγχνα in Homer is used of the inner organs of animals (cf. e.g., *Il.* 1.464 [= 2.427]; 2.426; *Od.* 3.9, 40, 461 [= 12.364]; 20.252, 260. Cf. LXX Prov 26:22 *etc.*).

The usage here more closely conforms to Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.1262; 4.1109, where σπλάγχνα is used of human organs, though not in contexts of fighting.

στέρνων, from στέρνον, "breast," "chest," used in both singular and plural in Homer, always of males (*LSJ*, 1640); cf. *Il.* 4.527-31 βάλε δουρὶ | στέρνον ὑπὲρ μαζοῖο, πάγη δ' ἐν πνεύμονι χαλκός· ... | ἐκ δ' ὄβριμον ἔγχος | ἐσπάσατο στέρνοιο, ἐρύσσατο δὲ ξίφος ὀξύ, τῷ ὅ γε γαστέρα τύψε μέσην ... In Apollonius of

Rhodes *Arg.* 2.106 *στέρνον* is used in a context of fighting (cf. 4.597), but it is not pierced by a sword. Cf. Callimachus *Hym. Dian.* 3.78 *μεσσάτιον στέρνοιο μένει μέρος*; also in Theocritus 2.39; 24.80. Cf. Fallon-Yarbro, 39. Cf. LXX Sir 26:18 hapax.

146. *λίπε δὲ φυχὴ δέμας*. Cf. *Il.* 5.696 *τὸν δὲ λίπε φυχή* (so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons *Supp. Hell.*, 365); 16.453 *αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ τόν γε λίπῃ φυχή τε καὶ αἰών*; *Od.* 14.426 (of a boar) *τὸν δ' ἔλιπε φυχή*; cf. also *Il.* 14.518; 16.856 (= 22.362); 23.100, 104, 106; *Od.* 10.560 (= 11.65); 14.134; 18.91; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 1.280.

φυχή in Callimachus *Epigr.* 12.2; 20.2; 25.4; 42.1.

δέμας, τό, "bodily frame," usually of man, in *Il.* 5.801; 8.305; *Od.* 8.14, 116, *al.*; (cf. *LSJ*, 378); frequent in Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.*, e.g., 1.204 *al.*; also Moschus 2.79, 84. The term does not occur in LXX.

147. Instead of the MSS reading *αὖθις*, "again," and the emendation *εὐθύς*, widely accepted by editors since Stephanus (and read by Mras), Fallon, 793, n. d on Frg. 8, prefers the epic form *αὖθι*, "forthwith," "straightway" (*Il.* 5.296; 6.281, *al.*).

148. With *ἐπιβοηθῆσαι*, from *ἐπιβοαθέω*, "come to aid," "succour" someone, Polyhistor returns to non-Homeric language (cf. *LSJ*, 625). The term does not occur in LXX; cf. LXX Gen 34:27 (the brothers) *εἰσῆλθον ἐπὶ τοὺς τραυματίας καὶ διήρπασαν τὴν πόλιν.*

Gen. Rab. 80 omits reference to their pillaging the city; perhaps 80:7.3, "The (people of Shechem) had in mind to cheat but were themselves cheated."

149. *καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἀναρρυσαμένους*. Cf. LXX Gen 34:26 *καὶ* (Simeon and Levi) *ἔλαβον τὴν Διναν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Συχεμ καὶ ἐξῆλθον.*

The rescue of Dinah is out of sequence here (similarly, *Jub*. 30.24). In the biblical account, Simeon and Levi (not the brothers) rescue her immediately after they finish their slaughter of Hamor, Shechem, and the males of the city (Gen 34:26).

In *Gen. Rab.* 80.11, Dinah must be forcibly removed.

ἀναρρυσαμένους, from ἀναρρύω, "*draw* the victim's head *back* so as to cut the throat," thus "sacrifice" (e.g., Pindar *O.* 13.81); middle aor., "draw back," "rescue" (Hippocrates *Ep.* 23; Iamblichus *VP* 7.33; references cited in *LSJ*, 119). Cf. LXX Aq Ps 33 (34):5; Cf. also Gifford, 4.309, who notes that ἀναρρυσαμένους literally rendered is "having drawn up," as from a well, citing Cratinus *Didasc. Fr.* and Suidas Ἀναρύτειν· ἐξαντλεῖν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐρύεσθαι. ὅτε σὺ τοὺς καλοὺς θριάμβους ἀναρύτουσ' ἀπεχθάνου. He concludes, "The reading of O ἀναρυσαμένους and the reference to ἐρύομαι by Suidas suggest ἀνερυσαμένους as more appropriate to the idea of 'rescuing.' He also cites *AnthGr* 6.300 (Leonidas) ὡς ἐκ νούσου ἀνειρύσω.

150. Theodotus omits Jacob's censure (Gen 34:30; cf. 49:5-7); cf. *T. Levi* 6:6-7; *Jub.* 30:25. As Collins, "Epic," 96, observes, "In Theodotus there is no hint of disapproval of their deed, nor indeed could there be, if God had inspired it. In all, the destruction of Shechem is endorsed far more wholeheartedly by Theodotus than is the case in the biblical account."

PHILO THE EPIC POET

To an otherwise unidentified Philo[1] are attributed twenty-four lines of hexameter verse. Whether he is the Philo whom Josephus designates "the Elder" and identifies as a Greek (*Ag.Ap.* 1.23 ¶ 218), and whose work is likely further delineated by Clement (*Strom.* 1.21.141.3) and Eusebius (*H.E.* 6.13.7), remains debated.[2] The central issue is the degree to which these poetic texts treat historical matters, which seems to have been the focal interest of Philo the Elder. How the question is resolved also affects one's judgment about the overall content and extent of the poetic fragments[3] as well as their date of composition[4].

That the author was Jewish is clearly suggested by the topics he chose to treat: Abraham, Joseph, Jerusalem.[5] Whether anything more can be deduced about his social status is difficult to say.[6]

The Work. In each of the three places where the work is cited in Eusebius (*P.E.* 9.20.1-2; 24.1; 37.1-3), its title is given by Polyhistor as *On Jerusalem.*[7] Even though Frgs. 1-2 and Frg. 3 focus on Abraham and Joseph respectively, Frgs. 4-6 have

as their central interest Jerusalem and its water supply. If the title is authentic as well as descriptive of the work, it may be assumed that the treatment of both Abraham and Joseph related to the author's larger literary purpose of praising Jerusalem.[8] Thus, both the title preserved in the tradition and the content of the fragments suggest that the work should be understood within the tradition of Hellenistic epic poetry that praised cities and countries,[9] most notably the third century B.C.E. works *Argonautica* by Apollonius of Rhodes and *Messeniaca* by Rhianus of Bene in Crete, and perhaps the *Hecale* by Callimachus.[10]

The length of the work has been a source of controversy. In the MSS tradition, Polyhistor is said to have excerpted the fragment on Joseph from the "fourteenth book" (*P.E.* 9.24.1 = Frg. 3.1). Convinced that brevity was the norm for Hellenistic epic poetry, Freudenthal contested this and emended the text to read "fourth book" (cf. discussion in annotations, n. 36). It was difficult to see how twelve (or thirteen) books could have been devoted to the period between Abraham, who is said to have been treated in the "first book" (*P.E.* 9.20.1. = Frg. 1.1), and Joseph. Noting that Jerusalem was also treated in the "first book" (*P.E.* 9.37.1 =

Frg. 4.1), scholars naturally wondered whether Philo treated events in chronological order.[11] Recent study of Hellenistic epic poetry has re-opened the question whether Callimachus' penchant for brevity should be regarded as the norm, or whether longer epic works were more common.[12] Consequently, some scholars think it likely that Philo's epic work on Jerusalem might have been of considerable length, hence a major work.[13]

Style. The language of the fragments is notably obscure.[14] Even though only twenty-four lines are preserved, there are numerous hapax legomena and highly unusual forms.[15] His style is usually characterized as bombastic and pretentious, but justified as typical of this form of Hellenistic epic.[16] Whether he is intentionally obscure, either in imitation of accepted Hellenistic literary conventions[17] or because of his Orphic connections,[18] or whether he sought to write intelligibly but had insufficient command of Greek language and style to do so or had his otherwise intelligible language corrupted through textual transmission[19] is still debated. Whereas critics formerly judged Philo's literary accomplishments with unqualified harshness, more recent assessments have been less negative and

correspondingly more appreciative.[20] Rather than being judged by earlier classical standards, e.g., the Homeric epic, it is now generally recognized that his work must be evaluated in the light of later, Hellenistic literary standards, and when this is done, he tends to fare better.[21]

Date and Place of Composition. Since Philo's work is preserved by Alexander Polyhistor, who flourished in the first century B.C.E. (ca. 105-35 B.C.E), it is certain that his work was composed prior to the mid-first century B.C.E. It is difficult to be more precise than this. Other indications of his date are only indirect and conjectural. If the "pool of the high priest" mentioned in Frg. 6 (=*P.E.* 9.37.3) is the pool built by Simon II (219-196 B.C.E.) and mentioned in Sir 50:3, then obviously the work must have been written after that date.[22] Or, if Walter is correct in proposing that the double pool of Bethesda is being described in Frgs. 4-6, and if the origin of the latter is traceable to the Hasmonean period, this would serve as an earlier chronological reference point for the fragments.[23] If he is to be identified with the Philo mentioned by Josephus and Clement,[24] and if they arranged their list of witnesses (Demetrius, Philo, Eupolemus) in

chronological order,[25] this may help establish his date between the end of the 3rd century B.C.E. and the mid-second century B.C.E.[26]

Another basis for establishing his date indirectly relates to the literary sources on which he might have depended. Assuming that he followed models of Hellenistic epic, such as those third century authors mentioned above, as is likely, this obviously places him after them. Similarly, if his description of the water system in Jerusalem depends in any sense on the panegyric of Simon II, and the tradition embodied in Sirach, the time of composition must have been later than the Greek translation of Sirach, which from the preface can be reasonably established ca. 130 B.C.E.[27] Depending on how one construes the relationship between Philo's description of Jerusalem's water supply and that of *Ep. Arist.* 89-91, it may be possible to date Philo in the same era as *Ep. Arist.*, i.e., ca. 100 B.C.E.[28]

As for the place of composition, traditionally it has been assumed that Philo's interest in Jerusalem suggests a Jerusalem provenance.[29] It must be asked, however, whether his description of Jerusalem in Frgs. 4-6 necessarily means that he lived in Jerusalem either as a permanent or short-

term resident,[30] or even whether he must have actually seen the city itself.[31] Given his affinity with other Hellenistic epics, an Alexandrian provenance is more likely.[32] A Samaritan provenance is unlikely.[33]

Sources. As already noted, contemporary Hellenistic epicists serve as models for Philo, although his direct dependence on any of them is difficult to establish because of the brevity of the fragments.[34] Although elements resembling Orphic traditions have been noted in the fragments, actual contact with Orphic circles or actual use of these traditions has not been demonstrated.[35] Obviously, given the content of Frgs. 1-3, and perhaps Frgs. 4-6, Philo is dependent on biblical traditions, and most likely LXX traditions, although specific instances of his use of LXX, for example, orthography of proper names, are not easily forthcoming.[36] It is also possible that his re-telling biblical stories merely reflects his general knowledge of oral biblical traditions, or perhaps even midrashic and haggadic traditions.[37]

Significance. The brevity of the fragments, combined with the difficulty of the language and the corruptness of the textual tradition, require caution in assessing Philo's significance. His

treatment of Abraham and Joseph is in many respects quite straightforward, indeed ordinary, and reflects an interest in these heroic figures typically found in Jewish writings of the Hellenistic-Roman period. Yet, read one way, Frgs. 1-3, especially Frg. 3, may present significantly enhanced profiles of both figures[38]. Accordingly, the texts may reflect both apologetic and propagandistic dimensions. Whether the description of the Jerusalem water supply in Frgs. 4-6 in any sense reflects historical realities is debated; nevertheless, it may be one of the earliest literary testimonies to the double pool of Bethesda, and thus may have an impact on archaeological investigations relating to that structure.[39]

It is also important to assess the significance of Philo's adoption and use of the genre of Hellenistic epic. Even though assessments of his mastery of the epic style differ, it is at least clear that he had more than an elementary command of the language.[40] As brief as the fragments are, they nevertheless show familiarity with, and perhaps dependence on, Hellenistic literary models, and perhaps even classical models, most notably Homer. Regardless of when and where

Philo flourished, the fragments provide clear indications of Jewish assimilation with Hellenistic culture.[41] More specifically, they illustrate how Jewish authors were moving into sophisticated forms of Greek literary expression. The earlier this can be established as having occurred, and the farther away from well known centers of Hellenistic culture, e.g., Alexandria, the more significant.

NOTES

1. Testimonia: Eusebius *P.E.* 9.20.1; 24.1; 37.1; possibly Josephus *Ag.Ap.* 1.23 ¶ 218 *ὁ μέντοι Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος καὶ Φίλων ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ Εὐπόλεμος οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διήμαρτον. οἷς συγγιγνώσκειν ἄξιον· οὐ γὰρ ἐνῆν αὐτοῖς μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας τοῖς ἡμετέροις γράμμασι παρακολουθεῖν* (= Eusebius *P.E.* 9.42.3); Clement of Alexandria *Stromata* 1.21.141.1 *Δημήτριος δέ φησιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων ... 3 Φίλων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέγραφε τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς Ἰουδαίων διαφώνως τῷ Δημητρίῳ. 4 ἔτι δὲ καὶ Εὐπόλεμος ...* (later referred to in Eusebius *H.E.* 6.13.7). Cf. Philippson, 61; Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.689-90; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 33.

Strictly speaking, it is only Eusebius who cites poetic texts and attributes them to Philo (*P.E.* 9.20.1; 24.1; 37.1). In each instance, he is quoting directly from Alexander Polyhistor (*P.E.* 9.20.2 = Frg. 2.2; *P.E.* 9.37.3 = Frg. 6.3); hence it is Polyhistor who actually first attributes the poetry to Philo. That Eusebius himself agrees is reflected by his inclusion of Philo's name in the chapter headings introducing each fragment (on Eusebius' authorship of the chapter headings, cf. Mras, *GCS* [43,1] viii-ix; also *FHJA* 1.13). Apart from supplying the title of the work "On Jerusalem," Polyhistor does not further identify Philo.

Whether this Philo mentioned by Polyhistor is to be equated with other persons with the same name remains uncertain. Since he clearly flourished prior to the time of Polyhistor (ca. 105 B.C.E. - 35 B.C.E.), he obviously cannot be identified with Philo of Alexandria who flourished several decades

later (ca. 20 B.C.E. to ca. 50 C.E.).

A more likely possibility is that he is to be equated with Φίλωνι ὁ πρεσβύτερος, mentioned by Josephus in *Ag.Ap.* 1.23 ¶ 218. Eusebius repeats the title in his verbatim excerpt of this text in *P.E.* 9.42.3, but clearly it remains Josephus' designation rather than his own. Most likely, it is Josephus' way of distinguishing him from the more famous "younger" Philo of Alexandria (cf. Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 33, n. 7; also, Denis, *Introduction*, 270; Schürer, *History* 3[1].560) and perhaps from Philo of Byblos as well (cf. Viger, *PG* [21], 712, n. 34; Seguier, *PG* [21] 1568, n. on col. 712 C1), although Philo of Byblos is likely to have flourished too late to have been cited by Josephus (cf. Philippson, 54, n. 5; Walter, *Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, 54, n. 3; also H. W. Attridge and R. A. Oden, Jr., *Philo of Byblos: The Phoenician History* [CBQ Monograph Series; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981] 22, n. 4, who date Philo of Byblos ca. 64-141). As is well known, Josephus mentions Philo, along with Demetrius of Phalerum and Eupolemus, as *pagan* authors who are exceptionally accurate in their treatment of things Jewish. It is now widely conceded, however, that all three were actually Jewish authors and that he confuses Demetrius the Chronographer with Demetrius of Phalerum (cf. *FHJA* 1.98, n. 2; also 55, n. 1). Though he does not say so explicitly, Josephus seems to imply that Philo the Elder is an historian; at least, he is bracketed by two (Jewish) authors whose main concern was historical subjects.

The later testimony of Clement of Alexandria *Stromata* 1.21.141.3, though quite brief, appears to be directly dependent on Josephus, since he mentions the same series of witnesses: Demetrius, Philo, and Eupolemus--and in the same order! (L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera*, lxxxxvi,

incorrectly identifies this Philo mentioned by Clement as Philo of Byblos; cf. Walter, *Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, 54, n. 3; also discussion above.) In fact, it was this threefold schema that led Freudenthal, 170, n., to think that the tradition actually goes back to Polyhistor himself. And, it is interesting to note that in at least two instances, quotations from Philo occur in Eusebius *P.E.*, immediately after excerpts that have been attributed to Demetrius (9.19.4 = Frg. 1; 9.23.4 = Frg. 2; cf. annotations to Philo Epicus, nn. 1 & 34); in any case, the fact that Eusebius quotes excerpts from both Demetrius (*P.E.* 9.19, 21, 29) and Eupolemus (*P.E.* 9.26, 30-34, 39; (Pseudo)-Eupolemus in 9.17 & 18) in the same contexts where he cites Philo strengthens the possibility that he has drawn directly on Alexander Polyhistor. Clement's contribution to the tradition, however, is his mention of Philo's treatment of the "kings of Judea," noting specifically that it differed from that of Demetrius, whose work *On the Kings in Judaea* he has just cited (= Frg. 6, *FHJA* 1.78-79). Given this explicit reference to the content of his work and the fact that it occurs in a section treating chronology, Clement's Philo is like Josephus' "Philo the Elder" in being concerned with historical matters. In neither case is it implied that Philo is anything other than an historian; certainly, no indication that he is a poet.

Eusebius reflects the same tradition preserved in Clement in his summary of the contents of the *Stromata*. In *H.E.* 6.13.7, he lists several writers mentioned by Clement who showed that Moses and the Jewish people had origins more ancient than the Greeks. Listed are Philo, Aristobulus, Josephus, Demetrius, and Eupolemus, all of whom Eusebius identifies as "Jewish writers" (*Ἰουδαίων συγγραφέων*). While it is conceivable that this otherwise unidentified Philo is Philo of

Alexandria, because he is mentioned along with Demetrius and Eupolemus, it is more likely that Eusebius has in mind "Philo the Elder" first mentioned by Josephus and repeated by Clement. The significant item in this testimony, however, is Eusebius' explicit identification of Philo as a "Jewish writer," which may be his intended correction of the Josephan tradition.

At one point in the commentary tradition on Josephus, *Ag.Ap.* 1.23 ¶ 218, Philo the Elder was linked with Philo the Pythagorean mentioned by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 1.15 [72.4]; 2.19 [100.3]). One way of defending Josephus' statement that Philo was a Gentile author was to identify him with this later pagan "Philo the Pythagorean." But it became all too clear that the latter was actually a reference to Philo of Alexandria, especially in light of Clement's reference to his "treating the history of Moses," which doubtless was Philo's *Life of Moses*. On this debate, cf. Philippson, 55-56; also J. Morris, "The Jewish Philosopher Philo," in Schürer, *History* 3(2).809-89, esp. 872-73, n. 9.

Thus even though the testimonia of Josephus, Clement, and Eusebius *H.E.* belong to the same tradition, there is no clear indication that it is directly related to the tradition attributing poetic works to Philo. The one consideration that makes their identification likely is that the poetic excerpts treat historical matters, most notably Abraham and Joseph as historical personages, and historical sites, most notably Jerusalem. In this sense, the content of the poetic fragments and the references to "Philo the Elder's" historical concerns are similar.

2. Cf. n. 1 above. Those who identify Philo the poet as Philo the Elder include Viger, *PG* (21) 712, n. 34, also cited in Müller, *FHG* 3.214; Philippson,

53-59; Freudenthal, 100; Müller, *Apion*, 181; Susemihl, *Geschichte* 2.654; Ludwich, 5, n. 1; Gifford 4.303; Stearns, 95; Schürer, *Geschichte* 3.497-98; Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 606; Riessler, 733; Ziegler, 20; Hadas, 99; Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.689-90, who includes the fragments under the title "Philon der Aëltere" (No. 729); Denis, *Introduction*, 270-71; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1.707; 2.986, n. 202; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* 1.69; 2.52, n. 139; 71, n. 352; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 328.

Those distinguishing the two Philos include Dähne, *Geschichtliche* 2.199; Seguier, *PG* (21) 1568-69; Ewald, 5.260, n. 5; Laqueur, 52; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 33; Walter, *Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, 54, n. 3; *Untersuchungen*, 108-111, 234-35; *JSHRZ* (1.2) 113; *JSHRZ* (4.3), 139 (followed by Schaller, 771); Schürer, *History* 3(1).560; van der Horst, "Korte notities," 103.

Those leaving the question open include Gutman, "Philo," 36; Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 282, n. 91; *EncJud*, 407; Attridge, *OTP* 2.781; Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 31.

3. The fragments themselves focus only on an earlier period of Israelite history, i.e., Abraham and Joseph, even though the description of Jerusalem's water supply in Frgs. 4-6 appears to presuppose later Jewish history, e.g., the mention of the "pool of the high priest" (*P.E.* 9.37.3 = Frg. 6.3). If, however, Philo Epicus also treated the period of the kings envisioned in Demetrius' *On the Kings in Judaea*, i.e., the exilic and post-exilic period, as Clement asserts (cf. Demetrius, Frg. 6, *FHJA* 1.78-79, 90-91, nn. 91-97), then obviously the case for his epic being a work of many volumes is strengthened. As Schürer, *History* 3(1).560, notes, "If the two Philos are in fact identical, Philo must have celebrated Jerusalem in

verse in a way that provided at the same time a history of the Jewish kings, as we may suppose from the fragments of Eusebius."

The work, however, may not have been chronologically sequential (cf. Gutman, "Philo," 38, n. 2). This observation is reinforced by the fact that his description of Jerusalem is said to occur in the "first book" (*P.E.* 9.37.1 = Frg. 4.1), whereas the excerpt on Joseph is said to have been taken from the "fourteenth (perhaps "fourth," or even "first"; cf. annotations, n. 36) book" (*P.E.* 9.24.1 = Frg. 3.1). One would expect the Abraham excerpt to have occurred in the "first book" (*P.E.* 9.20.1 = Frg. 1.1). If, however, the work served as a general panegyric on Jerusalem, it is conceivable that Philo could have ranged widely in drawing from different periods of Jewish history in discussing various aspects of Jerusalem.

Or, in a more general sense, if Philo's being mentioned with Demetrius and Eupolemus implies that his scope of historical interest was similarly extensive, this would mean that his work might have treated matters also found in the other two authors, e.g., anything from the time of Abraham and the patriarchs (Demetrius, Frgs. 1-2; Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frgs. 1-2), Moses and the exodus (Demetrius, Frg. 3-5; Eupolemus, Frg. 1), Solomon (Eupolemus, Frg. 2-3), and Jeremiah (Eupolemus, Frg. 4), indeed the whole scope of Jewish history (Demetrius, Frg. 6; Eupolemus, Frg. 5).

Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.13.7 may even imply that the content also treated Moses.

4. If he is identified with Philo the Elder, and if Josephus lists his witnesses in chronological order (i.e., Demetrius, Philo the Elder, Eupolemus; similarly, Clement *Stromata* 1.21.141.1-5), this would establish his date after Demetrius the Chronographer (ca. late 3rd cent. B.C.E.) and

before the time of Eupolemus (ca. mid-second cent. B.C.E.), thus ca. 200 B.C.E. (so, Schmid-Stählin, 606; Gutman, "Philo," 36-37; Denis, *Introduction*, 271; Attridge, 781).

5. Cf., e.g., Denis, *Introduction*, 271. At an earlier stage, the notion was seriously entertained that Philo Epicus was a Gentile. The question is discussed and successfully resolved by Philippson, 54-60.

6. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 283, conjectures that Philo, like Eupolemus, may have belonged to the "highest echelons of the priestly class," because of "his mention of the high priest and his concern with ritual."

7. On the precise Greek wording of the title, cf. annotations, n. 2.

8. This is more clearly the case with respect to Abraham than it is with Joseph. Treating the Akedah in connection with Jerusalem may reflect dependence on a tradition that linked Moriah with Mt. Zion (2 Chr 3:1; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.13.2 ¶ 226; 7.13.4 ¶ 333; *Jub.* 18:13; *Gen. Rab.* 55:7; *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen. 22:2; cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 141, n. 14).

9. Cf. Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 44, 57, n. 99; Gutman, "Philo," 38-39, 59-63.

10. Cf. Atwell-Hanson, 1-14, who delineate this literary tradition in some detail, citing particular stylistic similarities; also, Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.624-49.

11. Thus, the arrangement in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.690-91, assumes that the frgs. treating Abraham and Jerusalem occurred in the "first book," while the

Joseph frg. occurred in a later book (although he conjectures that even the Joseph frg. may have occurred in the first book; cf. 3.691 app. crit.); similarly construed by Wacholder, *EncJud*, 407-408. (Jacoby actually envisions a fourth, missing frg. treating Moses, referred to in Eusebius *H.E.* 6.13.7.)

12. Cf. especially, Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos*, 20-21; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 140, esp. n. 12.

13. Gutman, "Philo," 38, thinks of at least four books and that the extant fragments are but "a tiny fragment of the poet's composition."

14. Early translators dealt with the incomprehensibility of the language by leaving parts of it untranslated. For example, Viger, *PG* (21) 711-12, provides no Latin equivalent of Frgs. 1-2 (*P.E.* 9.20.1-2), explaining, n. 34, "At sequentes vetustioris hujus poetae versus, mihi quidem tenebrae *καὶ μηδὲν ὑγιές*. Nec manuscripti codices hilum juvant. Saltu igitur haec superare malui, quam in singulis fere verbis offendere." He does, however, provide a (partial) Latin translation of Frgs. 3-6 (*P.E.* 9.24.1 = *PG* (21) 725-26D and *P.E.* 9.37.1-3 = *PG* (21) 755-56 C-D). Similarly, Müller, *FHG* 3.213-14, 219, 229. Also, Gifford, 3.303, "These verses are made up of long and unusual words put into metre with little regard to sense....For the sake of completeness I have left the original Greek in the text of my translation"; so, Frgs. 1-2 untranslated, 3.453; Frg. 3 translated, 3.460-61; and Frgs. 4-6 partially translated, 3.481 (of Frg. 4, he writes, 4.321, "These verses are so corrupt that I cannot attempt to translate them," though he does provide Viger's Latin translation). Seguier, *PG* (21) 1569, "Hi versus adeo sunt adulterati, ut Vigerus a

proposito eos in aliam linguam vertendi deterritus fuerit, nec reipsa verti possunt nisi mutentur pleraeque voces." Seguier's solution was to construct a heavily emended text: "Immutari oportuit innumeras voces ut sensum rationi consentaneum obtinerem, cum periculo discedendi a sensu textus primitivi. Correctiones meas criticae relinquo, nec eas quidem defendere conabor." He adopts a similar solution for Frgs. 4-6, drawing heavily on earlier proposed emendations by Scaliger and Vossius (cols. 1581-82).

Hadas, 99, "The language is so curled and enigmatic as to be virtually unintelligible." Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.707, "... a most obscure style"; 2.986, n. 202, "...barely comprehensible (verse)." Attridge, 781, "...pedantic and obscure Greek. Unusual words combine with opaque allusions and a bombastic style to render much of the poetry barely intelligible.... much of the obscurity is due to Philo's attempt to imitate the erudite epics of the Alexandrian period." Denis, *Introduction*, 271, "La langue de cette épopée est recherchée, énigmatique et obscure, à la manière des oracles..." Cf. Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 33.

15. E.g., κλυτοηχὲς, πλή(μ)μυρος, μεγαύχητος, αἰνόφυτα, αἰνογόνος, πολύμνιον, ἀρτίχερος, δέρκηθρον, μεγιστοῦχος, ὑψιφάεννον (cf. annotations, nn. 8, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 26, 57, 59, & 62).

16. Somewhat typical is the assessment of Schürer, *History* 3(1).559-60, "The language is that of Greek epic poetry. Philo's hexameters are however written without full control of Greek prosody, although the fact that his diction is pompous and stilted to the point of being unintelligible is in keeping with the purposeful obscurity of Hellenistic epics."

Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 1.ix, "... die sieben als ganz unverständlich verschrienen Verse mit einem Schlage erhellt." Lohse, 347, "Seine Hexameter sind in einem schwülstigen und geschraubten Stil geschrieben."

Atwell-Hanson, 45-46, however, contest Schürer's judgment that Philo was "contemptible of Greek prosody," noting that "no line (is) defective or unscannable," and that "the meter neither improves nor worsens in relation to the difficulty of comprehension." In fact, they cite several instances that reflect careful composition on his part.

17. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.633-38, notes the opacity of Hellenistic scholarly language, e.g., Apollonius of Rhodes, but especially Lycophron's *Alexandra* (ca. 273 B.C.E.). Cf. Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 57, n. 100; also, Schmid-Stählin, 607, who mention Lycophron and Euphorion (b. ca. 275 B.C.E.) as Philo's models; similarly, Hadas, 99, "obviously ... in keeping with the hellenistic mode of purposeful obscurity of which Lycophron is the classic pattern." On the unintelligibility of the Alexandrian poets, cf. Couat, *Alexandrian Poetry*, 135-36.

18. So, Ludwich, 3-4, "Philo ... hüllte sich geflissentlich in das mysteriöse Dunkel der herkömmlichen Priesterpoesie ... (bewegt sich) in den theologischen, geschraubten, schwülstigen und gesucht-geheimnissvollen Weisen der Orphiker, denen er auch insofern treu bleibt, als er es wie sie meist verschmäht, durch Aufstöbern ganz verlegenen Wortkrams sich mit dem Nimbus profunder weltlicher Gelehrsamkeit zu umgeben.... Sein Vorbild ist also sicher nicht Homer gewesen, sondern vielmehr die ... Priesterpoesie der griechiscen Mystiker." Gutman, "Philo," 37, while recognizing Philo's

affinities with other Hellenistic writers, nevertheless suggests that, like the Orphic hymns, his apparent motive is "to shroud himself in a cloud of mystical obscurities." For a critique of Gutman's attempt to establish connections between Philo and Orphic traditions, cf. Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 44-46.

19. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 283, "...since the meaning of some lines is quite clear ... (he) wished to be understood. The unintelligibility must then be ascribed partly to the ravages of time, but chiefly ... to the fact that Philo's command of the Greek language was limited."

20. As noted above (cf. n. 16), Atwell-Hanson's analysis of Philo's meter provides a corrective to previous assessments, e.g., Schürer, *History*, 3(1).559-60; Stearns, 95, "though poetic in form (it) did not conform to metrical rules"; Susemihl, 2.654, "kläglich gebaute Hexameter"; Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 283, "his ill-constructed hexameters may be compared with Eupolemus' vulgar prose." Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 142, n. 19, concurs that such negative assessments have been insufficiently substantiated.

21. So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 142, who notes that Polyhistor's purpose in quoting Philo was primarily to convey geographical and cultural information about the Roman province of Judaea rather than to criticize the excesses of Jewish poetry: "Für sein und seiner Zeitgenossen Empfinden war die Dichtung Philons also durchaus 'normal,' dem Zeitgeschmack entsprechend, und die Zitate hatten seiner Meinung nach Informationswert -- trotz der Schwierigkeiten, die sie uns heute bereiten."

22. Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 144.

23. Cf. annotations, n. 51.

24. Cf. above n. 1.

25. The critical question, of course, is whether this schema implies a specific chronological order of the witnesses, or whether it simply points to an underlying common source, most notably Alexander Polyhistor. Cf. Atwell-Hanson, 41; Freudenthal, 34, 170-71 n.; Philippson, 56-57. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 139-40, n. 6, proposes that the common source is not Polyhistor but another, anonymous source, possibly Ptolemy of Mendes, which was written ca. 40 B.C.E. Cf. "Überlieferung einiger Reste," 318-20; also B. Z. Wacholder, "Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles," *HTR* 61 (1968) 451-81, esp. 470-77; also *Eupolemus*, 40-44.

26. Cf. above n. 4. So, Denis, *Introduction*, 271. Thus, the range of opinions includes the most cautious, namely that he is simply "earlier than Alexander Polyhistor"; so, Schürer, *History*, 3(1).560; Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 43; Philippson, 53; Ludwich, 3; or, "first century B.C.E."; so Riessler, 1315. Those placing him in the "second century B.C.E." include Laqueur, 52; Fiebig, 1198; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.69; van der Horst, *JHP*, 52 ("waarschijnlijk in de tweede eeuw v. Chr. leefden"). Others are more precise: Lohse, 347, "mid-second century B.C.E."; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 33, "ca. 200 B.C.E."; similarly Schmid-Stählin, 606; Hadas, 99. Gutman, "Philo," 36-37, "about the period of John Hyrcanus or even earlier"; similarly, Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, 169. Atwell-Hanson, 41-42, propose two additional bases for possible dating: 1) Philo's possible connection with a Jewish mystery movement in the time of Ptolemy IV (ca. 221-204 B.C.E), and 2) use of unusual terminology, specifically μεγαύχητος,

elsewhere attested only in the first half of the second century (cf. annotations, n. 14). Hence, they conclude that Philo likely flourished during the "first half of the second century (B.C.E.) ... (perhaps even) ... the first quarter of that century."

27. Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 142, 144.

28. So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 143-44.

29. So, Freudenthal, 100, 129; Karpeles, 1.183; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 34; Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 282; *EncJud*, 408; Denis, *Introduction*, 271; Schürer, *History*, 3(1).560. As Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3). 143, n. 27, cautions, the founding of a Greek gymnasium in Jerusalem during the time of Jason (ca. 174 B.C.E.) and the rabbis' demonstrated knowledge of Homer does not necessarily make it more likely that authors such as Philo Epicus or Ezekiel the tragedian received their Greek education in Jerusalem, especially considering how short-lived the hellenizing movement was. As far as the content of the fragments is concerned, apart from Frgs. 4-6, which focus on Jerusalem, it is also conceivable that Frgs. 1-2, which focus on the Akedah, would arise most naturally in a setting which identified Moriah with Mt. Zion, namely a Palestinian setting (cf. above n. 8).

30. Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 144; so argued by Freudenthal, 129; Karpeles, 1.183; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 34; also cf. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 282-83. Similar questions might be asked of *Ep. Arist.* 89-91, which is generally believed to reflect an Alexandrian provenance. Indeed, Diaspora Jews could have praised Jerusalem as easily and readily as those resident in Palestine (so Schürer, *History*, 3[1].560). Moreover, as Atwell-Hanson, 40,

note, it is possible that Philo's portrait of Jerusalem is drawn from the idealized picture in Ezek 47:1-12, which may mean that it is not based on an actual historical description or eyewitness account at all. Similarly, Attridge, 784, n. f.

31. Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 142.

32. So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 143-44; Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 46, 58, n. 111; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.69; 2.71, n. 352; Attridge, 781. Given Joseph's prominence in Jewish history in Egypt, the presence of Frg. 3 might be accounted for more easily if an Egyptian provenance is assumed (cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 144). This might be the case especially if the poem enhances the stature of the figure Joseph by calling him "great leader of all the earth" and "the most high" (cf. annotations, nn. 39 & 41). If geographical and topographical knowledge is any indication of authorship, it is difficult to imagine a native Palestinian committing such a blatant error concerning seasonal rains as that which occurs in Frg. 4 (cf. annotations, n. 54). For that matter, it is similarly difficult to imagine an Alexandrian making such a mistake. Perhaps the fault is Polyhistor's.

33. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.707, raises the possibility that Philo Epicus, like Theodotus, has Samaritan origins, though no reasons are given for this suggestion. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 283, by contrast, following Freudenthal, 101, envisions "bitter rivalry" between Philo Epicus, with his explicit loyalty to Jerusalem, and Theodotus, who praised Shechem; similarly, Karpeles, 1.184; Graetz, *Geschichte* 3.50.

34. Echoes of Homeric forms are listed by Atwell-

Hanson, 46. For the similarity of his language with that of other classical authors, cf. discussion of particular terms in the annotations.

35. On the case for Orphic connections, cf. esp. Gutman, "Philo," though earlier suggestions occur in Ludwich, 3-4. For a critique, cf. Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 44-46.

36. Cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 142. On possible LXX influences and his relation to LXX tradition, cf. annotations, nn. 5, 17, 18, 20, 32, 33, 38, 39, 49, 51, 53, & 63. Although it is generally asserted that Philo shows no evidence of having used the Hebrew Bible (so Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 142), in at least one instance his text is closer to the MT than LXX. Cf. annotations, n. 30.

37. Cf. van der Horst, *JHP*, 53; also, annotations, n. 17.

38. Cf. annotations, nn. 8, 14, 17, & 39.

39. Cf. annotations, esp. n. 51.

40. So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 142; Atwell-Hanson, 45-46.

41. Cf. Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Attridge, H. "Philo the Epic Poet," in *OTP*, 2.781-84.

Atwell, J. and J. Hanson. "Philo the Epic Poet." Unpublished seminar paper. Harvard New Testament Seminar. May 4, 1970. 46 pp.

Bammel, E. "Philo der Ältere," *BHH* 3 (1966) 1458-59.

Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, 168-69.

Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 10, 27, 31, 43-46, 47, 48, 49, 57-58 (nn. 98-111).

Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.199.

Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 33-35.

Denis, *Introduction*, 270-71.

Ewald, *Geschichte*, 4.338; *History*, 5.260; 8.62.

Fiebig, P. "Philo (3)," *RGG*^{2} 4 (1930) 1198.

Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.707; 2.986, n. 202; generally, 1.553-674.

Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, 2, 34, 100, 129, 170-71.

Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3.50, 626; *History*, 1.517-18.

Gutman, J. "Philo the Epic Poet," in *Scripta Hierosolymitana* (vol. 1, *Studies in Classics and Jewish Hellenism*, ed. R. Koebner; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1954) 36-63.

_____, *Beginnings*, 1.221-44.

Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, 99.

Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.69; 2.52, n. 139; 71, n. 352.

Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 2.519, 575.

Horst, van der, *Joods-hellenistische poëzie*, 51-57.

_____, "Korte notities over vroeg-joodse epiek," *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 39:2 (1985) 102-109.

Karpeles, *Geschichte*, 1.183-84.

Laqueur, R. "Philon (46)," *PW* 20/1 (1941) 51-52.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and P. Parsons. "Philo Iudaeus (Senior)," *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, 328-31 (Nos. 681-688).

Lohse, E. "Philo (3)," *RGG*^{3} 5 (1961) 347.

Ludwich, A. *De Philonis carmine graeco-iudaico*. Königsberg, 1900. 8 pp.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E., "Philo the Epic Poet," in "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *Jewish Writings*, 118-20.

Philippson, *Philo*, 53-66.

Schaller, B. "Philon (9)," *KP* 4 (1972) 771.

Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).606-607.

Schürer, *Geschichte*^{4}, 3.497-99.

_____, *History*, 3(1).559-61; also 555-56.

Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.654-55.

Wacholder, B. Z. "Philo (the Elder)," *EncJud* 13 (1971) 407-408.

_____, *Eupolemus*, 282-83.

Walter, N. "Philo 'der Ältere'," in *JSHRZ* (1.2), 112-14.

_____, "Philon der Epiker," in *JSHRZ* (4.3), 139-53.

_____, "Philon (der Epiker)," in *ANRW*, II. Principate (20.1), 109-10.

_____, "Zur Überlieferung einiger Reste früher jüdisch-hellenistischer Literatur bei Josephus, Clemens und Euseb," *Studia Patristica, VII.1* (*TU*, 92; Berlin, 1966) 314-20.

_____, *Untersuchungen*, 108-11, 234-35.

Ziegler, *Epos*, 20.

INDEX TO EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

Fragments One and Two

Source: Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.20.1
Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 246; Viger, 421c - 422a.
Greek Text Used: Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, p. 506, line 1 - p. 507, line 5.
Editions: Steph., 246; Vig., 421c-422a; Philippson, 62; Hein., 2.23; Gais., 2.376; Müll., *FHG* 3.213-14 (= No. 6); Migne, *PG* (21) cols. 711 B - 713 A (notes, cols. 1568-69); Dind., 1.488; Freu., (om.); Ludwich, 4; Giff., 1.531 (notes, 4.303); Stearns, 95-96 (= Frg. 1); Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, 506-507; Jac., *FGrH* 3.690 (= No. 729, Frg. 1); Denis, 203 (= Frg. 1); Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Suppl. Hell.* 328 (= Frgs. 681-82).
Translations:
English: Giff., 3.453 (poetry left untranslated); Attridge, *OTP* 2.783 (= Frgs. 1-2).
French:
German: Philippson, 63 (with notes); Ludwich, 5 (n. 5); Riessler, 733; notes, 1315; Walter, (*JSHRZ*, 4.3), 148-50.
Dutch: van der Horst, *JHP*, 55 (= Frg. 1, vv 1-10)

Fragment Three

Source: Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.24.1
Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 251; Viger, 430 b-c.

Greek Text Used: Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, p. 517, line 15 - p. 518, line 3.
Editions: Steph., 251; Vig., 430 b-c; Philippson, 64; Hein., 2.32; Gais., 2.392; Müll., *FHG* 3.219 (= No. 11); Migne, *PG* (21) col. 725 D (notes, col. 1573); Dind., 1.497; Freu., (om.); Ludwich, 5; Giff., 1.540 (notes, 4.310); Stearns, 97 (= Frg. 2); Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, 517-18; Jac., *FGrH* 3.691 (= No. 729, Frg. 3); Denis, 203-204; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330 (= Frg. 686).
Translations:
English: Giff., 3.460-61; Attridge, *OTP* 2. 783-84 (= Frg. 3).
French:
German: Philippson, 65; Ludwich, 7 (notes 17, 21, 24); Riessler, 733; notes, 1315; Walter, (*JSHRZ*, 4.3), 150-51.
Dutch: van der Horst, *JHP*, 56 (= Frg. 2, vv 11-15).

Fragments Four, Five, and Six

Source: Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.37.1-3
Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 266; Viger, 452d - 453c.
Greek Text Used: Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, p. 546, line 1 - p. 547, line 6.
Editions: Steph., 266; Vig., 452d-453c; Philippson, 64-66; Hein., 2.54-55; Gais., 2.434-35; Müll., *FHG* 3.229 (= No. 23); Migne, *PG* (21) cols. 756 C-D (notes, cols. 1581-82); Dind., 1.522; Freu., (om.); Ludwich, 4; Giff. 1.564 (notes, 4.321); Stearns, 98-99 (= Frg. 3); Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, 546-47; Jac., *FGrH* 3.690 (= No. 729, Frg. 2); Denis, 204;

FGrH 3.690 (= No. 729, Frg. 2); Denis, 204; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329-30 (= Frgs. 683-85).

Translations:

English: Giff., 3.481 (partially untranslated); Attridge, *OTP* 2.784 (= Frgs. 4-6).

French:

German: Philippson, 65 (with notes); Ludwich, 7-8 (note 26); Riessler, 733-34; notes, 1315; Walter, (*JSHRZ*, 4.3), 151-53.

Dutch: van der Horst, *JHP*, 56-57 (= Frg. 3, vv 16-23).

Fragment One (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.20.1)

(20.1) "Φησὶ δὲ περὶ τούτου καὶ Φίλων ἐν τῷ (1) πρώτῳ τῶν Περὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα·

ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ

'"Εκλυον ἀρχεγόνοισι τὸ μηρίον ὥς ποτε θεσμοῖς,
5 Ἀβραὰμ κλυτοηχὲς ὑπερτέρῳ ἄμματι δεσμῶν,
παμφαές, πλήμμυρε μεγαυχήτοισι λογισμοῖς,
θειοφιλῇ θέλγητρα. λιπόντι γὰρ ἀγλαὸν ἔρκος 421d
αἰνοφύτων ἔκκαυμα βριήπυος αἰνετὸς ἴσχων
ἀθάνατον ποίησεν ἐὴν φάτιν, ἐξότε κείνου
10 ἔκγονος αἰνογόνοιο πολύμνιον ἔλλαχε κῦδος,'

καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς·"

BION

3 ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ BON: ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑ ΤΟΥΑΥΤΟΥ I^{mg} | 4 *μηρίον* Mras: *μυρίον* BION: *μόρσιμον* Seguier | *ὥς ποτε*: *ὥποτε* B | *θεσμοῖς*, <lacuna> 5 Ἀβραὰμ Philippson | 5 *κλυτοήχου* Seguier | *ὑπερτέρῳ* Mras: *ὑπέρτερον* BION: *ὑπερτέρου* Seguier | *αἵματι* Philippson: *ἄμμα τι* Ludwich | 6 *ἐπλήμμυρε* N: *ἐπλήμυρε* Düntzer apud Ludwich | *μεγαυχήτοισι* BN: *-τοῖσι* IO | 7 *θεοφιλῇ* B | *θέλγητρα* Steph.: *θέλγηθρα* BION | *ἔρνος* Seguier | 8 *αἰοφύτων* cj. Mras: *αὐτοφύτων* Seguier | *αἰνετὸς*: *ἄγγελος* Seguier | 9 *ἀθανάτην* cj. Ludwich | *ἔξετι* Lloyd-Jones | *ἐξότε κείνου* ON: *ἐξ ὅτ' ἐκείνου* B1: *ἐξότ' ἐκείνου* Seguier | 10 *ἔκγονος* B: *ἔγγονος* I: *σσ* *ἔγγοΝσ* O: *ἔγγοΗx* N^{ac}: *ἔγγονx* N^{2} | *αἰογόνοιο* cj. Mras: *ἀντὶ γόοιο* Seguier | *ἔλαχε* B |

Fragment One[1]

(1) (20.1) "In the first book of his work *On Jerusalem*[2] Philo also speaks about this one:[3] *Philo's Remarks Concerning the Same Man*:

'They unloosed[4] the loins[5] for our ancestors[6]
just as once (they were commanded) by the
(divine) ordinances--[7]
O Abraham, (you are) renowned[8] through the
preeminent[9] seal[10] of the bond(s)[11]
Radiant[12] (are you), overflowing[13] with glorious
thoughts--[14]
Divinely pleasing gestures.[15] For this one who
left[16] the splendid enclosure
Of the awesome race[17] the praiseworthy one[18]
with a thundering sound[19] prevented (from
carrying out) the immolation,[20]
(And thus) he made his own voice immortal.[21]
From then on[22]
The offspring of that awesome child[23] achieved
much-hymned[24] renown.'

And so forth."

Fragment Two (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.20.1-2)

"οἷς μετ' ὀλίγα ἐπιφέρει·

''Αρτίχερος θηκτοῖο ξιφηφόρον ἐντύνοντος
λήματι καὶ σφαράγοιο παρακλιδὸν ἀθροισθέντος·
| ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν χείρεσσι κερασφόρον ὤπασε 422a
κριόν,'

καὶ τὰ τούτοις ἑπόμενα."

(2) Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἀπὸ τῆς προειρημένης τοῦ Πολυΐστορος γραφῆς.

BION

1-4 οἷς -- ἀλλ' om. B | 2 'Αρτίχερος Seguier: 'Αρτιχερὸς Gais.: 'Αρτίχειρος Hein.: 'Αρτιχειρὸς Steph.: ἄρτι χερὸς ON: ἄρτι χειρὸς I | θηκτοῖο I: θνητοῖο ON: θηκτοῦ Ludwich | ξιφήφορον Seguier: ξίφεος φόρον Ludwich | 3 λήματι Mras: λήμματι ION: λῆμμά τι Ludwich | κἀσφαράγοιο Ludwich | ἄρθροις θέντος Gutman (Schwabe ?) | 4 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν: καὶ ὁ μὲν B | μὲν ἐν: θεὸς Seguier | χείρεσι B | κεράσφορον Seguier | 6-8 καὶ -- γραφῆς: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὗτος B |

Fragment Two[25]

"After a few lines he adds the following:

'...as the strong-handed one[26] bearing a sharp
sword[27] made ready
With firm resolve,[28] and a rustle[29] at one
side[30] became stronger--[31]
But he[32] placed in his hand the horned ram.'[33]

And the rest that follows this."

(2) (2) This then from the aforementioned work of Polyhistor.

Fragment Three (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.24.1)

ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΙΩΣΗΦ· ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ ΓΡΑΦΗΣ

(24.1) "Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις καὶ (1)
Φίλων ἐν τῇ ιδ' τῶν Περὶ 'Ιεροσόλυμα, λέγων
οὕτως·

'Τοῖσιν ἔδος μακαριστὸν ὅλης μέγας ἔκτισεν
ἄκτωρ 430c
ὕψιστος καὶ πρόσθεν ἀφ' 'Αβραάμοιο καὶ 'Ισακ
'Ιακὼβ εὐτέκνοιό θ' ὅθεν 'Ιωσήφ, ὃς ὀνείρων
θεσπιστὴς σκηπτοῦχος ἐν Αἰγύπτοιο θρόνοισι,
δινεύσας λαθραῖα χρόνου πλημμυρίδι μοίρης',
καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ 'Ιωσήφ."

BION

1 ΦΙΛ -- ΓΡΑΦ. ON: ΦΙΛ. ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΥΣ ΓΡΑΦΗΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥΙΩΣΗΦ I^{mg}: ΦΙΛ. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ 'ΙΩΣΗΦ B | 2 *Μαρτυροῖ* ON | *ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις* om. B | 3 {ι}δ' Freu.: {ι}α' cj. Jac. | *οὕτω* ON | 5 *ὅλως* B: *ὅλου* Ludwich | *μέσασ* B | 7 *ἀπ'* 'Αβ. Müller | *'Αβραάμοιο* BI: *'Αβράμοιο* ON | 'Ισαὰκ BN | 8 'Ιακὼβ <τ'> Ludwich | *εὐτέκτοιο* E apud Ludwich | *εὐτέκνοιό θ' ὅθεν* Mras: *εὐτέκ. τόθεν* BION: *εὐτέκ. τόκος* Steph.: *εὐτέκ. τέκος* Düntzer apud Ludwich: *εὐτέκνοι' ὅθεν* Lloyd-Jones | 9 *σκηπτούχῳ* Lloyd-Jones | 10 *δηνεύσας* cj. Düntzer apud Ludwich | *λαθραῖα* Steph.: *λατραῖα* BION | *πλημμύριδι* Philippson: *πλημυρίδι* Düntzer apud Ludwich | 11 *ἑξῆς* Ludwich | *ταῦτα δὲ καὶ* Müller | *ταῦτα* -- 'Ιωσήφ om. B |

Fragment Three[34]

Philo's Remarks Concerning Joseph -- From the Same Work[35]

(1) (24.1) "In the fourteenth[36] book of his work(s) *On Jerusalem* Philo bears witness to the sacred Scriptures when he says the following:

'For them[37] a blessed dwelling place[38] the great leader[39] of all (the earth)[40] established,
The most high[41] -- even early on[42] (from the time of[43]) Abraham and Isaac
(And of) Jacob,[44] blessed with children,[45] whence came Joseph, who was a dream Interpreter,[46] bearing a scepter[47] on Egypt's thrones,
Having unravelled[48] time's secrets in the flow of fate.'[49]

And so forth. These, then, are the things concerning Joseph."

Fragment Four (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.37.1)

ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΟΙΣ ΥΔΑΤΩΝ

(37.1) "Φησὶ δὲ ὁ Φίλων ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἱεροσολύμων κρήνην εἶναι, ταύτην δὲ ἐν | μὲν τῷ 453a χειμῶνι ξηραίνεσθαι, ἐν δὲ τῷ θέρει πληροῦσθαι. (1)

λέγει δὲ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ οὕτως·

> Νηχόμενος δ' ἐφύπερθε τὸ θαμβηέστατον ἄλλο
> δέρκηθρον· συναοιδὰ μεγιστούχοιο λοετροῖς
> ῥεύματος ἐμπίπλησι βαθὺν ῥόον ἐξανιείσης,'

καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς."

BION

1 ΦΙΛ. -- ΥΔΑΤ. BION | 2 {ὁ} Jac. | 6 *νηχομένο<ι>ς* Lloyd-Jones: *νισσόμενος* Vossius apud Seguier | 7 *δέκρηθρον* Philippson: *κέρδηθρον* E apud Ludwich | *συναοιδὰ* Gifford: *σὺν ἀοιδᾷ* ION: *σοι ἀείδω* cj. Müll.: *σὺν ἄρ' οἶδα* Ludwich | 7-9 *συν.* -- *ἑξῆς* om. B | 7 *μεγιστοχόοιο* Scaliger apud Seguier: *μεγιστοχόοις* ὃ Ludwich | *δέρκηθρον· συναοιδὰ μεγιστούχοιο*: *δέρκηθρον σὺν ἀοιδᾷ, μεγιστούχοιο* ION Viger et al.: *δέρκῃ θροῦν ἀοιδᾷ μεγιστούχοιο* Vossius apud Seguier: *δέρκῃ κρούνισμ' ὅγ' οἶδα μεγιστοχόοιο* Seguier: *ἔδρακον ἀθρόον οἶδμα, μεγιστούχοιο* cj. Philippson: *δέρκηθρον σὺν ἄρ' οἶδα, μεγιστοχόοις* ὃ Ludwich: †*δέρκηθρον*† <*συναοιδὰ*> *μεγιστούχοιο* Gifford: *δέρκηθρον* † *σὺν ἀοιδᾷ μεγιστούχοιο* Jacoby | 8 *ῥεῦμα τόσ'* Ludwich | *ἐξανιεῖσι(ν)* Vossius apud Seguier: *ἐξανιέντος* cj. Philippson | 9 *καὶ* -- Frg. 5, lin. 1 *περὶ*: *ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ* B |

Fragment Four[50]

Philo's Remarks Concerning the Waters[51] *in Jerusalem*

(1) (37.1) "In his work(s) *Concerning Jerusalem*[52] Philo says that there is a pool[53] and that it dries up in winter but in summer fills to overflowing.[54] In the first book (of his work) he says:

'While swimming,[55] (from) above (one can see)[56]
another, most astonishing
Sight:[57] blending with[58] the ruler's[59] baths,
With a flow of water bursting forth (it)
fills a deep stream,'[60]

And so forth."

Fragment Five (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.37.2)

(2) "οἷς πάλιν ὑποβὰς περὶ τῆς πληρώσεως (2) ἐπιλέγει·

'Ῥεῦμα γὰρ ὑψιφάεννον, ἐν ὑετίοις νιφετοῖσιν
ἱέμενον, πολυγηθές, ὑπαὶ πύργοις συνόροισιν 453b
στρωφᾶται, καὶ ξηρὰ πέδῳ κεκονιμένα κρήνης
τηλεφαῆ δείκνυσιν ὑπέρτατα θάμβεα λαῶν,'

καὶ τὰ τούτοις ἀκόλουθα."

BION

καὶ (Frg. 4, lin. 9) -- 1 περὶ: ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ B |
2 ἐπιλέγει: ὑποβὰς λέγει B |
3 ὑψιφάχννον I^{ac}: ὑψιφάεννον BI^{1}: ὑψιφάεινον ON |
νιφετοῖς τε cj. Lloyd-Jones |
4 ὑπαὶ πύργοις συνόροισι(ν) Gifford:
ὑπὲρ πύργοισιν ὄροισι BION:
ὀρεινοῖς ὑπὲρ πύργοισιν $Viger^{1}$:
ὑπαὶ πύργοισιν ὀρεινοῖς $Viger^{2}$:
ὑπερπύργοισιν ὀροῖσι Ludwich |
5 ξηρὶ Ludwich | πέδου cj. Lloyd-Jones |
6 λαοῖς cj. Lloyd-Jones: λεῶν E apud Ludwich |
7 καὶ -- ἀκόλουθα om. B |

Fragment Five[61]

(2) (2) "To this, further below, he again adds some remarks about the filling (of the stream):

'For the stream, high and visible,[62] with
(water) from rainy snows[63]
Rushing (along),[64] (is) delightful, under
neighboring towers[65]
Winds,[66] and (as it hits) the dry, dusty
surfaces on the ground[67] the pool's[68]
Far-shining (deeds)[69] it displays[70] (causing)
people's[71] utter amazement,'[72]

And other things follow this."

Fragment Six (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.37.3)

(3) "εἶτα πάλιν περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως κρή- (3)
νης καὶ τῆς ἀποχετεύσεως διέξεισιν οὕτως·

'Αἰπὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκπτύουσι διὰ χθονὸς ὑδροχόοισι
σωλῆνες,'

καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τούτοις ἕπεται."

Τοσαῦτα μὲν δὴ τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν 'Αλεξάνδρου τοῦ Πολυΐστορος.

BION

1-5 εἶτα -- ἕπεται om. B | 3 ὑδροχόοιο Scaliger apud Seguier: -χέοισι Philippson: -χόαισι cj. Mras | 19 σωλῆνης Seguier: σωλλῆνες Düntzer apud Ludwich |

Fragment Six[73]

(3) (3) "Then, once again, he relates the following concerning the pool of the high priest[74] and the draining off of the water:

'And from high up[75] pour out[76] through the earth[77] in channels[78] Pipes,'[79]

5 And whatever else follows these things."

So, these are the things taken from Alexander Polyhistor.[80]

ANNOTATIONS

1. This selection occurs in the section of *P.E.* treating Abraham (9.16-20). Immediately preceding, Eusebius mentions various pagan authors known from Josephus (Berossus, Hecataeus, Nicolaus of Damascus) who attest Abraham's greatness. From Alexander Polyhistor he then cites several excerpts pertaining to Abraham, including (Pseudo)-Eupolemus (9.17; also 9.18.2 = Frgs. 1 & 2), Artapanus (9.18.1 = Frg. 1), Apollonius Molon (9.19), concluding with this quotation from Philo (9.20.1). He then continues by mentioning Josephus' use of Polyhistor, specifically citing the testimony of Cleodemus Malchus (9.20.2-4 = Frg. 1b). Then follows testimony pertaining to Jacob (9.21). Immediately prior to this quotation from Philo, Eusebius cites Polyhistor's account of Abraham's offering of Isaac (9.19.4), a fragment probably taken from Demetrius (= Frg. 1), which provides the thematic link with this passage.

2. Some confusion exists about the exact title of the work both with respect to the spelling of Jerusalem (Frgs. 1 & 3: Ἱεροσόλυμα; Frg. 4: Ἱεροσολύμων) and whether the form is articular. The apparatus criticus provided in this edition attempts to render what is found in Mras, who is consistently reliable in these matters.

With respect to the title in Frg. 1, line 2, Mras supplies no critical notes. Regarding the heading in line 3, however, he notes that it is found in BON and in the margin of I, and that BON read περὶ whereas I reads περὶ τὰ. This I have sought to convey in the apparatus criticus for line 3, though it appears odd. Thus, Mras reports that the presence or absence of the article relates to

Eusebius' supplied title (on the status of the titles in *P.E.*, cf. Mras, "Vorwort," viii-ix). In his middle register, however, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506 & 507, reports that the title is read in I as Τὰ *περὶ* ‘Ιεροσόλυμα (’Ιερ on p. 507). This is presumably in reference to Frg. 1, line 2 (= *GCS* [43,1] 506, line 1).

With respect to Frg. 4, lines 2-3, in his middle register, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, reports that "I.B." read the title as Τὰ *περὶ* ‘Ιεροσ., but records no variants in his app. crit.

Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.690, by contrast, reports *περὶ τὰ* as an alternate reading in I for the title mentioned in line 2. Earlier, Ludwich, 5, n. 4, had reported *περὶ τὰ* as the Vulgate reading, presumably referring to Stephanus and Viger (cf. Migne, *PG* [21] 712), although *τὰ* was absent in BCFG, rightly so in light of the two other forms of the title. Gutman, "Philo," 38, n. 3, who appears to be drawing on Ludwich, perhaps Gaisford, 2.376. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 140, n. 7, apparently follows Jacoby in supplying *τὰ* as a possible addition to the title.

The article is treated variously in the editorial tradition. Heinichen, 2.23, reads *τὰ* in the text (no app. crit. is supplied). Gaisford, 2.376, reads *τὰ* in the text, noting in app. crit.: "*τὰ* om. B.C.F.G. Iidem mox *Φίλωνος περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ*." Müller, *FHG* 3.213, omits *τὰ*. Dindorf, 1.488, reads *τὰ* (without app. crit.). Gifford, 1.531, reads *τὰ*, noting that *τὰ* is omitted by BO.

3. I.e., Abraham, the subject of this general section and the previous quotations.

4. The translation here follows the suggestion of Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506, that *ἔκλυον* should be read as the equivalent of *ἐξέλυον*, from *ἔκλυω*, "to loose," "unloose"; so, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 148, n. c; van

der Horst, *JHP*, 55. One difficulty is determining the antecedent of "they"; perhaps "our ancestors." Earlier interpreters (Philippson, 63; Ludwich, 5, n. 5; Riessler, 733) read it as second aorist of κλύω, "I heard," thus as Philo's own reminiscence. So also Gutman, "Philo," 40; Attridge, 783; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 328 ("audivi...").

5. The translation here follows Mras's suggested emendation, *GCS* (43,1) 506, τὸ μηρίον instead of τὸ μυρίον, which is supported by the MSS tradition, and generally understood adverbially as "thousands" or "countless." Cf. *AnthGr* 9.73.5 θαμβῶ σε τὸ μυρίον [Antiphilus of Byzantium], of the marvels of the Euboean gulf, as noted by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *S.H.* 328. Cf. Gow-Page, *Garland* 813 (1.94); 2.119, τὸ μυρίον, "infinitely," "incessantly." They also note Theocritus *Ep.* 21.1 οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος, from an inscription for a statue of Archilochus; thus, the possibility that κλέος, or something similar, stood in the following line, which Philippson conjectures has been omitted. Cf. app. crit. The parallel is significant in that it occurs in an inscription in praise of a renowned figure.

LXX use of μηρίον (= כסל, e.g., Lev 3:4, 10, 15) lends plausibility to Mras's suggestion, though μηρός is more common (cf. Gen 24:2, 9). The use of the singular seems surprising. Mras understands "unloosing the loins" as a reference to circumcision and God's covenant with Abraham (Gen 17:9-14).

6. Ordinarily, ἀρχέγονος has the sense of "original" or "primal." Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506, diverges from earlier interpretations which understood it attributively with θεσμοῖς, hence "primeval doctrines" (Gutman, "Philo," 40), "ancient laws" (Attridge, 783). Taken independently

as an indirect object, it signifies those to whom circumcision was administered. Mras's rendering, "the first-born" ("den Erstgeborenen"), seems unduly narrow, less apt than "ancestors" or "forefathers" (so, Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 148, "den Stammvätern"; also van der Horst, *JHP*, 55). In view are those "early ancestors" from Abraham's generation onward.

Cf. Nonnus *D.* 38.110; so, Lloyd-Jones *Supp. Hell.* 328.

7. If this last phrase refers to God's covenant with Abraham, and its resulting obligations, *θεσμοῖς* would appropriately designate the law's prescriptions or ordinances (cf. Gen 17:9-14). Probably, the sense is "... as they once did in their conformity to the divine instructions." For Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506, it was the "power of the ordinances" ("kraft der Satzungen") to which they were subject.

8. Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506, understands lines 5-6 as addressed to Abraham. Accordingly, *κλυτοηχὲς* is read as masc., voc., sing. Rather than taking this hapax legomenon in the simple sense of "famous" (*LSJ*, *Suppl.*, 85), Gutman, "Philo," 52-53, sees it as part of a Hellenistic-Jewish exegetical tradition using *ἠχώ* to interpret certain features of Abraham's career. Specifically, Gutman relates *κλυτοηχὲς* to the phrase used by Philo of Alexandria, *πατὴρ ἐκλεκτὸς ἠχοῦς*, "elect father of sound," in expounding the significance of Abraham's name change (cf. *Mut.* 66-76, esp. 69-76; *Cher.* 7; *Gig.* 64; *Abr.* 81-84; *Qu. Gen.* 3.43; also cf. Clement *Strom.* 5.1.8.6-7; Origen *Contra Celsum* 5.45; cf. Seguier, *PG* [21] 1569). The parallel with Philo *Abr.* 82 is also noted by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329.

For Philo of Alexandria, "Abram" and "Abraham"

symbolize two different stages of life. The former Philo interprets to mean "uplifted father," designating the period of his life when he was preoccupied with nature, i.e., the heavens and cosmological speculation. Being named "Abraham" (Gen 17:5) signified his shift from being astronomer or astrologer to being philosopher or sage. As the "elect father of sound," he became preoccupied with the things of the mind and how they became articulated as "words" or "sounds," and even more important, with their implications for virtue, the lived life. Put another way, it was the moment of his conversion from "sense" to "reason." If Gutman is correct in seeing behind *κλυτοηχὲς* this more elaborate tradition of interpretation, the next phrase in line 6, *μεγαυχήτοισι λογισμοῖς*, might very well signify Abraham's philosophical prowess.

9. *Ὑπερτέρῳ*, as emended by Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506, modifies *ἄμματι*. Here it is taken as "preeminent" in the sense of "preeminently strong or binding." Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 148, n. h, following the MSS and editorial tradition, retains *ὑπέρτερον*, interpreting it adverbially: "... especially on account of the knot of the bonds." It is similarly retained by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329, noting Homer *Il.* 12.437 *κῦδος ὑπέρτερον*. Specifically, they suggest that it is his preeminent fame resulting from the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22:9).

10. Philippson, 62, proposes that *ἄμματι* might be read as *αἵματι*, which would yield something like "by the blood of bonds," presumably rendering more explicit the reference to circumcision. Ludwich, 5, n. 7, proposes *ἄμμα τι* because he prefers two accusatives (he retains *ὑπέρτερον*) to "two unbearable datives." He suggests that they be read

in relation to the verb in line 6, although this requires him to accept *ἐπλήμμυρε*, read by N.

11. If *ἄμμα* signifies "something tied," the phrase might be construed literally as "by the knot of bonds" or "by the cord of bindings." Thus, "seal" is here understood in the sense of "knot," that which is tied or joined. "Bonds" would signify the enduring bond of the covenant between God and Abraham (Gen 17:4-8).

For *ἄμματι χειρῶν*, cf. Nonnus, *D.* 48.142; so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Suppl. Hell.* 329.

12. Along with *κλυτοηχὲς*, *παμφαές* is taken as vocative, thus "radiant are you, O Abraham ..."

13. This translation follows the suggestion of Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 148, n. k, that *πλή(μ)μυρος* is adjectival, albeit a hapax legomenon. Accordingly, *πλήμμυρε* is vocative, agreeing with *παμφαές*. So also van der Horst, *JHP*, 55. Another possibility is represented by N (followed by Seguier, *PG* [21] 1569; Ludwich, 4, 6, n. 8, who also notes *ἐπλήμυρε* as read by Düntzer; Gutman, "Philo," 40), which reads the finite verb form *ἐπλήμμυρε*, from *πλημ(μ)ύρω*, "to overflow," "abound" (*LSJ*, 1419). The question, then, is to decide on its proper subject. Gutman, "Philo," 40, reads Abraham in line 6, or more precisely "the spirit of Abraham" as the subject: "... how once (the spirit of) Abraham, abounded in primeval doctrines ... how (his spirit abounded) with wisdom of great praise ..." Attridge, 783, on the other hand, finds the subject in line 7: *θειοφιλῆ θέλγητρα*: "... how ... resplendently did your God-beloved prayers abound in wondrous counsels."

14. Literally, "with glorious reckonings." Gutman, "Philo," 51-52, notes the two extant inscriptional

uses of μεγαύχητος (*LSJ*, 1089; *Suppl.*, 97), both second century B.C.E. In each case, the term is doxological, used to praise the glorious reputation of a father whose son had distinguished himself as a brave warrior. Gutman's attempt to trace the use of this term by epitaph-writers to the religious language of the mystery cults is unconvincing (cf. Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 44-46). Thus the term as used here by Philo need not have any intrinsic mystical connotation. Yet, even if used here in a more neutral sense, the phrase still might suggest an image of Abraham the seminal philosophical thinker, specifically the founder of monotheism (so Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 148, n. m; cf. extensive bibliography cited on 145, nn. 32-34). This connection becomes especially credible if Gutman's exposition of κλυτοηχὲς (cf. above n. 8) is correct. Yet, if so, it must be asked how this "philosophical" image relates to the Akedah, which immediately follows. Riessler, 733, translates: "you are full of divine inspirations" ("du voller göttlicher Entzückung"), noting, 1315, that Abraham here appears "als Mystiker und Ekstatiker." Attridge, 783, renders the phrase "wondrous counsels," and sees in it a possible allusion to Abraham's prayer for an heir (Gen 15:1-6) or his obedience to the divine command (Gen 22:3-8). If the latter, Abraham's "glorious thoughts" would be understood as his commendable willingness to obey God.

15. Following Mras's suggestion, *GCS* (43,1) 506, n. on line 6, this phrase is understood as being in apposition with line 4, and hence referring to the act(s) of circumcision. It intends to convey the sense that the ancestors' actions, mentioned in line 4, were "gestures" pleasing to God. "Gestures" here renders θέλγητρα, from θέλγητρον/θέλγω, literally "charms" or "spells." It attempts to

capture Mras's understanding of the term as a "charm" in the sense of that which becomes a means of satisfying, or even appeasing, God ("Beschwictigungsmittel"). Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149: "Sühnemittel"; similarly van der Horst, *JHP*, 55. In contrast to Mras, Walter, and van der Horst, I have retained the plural form here. Gutman, "Philo," 40, takes the phrase with what immediately precedes: "how (his spirit abounded) with wisdom of great praise, the ecstasy beloved of God." For Gutman, "Philo," 48, *θέλγητρον* has "the sense of enchantment, or a psychic drunkenness or ecstasy of the soul, i.e., the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy to which Abraham attained as one loved by God." Accordingly, the phrase elaborates on Abraham's philosophic-mystic wisdom. His understanding of the syntax is similar to Ludwich, 5, n. 5, who takes the phrase with what immediately precedes, though rendering it "hinsichts seiner gottgefälligen Erquickungen." Attridge, 783, while noting the literal meaning of *θέλγητρα*, thinks in terms of Abraham's "God-beloved prayers" (cf. above nn. 13 & 14).

16. *Λιπόντι*, as a second aorist participle, masc., dat., sing., understood with reference to Abraham, would suggest a translation such as "for in (his) having left ..." The absence of the article makes it difficult to render the phrase "for to the one having left ..." The difficulty in translating the term is in trying, on the one hand, to capture the significance of the dative, while on the other hand relating it syntactically to the next line. In spite of the grammatical difficulties, I have chosen to render *λιπόντι* as if it were an articular participle, hence "the one having left." And, in spite of its dative form, I have rendered it as a direct object of the action expressed in the following line.

17. The phrase ἀγλαὸν ἔρκος αἰνοφύτων is problematic in at least two respects: 1) the type of "enclosure" (ἔρκος) being suggested, and 2) how to understand αἰνοφύτων.

Ἔρκος may be understood as "enclosure" in the sense of garden or vineyard (so Homer *Od.* 7.113; *Il.* 5.90; 18.564; *LSJ*, 690). So, Attridge, 783: "beauteous garden." Ludwich, 5, n. 5, renders it "prächtiges Gehege," understood more specifically, 6, n. 9, as the walled enclosure around the courtyard of a house (Homer *Od.* 21.238; *LSJ*, 690), hence as Abraham's lodging or farm. Philippson, 63: "der anmuthige Landschaft." Seguier, *PG* (21) 1569, proposes the emendation ἔρνος, "young sprout," "shoot," derivatively "offspring" (*LSJ*, 691).

Αἰνόφυτα is a hapax legomenon, rendered by *LSJ*, 40, as "plants of praise," hence as a compound of αἶνος/αἰνέω ("praise") + φυτόν ("plant"). The compound may be analyzed differently, however, as a combination of αἰνός ("dread," "horrible") + φυτόν ("plant," "offspring"), hence as "offspring/descendants of a dreadful/horrible/terrible origin," perhaps "awesome offspring," i.e., giants. So, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506, n. on line 7, followed by Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149, n. o.

Mras proposes that αἰνογόνοιο in line 10 be similarly construed, i.e., as a compound of αἰνός ("dread") + γόνος ("child," "offspring"). See below, n. 23. He further conjectures that both terms may be compounds based on αἶα, an epic form for γαῖα (so *LSJ*, 34), hence αἰοφύτων and αἰογόνοιο, "earth-offspring." While Walter regards the latter as unconvincing, he does follow Mras's suggestion, translating the expression "das prangende Gehege der Giganten." Similarly van der Horst, *JHP*, 55: "de schitterende omheining van de reuzen" (see his "Inleiding," 53).

Walter understands "the giants" as Nimrod, the "mighty man," and his successors (Gen 10:8-12), identified with the Nephilim of Gen 6:4 and as those responsible for planning and building the tower of Babel (Gen 11:1-9; also cf. Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.2-3 & Frg. 2, and discussion in *FHJA* 1.178, n. 5; 187, n. 47). On this showing, the "splendid enclosure of the awesome race," which Abraham left behind, would be the region of the "mighty men," i.e., Babel in the land of Shinar (Gen 11:2); similarly, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329, noting Jerome, *Onomasticum* (*Corpus Christianorum* 72) 4.22; 57.11.

What renders this interpretation plausible is the tradition found in Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* 6, which makes Abraham a contemporary of the builders of Babel, one of whom was Nimrod (*Bib. Ant.* 6:14; cf. Josephus *Ant.* 1.4.1. ¶113-14; *b. Pesah.* 118a; *Pirqe R. El.* 24; also *3 Enoch* 45:3; *b. Hul.* 89a; *b. Abod. Zar.* 53b; compare *Jub.* 10:18-26). In keeping with his heroic status, he was one of twelve men who objected to the project (*Bib. Ant.* 6:3) and was consequently incarcerated. Defiantly refusing an offer of escape, he was thrown into a fiery furnace, but through divine intervention miraculously survived (cf. Dan 3). If this is the tradition that lies behind our text, it is even conceivable that the "splendid enclosure" refers to the "royal household" where he was jailed (*Bib. Ant.* 6:7), or even to the furnace, especially since the earthquake sent by God cause a fiery eruption that killed 83,500 bystanders! In any case, one possible interpretation is that Abraham "left behind the splendid enclosure of the giants," understood broadly as "region" or more narrowly as a built structure. In a word, it refers to his departure from Ur (Gen 12:1-4).

An alternative interpretation is represented by Attridge, 783: "beauteous garden of dread

plants." In this case, the reference may be to Abraham's house or farm that he left behind (in Beersheba, Gen 21:25-34, esp. 31; 22:19) as he journeyed to Moriah. The "dread plants" would be the wood that he took with him to be used for the "dreadful" purpose of offering Isaac (Gen 22:3). Obviously, this way of reading the text relates more directly to the immediate context whose central focus is the offering of Isaac (though cf. the discussion below in n. 20).

It is not altogether clear how best to render Seguier's emendation: *ἔρνος, αὐτοφύτων* (cf. *PG* [21] 1569). Philippson, 63, renders the phrase: "der anmuthige Landschaft Unglückgeweihter verließ," i.e., "who left behind the graceful area/district of those destined for misfortune" (?). Riessler, 733, translates the phrase: "When he once left behind the sovereign land of the doomed" ("das herrlich Land der Todgeweihten"), and in his note (p. 1315) explains it as referring to Abraham's "departure" from Canaan at the time of his death (Gen 25:8). Possibly, Riessler also understands *αἰνοφύτων* in the sense of "dreadful offspring," and thus the land Abraham left as the land inhabited by the Canaanites who were doomed, dreadfully or terribly, because of their opposition to God's people.

18. *Αἰνετός* is here understood to refer to God (so used in LXX: 2 Sam 22:4; 1 Chr 16:25; Ps 47:2; 95:4; 112:3 v.l.; 144:3); so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329. Seguier's proposed emendation, *PG* (21) 1569, *ἄγγελος*, conforms the text to the biblical account (Gen 22:11).

19. *Βριήπυος* is rendered here adverbially, following Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 506, "mit starker Stimme" (also Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 149; van der Horst, *JHP*, 55). Literally, the term means "heavy-

sounding," hence "loud-shouting." It is used as an epithet for Ares in Homer *Il.* 13.521. It could as easily be taken with *αἰνετὸς* and rendered as "praiseworthy thunderer" (Philippson, 63; Riessler, 733; Attridge, 783) or "loud-shouting Glorified One" (Ludwich, 5, n. 5; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 34). It serves to render more dramatically the biblical account in which the (angel's) voice interrupted Abraham's sacrifice "from heaven" (*ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*). Cf. Philo *Abr.* 176, "God the Savior stopped the deed ... with a voice from the air" (*ἀπ' ἀέρος φωνῆ*).

20. *Ἔκκαυμα* is literally "wood for lighting fires" (*LSJ*, 508). In LXX, the "wood" for the burnt offering is rendered by the more usual term *ξύλον* (cf. Gen 22: 3, 6-7). The verb form *ἐκκαίω* is common enough in LXX, though often used metaphorically, especially of God's wrath. Attridge, 783, renders *ἔκκαυμα ... ἴσχων* as "quenched the pyre," yet notes that the fire is not quenched in the biblical account. Understanding *ἔκκαυμα* as the sacrificial wood/fire of the Akedah follows Mras's suggested translation: "indem der Gepriesene (= Gott) mit starker Stimme die Entzündung (des Holzes bei Isaaks Opferung) hinderte"; also, earlier Philippson, 63; Ludwich, 5, n. 5; Riessler, 733, 1315.

Though Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149, follows Mras's suggestion in his translation ("ließ der Gepriesene, indem er mit starker Stimme der Entzündung Einhalt gebot"; followed by van der Horst, *JHP*, 55), he raises the possibility (n. r) that the phrase may not refer to the Akedah at all. He notes, first, that an actual description of the Akedah does not occur until later (Frg. 2, lines 2-5), which Polyhistor says came "after a few lines" (*μετ' ὀλίγα*, Frg. 2, line 1). Thus the Akedah itself may not have been treated until several

stanzas later. Walter then wonders whether Gen 15 may be in view, since it involved sacrificial offerings (vv 7-11) and fire (v 17), interrupted by a theophany (vv 12-16) in which God reaffirms the promise to Abraham (cf. 15:1-6). If so, the relevant lines from Philo might be translated: "Because the one who had left behind the splendid court of the giants (Chaldea), the Praiseworthy One (God) ordered with a strong voice (i.e., reaffirmed the covenant promise, Gen 15:12-16), while he held back, i.e., delayed, the sacrificial burning of the animals (during Abraham's dream)." His "restraining action" would then explain the delay between the command to gather the animals (vv 9-11) and the consummation (albeit unusual) of the offering (v 17).

Walter suggests still another possibility: that the "burning" refers to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18-19), and that ἴσχων might actually mean "held fast," in the sense of "adhere to," thus that "the Praiseworthy One with a thundering voice held fast to his decision to destroy the cities by fire."

If this segment of line 8 does refer to an earlier incident, either God's renewal of his promise (Gen 15) or the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18-19), rather than the Akedah (Gen 22), this increases the likelihood that the previous segment refers to his departure from Ur instead of his leaving Beersheba for Moriah.

Walter (letter Feb. 11, 1989) mentions still another possibility suggested to him by D. Zeller (Mainz): that the line refers to Abraham's rescue from the fiery oven of Nimrod, a tradition preserved in rabbinic sources (cf. Strack-Billerbeck 2.95, 666; 3.35, 195, 215, 497; 4.454); also cf. Pseudo-Philo, *Bib. Ant.* 6.18. Cf. discussion above in n. 17.

21. The syntax of this line is relatively clear, though Ludwich, 6, n. 10, conjectures that *ἀθανάτην* might have been read originally. The subject of *ποίησεν* is almost certainly God, with *φάτιν* being understood as a "voice from heaven," or "oracle" (Sophocles *OT* 151, 1440; Euripides *Supp.* 834; Aeschylus *Ag.* 1132; cf. *LSJ*, 1919) in the sense of the divine promise. Thus, if the Akedah is in view in the preceding words, then *ἀθάνατον ... φάτιν* is God's promise transmitted to Abraham by the angel (Gen 22:15-18). Or, if the interpretation mentioned by Walter (cf. above n. 20) is correct, it would refer to the divine promise in Gen 15:13-16. A slight variation is offered by Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149, n. s, with credit given to Atwell-Hanson, 28: "God made his verdict (i.e., the promise made in Gen 12 and reiterated in Gen 15) immortal." The sense would be that after Abraham's demonstration of faith in the Akedah, God sealed his promise once and for all -- "for all times," hence an immortal promise. Atwell-Hanson, 28, raise the possibility that our text may have in view the notion that Abraham's faith made possible God's promise similar to what is found in Philo of Alexandria (*Abr.* 196, esp. 273). Also, cf. Rom 4; Gal 3.

22. *Ἐξότε* (*ἐξ* + *ὅτε*) = *ἐξ οὗ*, so *LSJ*, 598, hence temporal adverb, "from that time (on)." Cf. Aristophanes *Av.* 334; Palladas in *Anthologia Palatina* 11.383 (= Loeb, *Greek Anthology* 4.354); *Inscriptiones Graecae* 3.171 (cf. *LSJ*). Suggestive is the emendation by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329, *ἐξέτι*, a preposition taking the genitive, which would help account for *κείνου*, perhaps yielding "ever since that one's (i.e., Abraham's) time ..."; cf. Nonnus *D.* 30.280.

23. If *ἐξότε* is read adverbially and *κείνου* is understood to modify *ἔκγονος*, the resulting phrase

is awkward. The genitive form *αἰνογόνοιο* would appear to be redundant unless taken with *κείνου*, thus as "the offspring of that awesome child." Adopting Lloyd-Jones and Parsons's emendation in line 9 (cf. above n. 22) yields a simpler form in line 10, a nominative subject (*ἔκγονος*) modified by a genitive form (*αἰνογόνοιο*), which they understand as "'Chaldaei filius,' id est Judaeus" (p. 329). Cf. further discussion below.

As noted above (cf. n. 17), Mras suggests that *αἰνογόνος* and *αἰνοφύτων* in line 8 are formed with the same prefix, *αἰνός*, whose fundamental sense is dread, fear, or terror. Ludwich, 5, n. 5, apparently attempted to convey this in his translation "der Nachkomme jenes Unglückssohnes." The translation adopted here, "awesome child," seeks to convey this. Attridge, 783, renders the phrase "the offspring of that awesome born one," noting (n. k) that the "awesome born one" is likely Issac, since his birth was unusual in the first place (Gen 21:1-3) and his extraordinary rescue from the sacrificial pyre was a figurative rebirth. Accordingly, the "offspring" (*ἔκγονος*) might be Jacob specifically (so Mras), or Isaac's heirs generally. Following Mras's suggestion, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149, makes the connection with *αἰνοφύτων* more explicit, translating the phrase "the descendant of that one originating from the giants" ("der Abkömmling jenes von Giganten Abstammenden"). In this case, *αἰνογόνος* would refer to Abraham and *ἔκγονος* would refer to Isaac. Similarly, van der Horst, *JHP*, 55. Accordingly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149, n. o, rejects *LSJ*'s suggested translation of *αἰνογόνος*: "child of praise" (p. 40). Philippson, 63, quite specifically renders the phrase "that one's grandson" ("jenes Enkel"), identifying him as Joseph, "the symbol of undeserved suffering"; similarly, Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 34. Riessler, 733, "jenes Mannes

Enkel," although he identifies, 1315, the "Enkel" as Jacob.

24. Πολύμνιον is a hapax legomenon, apparently compounded from πολύς ("much") + ὕμνος ("hymn"), similar to πολύυμνος, -ον, "much sung," "famous," e.g., of Dionysus in Euripides *Ion* 1074 (*LSJ*, 1445), or πολυύμνητος, "much famed in song" (Pindar *N.* 2.5; *LSJ*, 1445). Alternative translations here might be "storied," "celebrated." Also, cf. Πολύμνια (contracted form of Πολυύμνια), "she of many hymns," one of the Muses (cf. Hesiod *Th.* 78; so *LSJ*, 1440).

25. As indicated in n. 20, this fragment occurs "a few lines after" Frg. 1 (cf. Frg. 2, line 1). Since it continues to treat Abraham, it is usually considered as part of Frg. 1; so, Müller, *FHG* 3.213-14; Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.690; Riessler, 733; Denis, *Frag.* 203; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 148-50. Nickelsburg, "Philo," 118-20, however, follows Attridge's numbering system, which is also adopted here.

26. In reading ἀρτίχερος, Mras follows earlier editors who emended the MSS tradition, which separated ἄρτι and χε(ι)ρὸς: ἄρτι χερὸς in ON and ἄρτι χειρὸς in I. No variant is given by B since this phrase belongs to the section (lines 1-4 οἷς --- ἀλλ') omitted by B. Accordingly, the line would begin "... now as the hand (bearing the sharp sword prepared)..." As early as Stephanus, the text was emended to ἀρτιχειρὸς, with later editors either shifting the accent to the antepenult or altering the spelling. As Ludwich, 6, n. 13, observes, this seldom used term (cf. Plato *Lg.* 795D; *LSJ*, 249) is analogous to other compounds, e.g., ἀρτίπους, ἀρτιμελής, ἀρτίφρων, ἀρτίνοος, hence "strong of hand." As gen. sing., it is being translated here

as the subject of the gen. participle *ἐντύνοντος*. The line appears to begin in mid-sentence; so, Attridge, 783, n. l.

27. This translation follows the suggestion of Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 507, that *θηκτοῖο ξιφηφόρου* = *θηκτὸν ξίφος φέροντα*. As it stands, the phrase presents difficulties: should the gen. *θηκτοῖο* be taken with *ἀρτίχερος*, with *ἐντύνοντος*, or neither? If with *ἀρτίχερος*, with which form--the single word or double word (cf. n. 26 above)? Either way, it would yield something like "sharpened hand" or "sharpened strong-hand." Understandably, an alternate reading emerges in ON: *θνητοῖο*, which, taken with the previous word, would yield "mortal hand." So, Atwell-Hanson, 29; Attridge, 783; also Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 328. Ludwich, 4, 6, n. 13, emends the text to read: *θηκτοῦ ξίφεος φόρου*, objecting that *θηκτοῖο ξιφηφόρου* violates both sense and meter. Accordingly, he translates: "as the able-handed one (Abraham) prepared *the tribute (?) of the sharpened sword* for the sacrificial gift..." ("... während der Handtüchtige (Abraham) den Tribut des gewetzten Schwertes zurüstet für die Opferspende"). Cf. Philo *Abr.* 176 *καὶ σπασάμενος τῇ δεξιᾷ τὸ ξίφος ἐπέφερεν*.

Ξιφηφόρος, taken alone, means "bearing a sword," "sword in hand" (cf. Euripides *Or.* 1504; *LSJ*, 1190), and is used attributively with *χείρ* (Antiphanes 217.19; Callistratus *Stat.* 13, apud *LSJ*, 1190).

Apart from the syntax is the question of the referent: who is the strong-handed (or mortal-handed) one making ready a sharp sword? Mras identifies the "strong-handed one" as God, yet oddly equips the angel, who is mentioned in Gen 22:11, with a sharp sword: "as the strong-handed one (God) made ready an angel with a sharp sword..." Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149, n. x, rightly

objects, noting that Gen 22:6 has Abraham himself handling the fire and knife. He also observes that line 2 appears to be paraphrasing Gen 22:10. Accordingly, for Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 149, Abraham is the subject of the action: "as the strong-handed one made ready (his arm as) a bearer of the sharp-edged (knife)" ("...als der Starkhändige [seinen Arm als] Träger scharfgeschliffenen [Messers] bereitmachte"). For Attridge, 783, it is Abraham's "mortal hand" that "readied the sword." Similarly, Ludwich, 6, n. 13. Philippson, 63, by contrast, notes that ξιφηφόρος is "none other than Isaac."

28. The translation here renders Mras's emendation λήματι, from λῆμα, "will," "desire," "purpose." The received text λήμματι, read in ION, from λῆμμα, meaning "anything received," "gift," is more difficult to translate. If retained, it is usually understood as the offering or sacrificial gift Abraham was preparing. So, Ludwich, 6, n. 13, "für die Opferspende." Riessler, 733, "für das Opfer." Ludwich, 6, n. 14, conjectures that λήμματι is a corruption of λῆμμά τι, hence "the tribute (of the giver) as a form of gain (for the recipient)."

29. The gen. form σφαράγοιο derives from σφάραγος, "a bursting with a noise." The verb form σφαραγέομαι, "to burst with a noise," "to crackle," "to sputter," is used in Homer *Od.* 9.390 to depict the hissing, crackling sound accompanying burning (*LSJ*, 1739). If sound is the primary element conveyed by the term, "rustle" seems an adequate translation. So, Philippson, 63: "ein rauschend Gerassel"; also, Riessler, 733; similarly, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 507; Gutman, "Philo," 56; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 150; van der Horst, *JHP*, 55. If, however, the image of fire or burning is a central element, it may relate to the "wood and fire" mentioned in the biblical account (Gen 22:3, 6-7, 9). So,

Attridge, 783: "and crackling (wood) was gathered..." Still another possibility is that σφάραγος, because of its association with βρόγχος, τράχηλος, λαιμός, φόρος (Hsch.), φάρυγξ (Apion apud Photius, *LSJ*, 1739; cf. Euripides *Or.* 1471; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329), should be rendered "neck" or "throat," and thus refers to Abraham's clutching Isaac's throat in preparation for the sacrifice (cf. Gen 22:10). So, Ludwich, 6, n. 6: "die Kehle schon seitwärts zusammengedrängt ist" (on his emendation κἀσφαράγοιο, cf. 6, n. 14); Schwabe, apud Gutman, "Philo," 56: "when he (Abraham) ... laid (it, i.e., the whetted blade) beside the joints of the throat..."

30. Παρακλιδὸν, from παρακλίνω, intransitively "turn aside," is understood here adverbially (so, *LSJ*, 1313), hence "at the side." If indeed it locates the noise caused by the caught ram (rather than the position of Isaac's neck), it has no verbal counterpart in LXX Gen 22:13. Interestingly, however, it does a verbal counterpart in MT: אחר.

31. Ordinarily, ἀθροίζω signifies "collect," "gather together." Thus the adjectival form (ἀθρόος) is used in the sense of "crowded." Other derivative variations carry the same sense (so *LSJ*, 33). If the passive participle is understood literally as "having been gathered," "collected," Attridge's translation, 783, is a felicitous rendering: "and (crackling) wood was gathered at the side." If, however, σφαράγοιο is understood in the sense of a "rustling sound," this seems to require that ἀθροίζω be translated more loosely as "gathering strength," thus "became stronger," or simply "arose" (so Philippson, 63; Riessler, 733). Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 507, defends this more idiomatic rendering of the term ("ein Geräusch seitwärts immer stärker geworden war") by citing Xenophon

Cyr. 5.2.34 [*φόβος*] ... *ἤθροισται*, rendered by *LSJ*, 33, as "fear has gathered strength."

Following Mras, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 150, successfully retains the basic sense of *ἀθροίζω* in his translation: "and as a rustling sound became concentrated at one side" ("und als ein Rascheln seitwärts sich verdichtete"); followed by van der Horst, *JHP*, 55.

Ludwich, 6, n. 13, also understands the term in the sense of "collect," "press together," but with reference to Isaac's throat: "und die Kehle schon seitwärts zusammengedrängt ist." Gutman, "Philo," 56, offers yet another possibility by suggesting that *ἀθροισθέντος* be emended to read *ἄρθροις θέντος*. Whether Gutman is indebted to Schwabe for this emendation is not clear, but it appears to undergird Schwabe's translation: "... and laid (it) beside the joints of the throat." Inexplicably, Gutman seems to accept the emendation then opt for the more traditional way of translating the phrase: "a rustle rose from the side" (p. 56). This solution is rejected by Atwell-Hanson, 29-30.

32. I.e., God, on the basis of Gen 22:14 (also, cf. Philo *Abr.* 175). So, Ludwich, 6, n. 13; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329. Seguier, *PG* (21) 1569, removes all doubt that God is the subject as he emends *ὁ μὲν ἐν* to read *ὁ θεὸς*. Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 507, however, in keeping with his understanding of Frg. 2, line 2, thinks the subject is the angel, because of its role in Gen 22 (cf. above, n. 27). Also, Schwabe apud Gutman, "Philo," 56; Atwell-Hanson, 30; Attridge, 783, "God or his angel."

33. Gen 22:13 LXX: ... *καὶ ἰδοὺ κριὸς εἷς κατεχόμενος ἐν φυτῷ σαβεκ τῶν κεράτων.*

34. After treating Jacob (9.21-22), Eusebius provides two selections from Polyhistor on Joseph (9.23-24). The first is from Artapanus (9.23.1-4 = Frg. 2, though Walter thinks the final line may derive from Demetrius, Frg. 2, or directly from Gen 41:45-49; 42:6. Cf. *JSHRZ* [1.2], 128, n. 4c; also *JSHRZ* [3.2], 287, n. 12c; *JSHRZ* [4.3], 150, n. a on Frg. 2; also *FHJA* 1.230, n. 29). The second is this fragment from Philo (9.24). It is followed immediately by Aristeas' testimony on Job (9.25.1-4 = Frg. 1), also taken by Polyhistor from Aristeas.

35. I.e., Polyhistor. Cf. *P.E.* 9.22.11.

36. Thinking it incredible that Philo could have written fourteen books of epic verse celebrating Jerusalem, Freudenthal, 100, emends ιδ′ to read δ′. He conjectures that the ι resulted from dittography of the iota subscript in the preceding τῇ (THI); also accepted by Ludwich, 7, n. 25. Even granting the possibility of producing a work of this length, it was thought improbable that Philo could have devoted thirteen books to the period between Abraham (*P.E.* 9.20.1 = Frgs. 1 & 2) and Joseph. If anything, it was thought that they were likely treated close together, probably in the "first book." Thus, Jacoby suggests that δ′ be emended to α′. So, Attridge, 783: "in the first book," though noting (n. b on Frg. 3) the other possibilities. Gutman, "Philo," 38, while conceding the force of Freudenthal's observation, insists that the work contained at least four books. He also observes, 38, n. 2, that Philo's order of treatment need not have been strictly sequential; Joseph could have been included as part of a later treatment of Israel in Egypt. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 140-41, 150, holds out for the MSS tradition (as does Mras), insisting that recent research on epic poetry during the Hellenistic period (e.g., Ziegler)

increases the likelihood that lengthy epic works were produced (cf. *JSHRZ* [4.3], 140, n. 12).

37. The antecedent is unidentified. Presumably it is the Israelites.

38. "Dwelling place" translates ἔδος, literally "seat" or "sitting place," especially used to describe the dwelling place of the gods (*LSJ*, 477; cf. Homer *Il.* 5.360, 367), but also of men (Homer *Il.* 4.406; *Od.* 13.344; also *Il.* 24.544). The term does not occur in LXX. Cf. Gen 47:11 (Joseph) ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς κατάσχεσιν ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου. It may refer either to the dwelling place given to Jacob's family in Egypt or to the land of Canaan promised and given to Abraham. Cf. below n. 39.

39. The identity of this "great leader" (μέγας ... ἄκτωρ) is much disputed: 1) Joseph (Viger, *PG* [21] 726; Philippson, 65; Gifford, 3.460-61; Riessler, 733, 1315, n. on line 11; Gutman, "Philo," 59; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 34); 2) God (Ludwich, 7, n. 26; Mras, *GCS* [43,1] 517; Atwell-Hanson, 31-36; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 150, n. c; van der Horst, *JHP*, 56; Attridge, 783, n. d on Frg. 3; Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 331); or even 3) Pharaoh (mentioned as a possibility by Attridge, 783, n. d on Frg. 3). The question turns on how one understands ὅλης (line 5), and the most likely referent of ὕψιστος (line 7).

Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 517, understands ὅλης to imply γῆς; similarly Gifford, 4.310, who cites Euripides *Heracl.* 140: ἐκ τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ τούσδε δραπέτας ἐλών. Ludwich, 8, n. 26, remains doubtful, preferring ὅλου instead; "des Alles" (p. 7; followed by Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 34). Finding ὅλης senseless, Viger, *PG* (21) 725, proposes ὅλως (also read by B), rendering it "ultro." Atwell-Hanson, 34, also observe that ὅλης

can modify the previous expression, hence "the most blessed dwelling place of the whole land," which would be true to the biblical account that Joseph's family settled in the "best of the land" (ἐν τῇ βελτίστῃ γῇ, Gen 47:6, 11). Cf. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 331.

Ordinarily, ὕψιστος is used as a divine epithet, e.g., of Zeus (Pindar *N.* 1.60; 11.2; Aeschylus *Eu.* 28; Sophocles *Ph.* 1289), and in LXX of Yahweh (Gen 14:18, 19, 20, 22; Deut 32:8; passim; also, cf. Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.5, on which cf. *FHJA* 1.172-73, 183, n. 21). Since it is commonly used of gods, and by extension to their dwelling places, it would be most unusual if it applies to Joseph here (cf. Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 35). So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 150, n. c: "und mit ὕψιστος wäre dem Joseph eine allzu gottähnliche Würde zuerkannt." Cf. esp. A. D. Nock, C. Roberts, and T. C. Skeat, "The Gild of Zeus Hypsistos," in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1972) 1.414-43, esp. 422-27; also G. Bertram, *TDNT* 8.614-20; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.244, 298.

According to Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 150, n. c, this "most blessed dwelling place" is the "promised land" of Canaan (Gen 12:7; 13:15, etc.); also van der Horst, *JHP*, 56.

On ἄκτωρ, cf. Aeschylus *Per.* 557 Δαρεῖος ... Σουσίδαις φίλος ἄκτωρ; cf. Gifford, 4.310. Also, cf. Aeschylus *Eum.* 399; so Jacobson, *Ezekiel*, 27.

40. So, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 517; cf. above, n. 39.

41. I.e., God; cf. above, n. 39.

42. The translation here renders πρόσθεν adverbially, "formerly," "earlier" (*LSJ*, 1513). It follows the suggestion of Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 517, that καὶ πρόσθεν underscores the antiquity of the

land promise: "bevor sie ins Gelobte Land kamen."

43. The prepositional phrase (*ἀπό* + gen.) is understood here primarily in a temporal sense ("from the time of ..."; Mras, *GCS* [43,1] 517: *ἀφ'* = "seit"). In mind is God's promise to Abraham (Gen 12:7; 13:15), reaffirmed to Isaac (Gen 26:2-5) and Jacob (Gen 35:12). So, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 150, n. d.

44. The translation here follows Ludwich, 8, n. 28, who supplied *τ'* after *'Ιακὼβ*.

45. Cf. 4 Macc 18:9 *τὸν ... τῆς εὐτεκνίας βίον*.

46. Literally, "a prophet of dreams." On *θέσπιστής* as prophet, cf. Manetho *Astrol.* 6.378. Philo of Alexandria employs *θεσπίζω* and cognates in his description of Moses' work as prophet. Cf. *V. Mos.* 2.246-87, esp. 246 *τὰ κατ' ἐνθουσιασμὸν τοῦ προφήτου θεσπισθέντα λόγια*; also 270. In describing Joseph's role as interpreter of dreams, more conventional terms are used, e.g., *ὀνείρων κριτής* (*Jos.* 95; cf. Aeschylus *Per.* 226; *LSJ*, 997). In LXX, *συγκρίνω* and cognates are used in recounting Joseph's interpretations of dreams (cf. Gen 40:8, 12, 16, 18, 22; 41:12, 13, 15).

47. Here *σκηπτοῦχος* is understood as applying to Joseph (Gen 41:37-45; 42:6), although the biblical account stipulates that Pharaoh retained supreme rule (Gen 41:41, 43). Also, Ludwich, 8, n. 26; Gutman, "Philo," 59: "bearer of the scepter of the throne of Egypt." If this means that Pharaoh rather than Joseph actually bore the scepter, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons's emendation *σκηπτούχῳ* (p. 330) is appropriate; hence, "... Joseph who was the interpreter of dreams for the scepter-bearer in Egypt's courts." So, Attridge, 784.

48. "Unravel" attempts to convey the sense of spinning motion suggested by *δινεύω*, ordinarily translated "whirl," "spin around," "rotate" (*LSJ*, 431). Cf. Homer *Il.* 18.543 *ζεύγεα δινεύοντες ἐλάστρεον*; Gifford, 4.310; also Nonnus *D.* 7.70 *ἐγκεφάλου ... ἐδινεύοντο μενοιναί*; so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 331. The term, however, may refer simply to the "whirling" upheavals of Joseph's career; so, Gifford, 3.461: "(Joseph) ... much tossed erewhile by waves of fickle fate." So understood, the term says nothing about Joseph's prophetic ability to interpret dreams.

49. The translation of "this rather sententious line" (Attridge, 784) follows Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 517: "nachdem er die Geheimnisse der Zeit in der Hochflut des Schicksals herumgedreht hatte," i.e., after he had interpreted Pharaoh's dream (Gen 41). Similarly, Ludwich, 8; Riessler, 733; also, Philippson, 65.

"Secrets of time" (*λαθραῖα χρόνου*) seems a suitable, though highly stylized, way of referring to the future that Joseph foresaw. This translation became possible through Stephanus' emendation of *λατραῖα*, read in the MSS tradition, which would yield something like "services of time."

The main question raised by the phrase "flow of fate" (*πλημμυρίδι μοίρης*) is whether *μοῖρα* is being used in the technical sense, and thus whether Joseph is being portrayed as a divinely endowed prophet who either conspires with the goddess Fate in achieving his purpose, or who perhaps triumphs over Fate because of Yahweh's assistance. Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 35, sees the expression and range of thought as non-Jewish. Atwell-Hanson, 35, raise the possibility that *πλημμυρίδι* is based on a false etymology (*πλήν* + *μύρομαι*), an intentional pun by Philo signifying something like "without

shedding the tears of fate." Joseph would thus be seen as the successful interpreter of dreams who thereby managed to avoid an otherwise painful future.

Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 150, n. f, prefers to interpret the phrase chiastically, taking λαθραῖα μοίρης together, hence "die Verborgenheiten des Schicksals," and χρόνου πλημμυρίδι together, hence "im Geflute der Zeit." So, also van der Horst, *JHP*, 56.

Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 331, cite LXX Gen 41:45 ἐκάλεσεν Φαραω τὸ ὄνομα Ιωσηφ Ψονθομφανηχ, noting the interpretation, preserved in Josephus *Ant.* 2.6.1. ¶ 91, that Joseph's new name means κρυπτῶν εὑρέτην (cf. F. Wutz, *Onomastica Sacra. Untersuchungen zum Liber Interpretationis Nominum Hebraicorum des Hl. Hieronymus* [*TU* 41.1-2 (1914-15)] 1.373). H. St. J. Thackeray notes in the Loeb edition of Josephus (vol. 4, p. 206) that this interpretation is based on the "Hebrew form of the name (the first half of which was connected with Heb. צפן, 'to hide'..."). Cf. *BDB*, 861. A similar etymology is preserved in *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 41:45, "And Pharaoh called Joseph's name, 'The man who reveals hidden things.'" Also, Peshitta, *Tg. Onq.* As J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969) 254-55, notes, many interpretations were suggested for the name: *Ber. R.* 90.4: "R. Johanan said: 'The name means that he reveals hidden things easily.' Hezekiah said: 'He reveals hidden things with his understanding, and brings peace to troubled hearts.' Our rabbis said: 'It is foreseer," "redeemer," "prophet," "supporter," "interpreter," "wise," "discriminating," "seer."' R. Aha said, 'It means, "You have come to reveal the woman that was hidden here."'" Also, cf. O. Wintermute, "Zaphenath-Paneah," *IDB* (1962) 4.934. Cf. Philo *Mut.* 89-91, esp. 91, where Psonthomphanech is

interpreted to mean "mouth which judges in answer."

Though there is no discernible connection between the name given to Joseph by Pharaoh in Gen 41:45 and the terminology here, conceivably this line, at least as translated here, embodies a tradition about Joseph's prophetic role that is also elaborated in the etymological discussions mentioned above in Josephus, the Targums, and Peshitta. If so, it may serve to locate the existence of this tradition in an Egyptian setting, which at least supplements the other occurrences.

On the reinterpretation of the figure Joseph, cf. H. Sprödowsky, *Die Hellenisierung der Geschichte von Joseph in Agypten bei Flavius Josephus* (Greifswald, 1937); also M. Braun, *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (Oxford, 1938); Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*, 74-75.

50. Frgs. 4, 5, & 6 occur towards the end of *P.E.*, Book 9, in a section treating the geography of Jerusalem (9.35-38). Prior to this, Solomon's building the Jerusalem temple has been a central feature of the excerpt from Eupolemus (9.30-34 = Frg. 2). Immediately preceding are two other fragments, one from Timochares' *Life of Antiochus* (9.35; cf. Jacoby *FGrH* 165, Frg. 1), the other from an anonymous *Metrical Survey of Syria* (9.36; cf. Jacoby *FGrH* 849, Frg. 1; Müller, *FHG* 3.209, 228-29, attributes it to Xenophon of Lampsacus). Besides recording the circumference of Jerusalem, both mention the city's water supply. Both of these fragments, along with these excerpts from Philo, are taken from Alexander Polyhistor (cf. 9.37.3). Following these fragments is a quotation from *Ep. Arist.* 88-90 describing the water system of Jerusalem. These should be compared with other texts referring to Jerusalem's water supply (cf. Strabo *Geog.* 16.2.36; Tacitus *Histories* 5.12).

Traditionally these three fragments have been

treated as one. Cf. Müller, *FHG* 3.229 (= No. 23); Stearns, 98-99; Jacoby, *FGrH* 3.690 (= No. 729, Frg. 2); Denis, *Frag.*, 204; also Riessler, 733-34; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3) 151-53. This scheme of treating them as three separate fragments follows Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329-30 (= Frgs. 683-85); Attridge, 781-841; also, cf. Nickelsburg, "Philo," 118-20.

51. It is difficult to identify these "waters in Jerusalem" described by Philo in Frgs. 4-6. The term *κρήνη* is used both in Philo's introductory remarks (Frg. 3, line 3; Frg. 6, line 1) as well as in the poem itself (Frg. 5, line 5). But in what sense one should understand *κρήνη* is not clear, whether as a spring of water issuing from the ground or as a pool or cistern into which water flows or is poured from another source. (On the terminology, cf. below n. 53).

Although Frgs. 4-6 pertain, in some sense, to the "waters in Jerusalem," it must be asked whether all three describe a single source of water. Even though *κρήνη* is the term used throughout, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546-47, understands the first two excerpts (Frg. 4, lines 6-8 and Frg. 5, lines 3-6) to describe the "ruler's bath" ("Das Königsbad"), and the final excerpt (Frg. 6, lines 3-4) as referring to the "high priest's bath" ("Das Bad des Hohen Priesters"), presumably referring to two different structures. A similar distinction is entertained by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330, though noting the uncertainties involved in identifying the pools. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, n. s, on the other hand, observes that during the Hasmonean period the high priest was the ruler, thus rightly questions Mras's distinction. While conceding that the third excerpt (Frg. 6) might describe another structure, he also allows that all three excerpts might describe a single structure.

Besides the ambiguity of *κρήνη*, the obscurity of the language in the fragments makes it difficult to identify the "waters." There are several possibilities.

First, the excerpts may describe, either in whole or in part, the water system consisting of a) the Gihon Spring (2 Kgs 20:20; 2 Chr 32:2-4, 30; "upper Gihon"), located on the eastern side of the old city outside the wall and providing a continuous flow of water; b) a "pool," such as the Pool of Siloam (John 9:7; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.16.2 ¶ 340; 5.4.1 ¶ 140; 5.4.2 ¶ 145; 5.6.1 ¶ 252-53; 5.9.4 ¶ 409-10; 5.12.1 ¶ 505; 6.7.1 ¶ 363; 6.8.5 ¶ 401), the Pool of Shelah (Neh 2:14; 3:15), or the "lower pool" (Isa 22:9); and c) the tunnel(s) or aqueduct system connecting them, either the tunnel dug during the reign of Hezekiah (701 B.C.E.; 2 Kgs 20:20; 2 Chr 32:30; Sir 48:7) or the Siloam channel, also known as the Aqueduct of Shiloah ("waters of Shiloah," Isa 8:6; on this watering system, cf. 1 Kgs 1:33; 2 Kgs 18:17; 20:20; 2 Chr 32:2-4, 30; Sir 48:17; Isa 7:3; 8:6; 22:8-11; 36:2).

Second, they may describe some aspect of the water system comprising the reservoirs under the temple area and the aqueduct system from regions south of the city that supplied them (on the aqueduct system in Roman times, cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.9.4 ¶ 175-77; *Ant.* 18.3.1 ¶ 60-62; also *b. Yoma* 31a).

Third, the "waters" may be the Jordan River, or some water system related to it (Riessler, 1315).

Fourth, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 151, n. d, offers the intriguing suggestion that the Jerusalem "waters" in question may be the Bethesda pool mentioned in John 5:2, which was located north of the temple area. Drawing on J. Jeremias, *The Rediscovery of Bethesda: John 5:2* (NT Archaeology

Monograph No. 1, ed. J. Vardaman; Lousville, KY: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary), Walter suggests that the double pool of Bethesda provides the architectural model that satisfies many of the problematic features of all three excerpts of our text.

The earliest Christian testimony to the Bethesda pool is provided in Eusebius, *Onomasticon of Biblical Place-Names* (s.v. "Βηζαθά"; in E. Klostermann, ed., *Eusebius Werke III.1 Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen* [*GCS* 11,1]; Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966; reprint of Leipzig, 1904 ed.; p. 58, lines 21-26). The text is translated as follows in Jeremias, *Rediscovery*, 16: "Bezetha. A pool in Jerusalem which is the Sheep Pool, formerly having five porticoes. It is still shown in the twin pool (which is) there. Each of the two (pools) is filled by the annual rains, but, oddly enough, one of them exhibits reddish colored water, a vestige, people say, of the sacrificial animals once washed in it. That is also why it is called Sheep (Pool), on account of the sacrifices."

As Jeremias reconstructs the design of the double pool, based on archaeological excavations, each pool was trapezoidal in shape (cf. diagram, *Rediscovery*, 26-27). With a total surface of the two pools exceeding 5,000 square meters, it was certainly large enough for swimming or bathing. In fact, Jeremias, 17, suggests that one pool was for men, the other for women. Moreover, he notes, 17, n. 34, the Old Latin MS b on John 5:2, which reads "natatoriae piscinae," "swimming pools."

Also worth noting is Eusebius' remark that the pools were supplied by the annual rainfalls, which would square, at least partially, with the mention of "rainy snows" in Frg. 5, line 3. The sheer size of the pools would seem to qualify the site as a "spectacle" (Frg. 4, lines 6-7), and the double-pool design makes some sense of the description in

Frg. 4, line 7, especially if Mras is correct in suggesting that the line refers to two structures "connected" (*συναοιδὰ*) to each other. Thus, if the text envisions the two pools somehow joined in the middle and having "a stream of water bursting up... filling a deep stream" (Frg. 4, line 8), this may describe either the flow of water into the northern pool from an external source, or the flow of water from the northern pool into the southern pool.

The references to elevation in Frg. 4, line 6 and Frg. 5, line 3 might also make sense, especially if the southern pool was on a lower level than the northern pool, or if each (or both) was supplied by pipes or spouts that were elevated. Moreover, the reference to a stream "flowing under neighboring towers" may be understood with reference to the nearby northern wall of the city (cf. below n. 65). One can imagine water flowing, or being discharged, from one or both of the twin pools, flowing "beneath (i.e., at the base of rather than underneath the ground of) the neighboring towers" of the northern city walls and out into the nearby Kidron valley. Accordingly, the reference to streams of water "flowing on dry, dusty ground" (Frg. 5, line 5), providing a marvel to all observers, may describe how water from these pools served to irrigate the regions around the northeastern edge of the city.

Other references in the excerpts to the movement of the water (Frg. 4, line 8; Frg. 5, lines 4-5) appear to fit with Jeremias's suggestion that the pool was an "intermittent spring," similar to the pool of Siloam (*Rediscovery*, 37). Another fourth century C.E. tradition, that of the Pilgrim of Bordeaux, mentions that the "twin pool carries water which is stirred (and colored) in a kind of scarlet" (*Rediscovery*, 17). Thus, even though Philo's description of a pool which "dries up in the winter and overflows in the summer" may be

factually incorrect, it may nevertheless be accurate in the *kind* of pool described here, namely, one whose water supply fluctuated with the seasons, which depended partially on rainfall, and thus producing water intermittently.

Jeremias, *Rediscovery*, 37, also reports on the drainage system that served the pools of Bethesda. Located in the middle wall were at least three canals through which water drained off. One of the canals, which drained the north pool, led under the southern pool and turned eastward towards the Kidron Valley. This may very well be the image that lies behind the description in Frg. 5, lines 5-6. A middle canal appears to have directed water from the north pool into the south pool once the water reached a height of eight meters. Conceivably this could be the image behind the description in Frg. 4, line 8 of a "stream bursting forth to fill a deep stream" or that of Frg. 6, lines 3-4, where pipes are said to "pour forth (water) through the earth (the middle wall, perhaps) in channels." The third canal is more recent and does not come into consideration for our purposes. Whether or not such precise identification can be made reliably, the fairly elaborate drainage system, with its various canals (pipes), appears to make sense of several references in the excerpts.

An especially important consideration is the early date of the Bethesda pool. Even though Herod the Great enhanced the pool ca. 20/19 B.C.E. by adding five porticoes (enclosing both pools with four porticoes and providing a fifth portico on the partition separating the two pools), its earlier construction is reliably dated during the Hasmonean period (cf. M. Avi-Yonah, "Excavations in Jerusalem--Review and Evaluation," in Y. Yadin, *Jerusalem Revealed* [New Haven/London: Yale University Press/Israel Exploration Society, 1976] 24). Jeremias, *Rediscovery*, 33, plausibly suggests

that this may be the pool mentioned in Sir 50:3: "in his time (i.e., Simon II, high priest ca. 219-196 B.C.E.) a cistern for water was quarried out, a reservoir like the sea in circumference." This would certainly place the pool at a time early enough to be mentioned by Philo Epicus, who appears to have flourished in the late third or mid-second century B.C.E. (cf. Introduction). Thus, as Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 151, n. d, observes, Philo would serve as an important witness from the Diaspora who testifies to this technological marvel.

On the water system of Jerusalem, cf. G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem: The Topography, Economics and History from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1972; 2 vol. in one; repr. of 1907-08 ed.) 1.75-133, esp. 87-91; G. Dalman, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930) 168-73; J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories* (Leiden: Brill, 1952) 157-94, esp. 163-64; L.-H Vincent and M.-A. Steve, *Jérusalem de l'ancien testament; recherches d'archéologie et d'histoire* (3 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1954-56) 1.260-312, esp. 260-64; G. A. Barrois, "Gihon (Spring)," *IDB* (1962) 2.396; "Siloam," *IDB* (1962) 4.352-55; M. Burrows, "Jerusalem," *IDB* (1962) 2.843-66, esp. 850-51; R. W. Hamilton, "Water Works," *IDB* (1962) 4.811-16; W. L. Reed, "Pool," *IDB* (1962) 3.842-43; R. Amiran, "The Water Supply of Israelite Jerusalem," and A. Mazar, "The Aqueducts of Jerusalem," in Y. Yadin (ed.), *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968-74* (New Haven/London: Yale Univ. Press/Israel Exploration Society, 1976) 75-78, 79-84.

52. On the title of Philo's work, cf. above n. 2.

53. Whether *κρήνη* is best understood here as a natural spring (perhaps "fountain") or as an

artificially built structure, either for reaching underground sources of water ("well") or for receiving and holding water ("pool," "cistern," "reservoir") is not clear. In classical Greek, *κρήνη*, "well," "spring," "fountain" (*LSJ*, 994; cf. Homer *Il.* 16.3; *Od.* 7.129; 10.107; Pindar *P.* 1.39; Plato *Phd.* 112C) is contrasted with *φρέαρ*, "artificial well," hence "tank," "cistern," "reservoir" (*LSJ*, 1954; cf. Homer *Il.* 21.197; Herodotus 4.120; Thucydides 2.48.2; Demosthenes 14.30; also cf. Herodotus 1.68; 6.119; Thucydides 2.49.5). In the previous quotation from the anonymous work *Metrical Survey of Syria* (*P.E.* 9.36.1), the source of Jerusalem's water supply is "a spring which spouts up abundance of water" (*πηγὴν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ ὕδωρ δαφιλὲς ἀναβλύζουσαν*). The term *πηγή*, also used in the following quotation from Aristeas (*P.E.* 9.38.3), which is frequently used in Homer, always in the plural, ordinarily suggests "running water," hence "streams," though it can also mean "fount" or "source" (*LSJ*, 1399; cf. Homer *Il.* 20.9; Herodotus 1.189; also 2.28; *BAG*, 655). The related term *κολυμβήθρα*, which can signify "place for diving," "swimming-bath" (*LSJ*, 974; cf. Plato *Rep.* 453D; Diod. Sic. 11.25.4), or even "wine vat" (Diod. Sic. 13.83.3), is not used in this section of *P.E.* Timochares (9.35.1) reports that "the whole city is flooded with water" (*ὅλην δὲ τὴν πόλιν ὕδασι καταρρεῖσθαι*).

Biblical use of the terms is as follows: עין and מקור = *πηγή*, frequent in LXX, usually "spring," often "fountain" (RSV, e.g., Gen 16:7; 24:16, 29, 30, 42-45; 2 Chr 32:3-4, "[water of the] springs ... outside the city"; Neh. 2:13); באר = *φρέαρ*, frequent in LXX, usually "well" (RSV, e.g., Gen 16:14; 21:14-34; 24:11, 20; 26:15-33); ברכה = *κολυμβήθρα* (10x); usually "pool" (RSV, 2 Kgs 18:17, "[conduit of the] upper pool"; Neh 2:14, "King's Pool"; 3:15, "Pool of Shelah"; 3:16, "artificial

pool"; Eccl 2:6; Nah 2:8; Isa 7:3, "[conduit of the] upper pool"; 22:9, "lower pool"; 22:11, "old pool"; 36:2, "[conduit of the] upper pool"); also = *κρήνη* (8x), usually "pool" (RSV, 2 Sam 2:13, "pool of Gibeon"; 4:12, "pool at Hebron"; 1 Kgs 22:38, "pool at Samaria"; 2 Kgs 20:20, "pool [and conduit made by Hezekiah]"; Sir 48:17, "pools [for water built by Hezekiah]"). LXX usage of *κρήνη* seems to suggest artificially constructed pools or rock hewn cisterns rather than natural, intermittent springs.

54. Given what is known about the climate in Palestine, this remark is clearly inaccurate. Since the rainy season occurred during the winter (November-April -- average rainfall 25 inches) and the dry season occurred during the summer (May-October), we would have expected the reverse, namely, that the pool overflowed in the winter but dried up during the summer. That Philo is talking about a spring supplied by winter rains is suggested by the phrase in Frg. 5, line 3, "fed by (waters from) rainy snows," or perhaps "rain and snow" (cf. below n. 63). Also, cf. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 151, n. d; Hamilton, "Water Works," *IDB* (1962) 4.813; Smith, *Jerusalem*, 77-79; also D. Baly, *The Geography of the Bible* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1974) 43-68.

55. Νήχω, "swim," usually middle (*LSJ*, 1175; cf. Hesiod *Sc.* 317 *νῆχον ἐπ' ἄκρον ὕδωρ*; middle participle in Homer *Od.* 7.276; 14.352; Hesiod *Sc.* 211); perhaps "flowing," so Viger, *PG* (21) 755, "allabens"; cf. *νήχυτος*, "full-flowing," esp. *ὕδωρ*, Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 3.530. If rendered "swim," or "swimming," the term would appear to envision persons swimming in a pool or stream. Accordingly, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 329-30, emend *νηχόμενος* to *νηχομένοις*, rendered by Attridge, 784, "above the swimmers." Taking

νηχόμενος in the sense of "swimming," as opposed to "flowing," is reinforced by the mention of λοετροῖς in the next line (so, Ludwich, 7, n. 17), which perhaps suggests that "bathing" is the appropriate translation. As Atwell-Hanson, 37, note, νηχόμενος is not found in LXX (though, cf. Job 11:12), and only rarely does the Bible refer to swimming (,שחה, Isa 25:11; Ezek 47:5; cf. 32:6).

As Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 151, n. 3, observes, νηχόμενος must be related to the unstated subject of the sentence, and even then, it is not altogether clear what is being envisioned, whether a natural water source (so, Gutman, "Philo," 57, who thinks of "one of the streams near the city" in which persons could swim) or a reservoir or pool large enough to swim in.

Seguier, *PG* (21) 1582, accepts Vossius' proposed emendation νισσόμενος, from νίσσομαι or νίσομαι, "go," "come," used especially with prepositions of motion; hence, here "coming or descending from above" (*LSJ*, 1177). Though Philippson, 64-65, reads νηχόμενος, his translation appears to follow Vossius: "Kommend von oben herab..." Similarly, Riessler, 733: "Komm ich von oben her..."

The following expression "from above" (ἐφύπερθε) may mean that while one is swimming or bathing in the pool, one can look up to another, higher level and see an "astonishing spectacle." In this case, one might think of two pools at different levels, connected perhaps by a waterfall, or some other impressive spout or pipe pouring water from the upper pool to the lower pool. Or, one might think simply of a pool supplied by a water source from "high up," thus perhaps a reservoir or cistern supplied by a natural water source, e.g., a flowing stream or spring, or one into which water is poured from an aqueduct, or a similar pipe or spout.

56. As Mras notes, *GCS* (43,1) 546, a finite verb probably stood in the preceding section, hence the parentheses here. He suggests "Ich bemerkte"; already similarly translated by Viger, *PG* (21) 755: "vidi"; Philippson, 65; also, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 151: "(erblickt man...)."

57. "Sight" translates *δέρκηθρον*, a hapax legomenon, whose sense remains uncertain (*LSJ*, *Suppl.*, 38, "dub. sens."). Here it is understood as deriving from *δέρκομαι*, "see," "see clearly" (*LSJ*, 379). So, Gutman, "Philo," 57. Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, suggests "spectaculum," citing as analogous forms *λείβηθρον*, *κήληθρον*, and *θέλγητρα* (Frg. 1, line 7). Similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 151: "Sehenswürdigkeit"; van der Horst, *JHP*, 56: "schouwspel."

In one sense, the term must be considered along with the following expression *συναοιδά*. The phrase was regarded as corrupt as early as Viger, *PG* (21) 756, who provides no Latin translation of *δέρκηθρον σὺν ἀοιδᾷ*. Seguier, *PG* (21) 1582, reports Vossius' suggested reading: *δέρκῃ θροῦν ἀοιδᾶ*, but himself reads *δέρκῃ κρούνισμ' ὅγ' οἶδα*. An alternative solution is proposed by Philippson, 66, n. on v 17, whose text (p. 64), for some reason, reads *δέκρηθρον*, possibly a misspelling resulting from the inversion of *ρκ*. In any case, he emends *δέκρηθρον σὺν ἀοιδᾷ* to read *ἔδρακον ἀθρόον οἶδμα*, which he takes with the preceding phrase *τὸ θαμβηέστατον ἄλλο*; hence, his translation, "erblickt' ich mit Staunnen den andren, Mächtigen Wasserschwall." Thereby he solves the problem of the absent main verb (cf. above n. 56). Similarly, Riessler, 733. Gifford, 1.564, also regards *δέρκηθρον* as a corrupt form and emends the following word (cf. below n. 58). Attridge, 784, n. c, observes that the term may be "an unattested

form of *derethron* (*δέρεθρον*; "gulf," "pit"), used, for the sake of the meter, to refer to a body of water, such as the baths mentioned in this F(rg)"; thus "another pool."

58. The MSS tradition (i.e., ION; the phrase belongs to a section omitted by B [Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330, failing to note the material omitted by B, imply that *σὺν ἀοιδᾶ* is also read in B.]) reads *σὺν ἀοιδᾶ*, literally "with a song," understanding *ἀοιδᾶ* as the orthographical variant of *ἀοιδή*, whose Attic contracted form is *ᾠδή*, from *ἀείδω*, "sing" (*LSJ*, 172). Gifford, 1.564, proposes *συναοιδὰ*, citing Euripides, *HF* 787 *πατρὸς ὕδωρ βᾶτε λιποῦσαι συναοιδοί*. This reading is adopted by Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546. The term is an orthographical variant of *συνῳδός*, *-όν*, "singing," "sounding in unison with," "echoing" or "responsive to" (*LSJ*, 1730). So understood, it would appear to describe the sound of water as it flows into and through the pool. The translation adopted here, "blending with," attempts, on the one hand, to express the notion of sound, especially "singing," which seems basic to the word. So, Attridge, 784, "its sound..." On the other hand, however, it moves in a metaphorical direction towards "according with," "in harmony with," functioning as an adjectival expression taking the dative (cf. Euripides *Med.* 1008; Aristotle *EN* 10.1.4 [$1172^{b}5$]). Although Mras accepts Gifford's emendation, he understands the term to signify "harmony" or "accord" in the sense of being related or connected (physically or spatially) with something else. Thus Mras envisions a two-tiered terrace, each with a pool of water connected to each other, one probably flowing into another. Hence, he translates, "(Ich bemerkte), schwimmend im oberen Becker, eine andere Sehenswürdigkeit, die erstaunlichste: die miteinander in Verbindung stehenden Becken füllen

für das Bad des Fürsten..." Similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 151, "die miteinander kommunizierenden (Becken?)..., noting (n. h) that *συναοιδός* is being understood as "miteinander harmonierend." As noted above (cf. n. 51), he has in mind specifically the twin pools of Bethesda, which were connected with each other by a pipe (conduit) system. Thus when the north pool was filled, water would overflow from it into the south pool.

Müller, *FHG* 3.229, conjectures that *σὺν ἀοίδα* might be read *σοι ἀείδω*, thereby providing yet another way of supplying a finite verb. Hence, "I sing to you (of) another, most remarkable spectacle..."

Ludwich, 4, 7, n. 18, emends *σὺν ἀοίδα* to *σὺν ἄρ' οἶδα*, citing Demosthenes 20.13 *ἔγωγε οὐκ οἶδα, οὐδὲ λέγω φλαῦρον οὐδὲν οὐδὲ σύνοιδα.*

59. Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, understands *μεγιστοῦχος*, otherwise unattested (and not cited in *LSJ*), as "Fürst," the equivalent (both morphologically and materially) of *σκηπτοῦχος*, from *σκῆπτον* + *ἔχω* (so *LSJ*, 1609), i.e., "(one) bearing a scepter," "ruler" (cf. Frg. 3, line 9; also n. 47 above); thus, *μέγιστος* + *ἔχω*, "(one) having the greatest (position)." Similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, n. i, who further identifies the "ruler" as the reigning Hasmonean high priest (cf. Sir 50:3); also, Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330, *μεγιστούχοιο* = "regis," adducing, besides *σκηπτοῦχος*, analogous forms built on the same suffix: *μεγαλοῦχον*, "lordly," "overweening" (*LSJ*, 1087; cf. Bacchylides 17.23; *δευτεροῦχον* = *τὰ δευτερεῖα ἔχων*, "having second rank, place" (*LSJ*, 381-82; cf. Lycophron 204). So, Attridge, 784, "ruler's (baths)."

Mras appears to have been the first to interpret the term as referring to a ruler, thereby enabling his interpretation of this passage with

reference to the "king's baths" in Jerusalem. Prior to Mras, commentators seem to have understood the term as a compound of *μέγιστος* + *χέω* ("pour"), or perhaps *χοή* ("pouring out," "stream," cf. Sophocles *Fr.* 523, *LSJ*, 1996), thus as that which pours out abundantly. So, Viger, *PG* (21) 755, "qua fons uberrimus undas egerit"; Philippson, 65, "Wellenreicher" (?); similarly, Riessler, 733, "wellenreichen (Strömung)"; Ludwich, 7, n. 17, "stärkstgüssigen" (?). It is left untranslated by Gifford.

Scaliger's emendation *μεγιστοχόοιο*, cited (and adopted) by Seguier, *PG* (21) 1582, was thought to be metrically preferable. What lexical form they presuppose is not clear; perhaps *μεγιστόχοος*, from *μέγιστος* + *χοός* (*χοῦς*), a measure of capacity, perhaps "pitcher" (*LSJ*, 2000). Ludwich, 4, prefers the same form, but in the dat. (*μεγιστοχόοις*). Interestingly, Ludwich, 7, n. 18, inserts ὃ following *μεγ.*, understanding it like *ὅτι*.

Given the confusion that exists concerning the meaning and derivation of *μεγιστοῦχος*, other possibilities might be explored. Is it conceivable, for example, that it is a compound formed from *μέγας* + *τεύχω*, thus "that built, or made large"? Or, *μέγιστος* + *χοῦς* ("soil excavated, heaped up," *LSJ*, 2000), perhaps a large structure made of bricks, earth, or stone, e.g., a humanly constructed fountain or pool, or even aqueduct?

Closely related to *μεγιστούχοιο* is the adjacent term *λοετροῖς*, "baths." As noted earlier (cf. n. 55), the image of "baths" is quite clear, and the term can hardly be understood in any other way. Its use here reinforces the understanding of *νηχόμενος* as referring to someone swimming, perhaps bathing, rather than as water flowing or running.

60. This crudely literal translation attempts to convey the gist of meaning while exhibiting the

problematic character of the line. It is difficult to know how ῥεύματος relates syntactically to the rest of the line. As Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, n. k, observes, it can hardly be taken with μεγιστούχοιο. For the lack of a better explanation, it is here seen as the genitive accompanying ἐμπίπλησι, with the double accusative providing the direct object: "(it) fills up the deep stream with a flow of water" (cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* ¶ 1369). Even so, there is no obvious subject of ἐμπίπλησι. Obviously, ἐξανιείσης, as read in Mras, does not agree with ῥεύματος, but it is so rendered here. One solution, adopted by Mras, Walter, and Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330 is to regard κρήνης (Frg. 4, line 3) as the unstated antecedent. Thus, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, "die miteinander kommunizierenden (Becken?), die zum Bade des Fürsten (dienen), füllen mit Strömung das tiefe Fluß(-bett) der sprudelnden (Quelle)." Another possibility, suggested as early as Vossius, adopted by Seguier, *PG* (21) 1582, emended ἐξανιείσης to read ἐξανιεῖσιν, thus taken with λοετροῖς, i.e., "with baths bursting forth." Philippson, 66, adopts a similar solution, conjecturing ἐξανιέντος for ἐξανιείσης, but relating it to ῥεύματος and understanding it intransitively. Thus, "vorsprudelnd erfüllt er mit Strömung" (p. 65). Ludwich, 7, 19, regards the line as preserved in the Vulgate (and read in Mras) as completely incomprehensible. Accordingly, he adopts Vossius' suggested emendation of ἐξανιείσης and emends ῥεύματος to read ῥεῦμα τόσ'. He also emends the previous line to read δέρκηθρον σὺν ἄρ' οἶδα, μεγιστοχόοις ὃ λοετροῖς. Taking ἐξανιεῖσι with λοετροῖς, he thus translates, "dass mit ihren stärkstgüssigen, tiefen Strom hervorsendenden Bädern die Fluth so Vieles anfüllt" (7, n. 17).

Once again, it should be noted that Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330 imply that

ἐξανιείσης is read in B, when it actually belongs to a section omitted by B. Cf. app. crit.

Though syntactically difficult, this line seems to envision a stream (ῥεύματος) of water (whether a natural stream flowing in or along the ground or water flowing from one receptacle to another, perhaps through a pipe or spout, or over an edge, is not clear) bursting forth (assuming ἐξανιείσης is to be taken, in some sense, with ῥεύματος) and "filling a deep stream" (βαθὺν ῥόον). Perhaps envisioned here is Mras's suggestion of two pools or basins at different levels, with water pouring from an upper pool into a lower, deeper pool, filling it up. Or, it could be an equally apt description of water flowing from Hezekiah's tunnel into the Lower Gihon, or into the Siloam pool, or some similar pool or reservoir being filled by a stream of water, perhaps from an aqueduct. If, however, the pool of Bethesda is in view (cf. above n. 51), the line may refer to the middle canal (pipe) connecting the north and south pool and used to pour water into the south pool once it reached a depth of 8 meters in the north pool.

61. For the literary context of this fragment, cf. above n. 50.

62. "High and visible" renders ὑψιφάεννον, a hapax legomenon, for which *LSJ*, 1910, offers no suggested translation; "an unusual form" (Gifford, 4.322). The compound is formed from ὕψι, adverb "on high," "aloft" + Aeolic φαεννός (= φαεινός), "shining," "radiant," "bright" (*LSJ*, 1911). The alternate form ὑψιφάεινον is read in ON. On the form read by BION, cf. app. crit., which assumes that Mras's note pertaining to the ε being written on the erasure applies only to I. On the compound itself, cf. ὑψιφαής, "high-shining," "far-seen," e.g., *AP* 7.701 (Diodorus) λάινον ὑψιφαῆ τόνδ' ἀνέτεινε τάφον;

ὑψιφανής, "eminent." Philippson, 65, "weitglanzende"; Ludwich, 7, 21, "hochstrahlend"; Riessler, 733, "der weithin glänzt"; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, "ein hochoben (weithin) sichtbarer Strom"; van der Horst, *JHP*, 56, "in de hoogte zichtbare stroom." The term may suggest an elevated stream of water pouring into a lower pool. Attridge, 784, n. g, envisions "water at the top of an aqueduct, possibly supplying the pool" mentioned in Frg. 4, lines 6-8.

Whether or not "high and visible" is the most felicitous translation, the term nevertheless suggests something "aloft" or "high up" whose appearance is dazzling, radiant, or brilliant. Once again, one has the image of seeing a stream of water, perhaps a waterfall, or a flow of water from an elevated pipe, spout, or aqueduct, flowing down to a lower level. This is reinforced by the use of πολυγηθές in Frg. 5, line 4: the stream is "delightful," perhaps "sparkling," or (flowing) "merrily." Even allowing for poetic overstatement, one gets the sense of brisk, sparkling, movement of water.

63. "With rainy snows" renders literally ἐν ὑετίοις νιφετοῖσιν. It follows the suggestion of Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, "regnerischer Schnee = Regenwasser mit Schneewasser gemischt." Similarly, Philippson, 65, "von regnichtem Schnee genähret"; Ludwich, 7, n. 21, "unter regnigen Schneegestöbern emporstrebend"; Atwell-Hanson, 38, "by rainy snows," perhaps sleet. Ὑέτιος, from ὕω, "rain," hence "rainy" (*LSJ*, 1846). Νιφετός, from νείφω," snow" (*LSJ*, 1165) νιφάς, "snowflake" (*LSJ*, 1177), hence "falling snow," "snowstorm," may, however, be rendered simply "rain" or "showers" (Nonnus *D.* 6.267; 8.260). Hence, Attridge, 784, "fed by moist rains." "Rain and snow" would suggest two separate sources of water. Accordingly, Lloyd-Jones and

Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330 conjecture νιφετοῖς τε. The phrase has been translated in this way consistently: "et pluviis crescens nivibus" (Viger, *PG* [21] 755); "flooded by rain and snow" (Gifford, 3.481); "von Schnee und Regen wohl genährt" (Riessler, 733); "mit Regen- und Schnee(wasser) sich ergießend" (Walter, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 152); "die gevoed wordt door regen- en sneeuwwater" (van der Horst, *JHP*, 56). Perhaps "storms" happily combines both elements.

How the phrase is rendered bears on the question of whether this passage describes a water supply system in Jerusalem, or whether (at this point at least) it is simply a poetic description of the Jordan river (so Riessler, 1315, n. on line 20), whose sources are supplied by rains and the snow of Mt. Hermon.

A related question is the relative rarity of snow in Jerusalem, and thus whether this description is at all apt or historically accurate. It may be a false problem, if Attridge's translation "moist rains" is correct. In its favor is the LXX use of νιφετός in Deut 32:2 for MT רביבים, "copious showers" (*BDB*, 914); also Dan 3:68 (also Theod. Dan 3:68). The more common Hebrew word for snow שלג (*BDB*, 1017) is rendered by χιών, especially when referring to the "snow of Lebanon" (Jer 18:14); cf. also Isa 55:10 ὑετὸς ἢ χιὼν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. On snowfall in Jerusalem, cf. Smith, *Jerusalem*, 1.19-20; R. B. Y. Scott, "Snow," *IDB* (1962) 4.394; Baly, *Geography*, 50, 55.

However the phrase is understood, it appears to suggest an outside stream, or at least an outside pool of water supplied by rainfall, perhaps snowfall. As noted earlier (n. 51), the pool of Bethesda would fit this description since it was an open double pool supplied by external sources, including rainfall (cf. Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, n. 51 above). Alternatively, the phrase could

conceivably refer to sources that supply the aqueducts, or even that fill the open areas of the aqueducts themselves. Or, if the pool is an open-air pool, presumably it could be supplied by trenches that catch rain water. What appears not to be in view, however, is the Gihon Spring, unless it was imagined that somehow its water reserves were replenished by "rainy snows" or "moist rains." Possibly in view is the Lower Gihon or the Siloam pool, which might be supplied both by the Upper Gihon and rainfall.

64. Ἰέμενον, present middle/passive participle of ἵημι, which is often used of water, "let flow," "send forth" (cf. Homer *Il.* 12.25; 21.158; *Od.* 11.239; cf. 7.130; *LSJ*, 824); middle, "speed oneself," "hasten." Cf. Plato *Cra.* 420A ἰέμενος ῥεῖ. It is taken here with ῥεῦμα, thus "stream ... rushing or speeding along." Attridge, 784, "the stream ... fed by moist rains."

65. "Under neighboring towers" renders the text as read by Mras: ὑπαὶ πύργοις συνόροισιν. Early on, commentators recognized as corrupt the reading preserved in the MSS tradition (BION) ὑπὲρ πύργοισιν ὄροισι (read by Gutman, "Philo," 57). Apart from the fact that ὑπέρ ordinarily is used with the genitive and accusative and very rarely with the dative, the term ὄροισι is problematic (from ὄρος, "mountain" ?). Viger, *PG* (21) 756, first emends ὄροισι to ὀρεινοῖς, from ὀρεινός, "mountainous," "hilly," reverses the position, thus producing ὀρεινοῖς ὑπὲρ πύργοισιν, "over mountainous towers." Yet, in a note he conjectures ὑπαὶ (poetic form of ὑπό) πύργοισιν ὀρεινοῖς, which he actually follows in his Latin translation "sub turribus altis." This same reading is adopted by Seguier, *PG* (21) 1582; also Philippson, 64, rendered as "um berganseigende Burgen"; similarly,

Riessler, 733, "fließt fröhlich um die Burgen an den Bergehängen." Ludwich, 4, 7, n. 22, offers what he regards as a simpler solution: *ὑπερπύργοισιν ὀροῖσι*. He understands *ὑπέρπυργος* to be formed like *ὑπέρδικος*, *ὑπέρβιος*, *ὑπέρχρονος*, *ὑπερήμερος*, *ὑπέρλοφος*, *ὑπέρχειλος*. The accompanying term *ὀροῖσι* he sees deriving from *ὀρός*, "watery, serous part of milk," "whey," citing the definition in Hesychius and Eustathius 1625.65. Also cf. Homer *Od.* 9.222; 17.225; Hippocrates *Acut.* 2; Aristotle *HA* 3.20 ($521^{b}27$); Eustathius 1818.23; *LSJ*, 1255. Accordingly, Ludwich, 7, n. 21, translates the phrase "in überthurmhohen Gerinnseln" ("in tower-high rivulets").

Gifford, 1.564; 4.322, makes the next advance, adopting *ὑπαὶ*, as Viger suggests, but emending *πύργοισιν ὄροισι* to read *πύργοις συνόροισι*. He adduces uses of *σύνορος*, "marching with," "conterminous," "neighboring" (*LSJ*, 1723), from Aristotle *EN* 8.10.3 ($1160^{b}17$) *σύνοροι γάρ εἰσιν αὗται*; *EE* 7.9.1 ($1241^{b}17$) *καὶ πάντα ταῦτα σύνορα ἀλλήλοις*. Accordingly, he translates the expression "beneath the neighbouring towers" (3.481). This reading is adopted by Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, which he further identifies as the "towers of the city wall" ("die Türme der Stadtmauer"). He thus envisions the stream of water ("Quelle") as winding its way to the foot of the city wall into the plain. Following Mras, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, renders the expression "unterhalb der angrenzenden (Stadtmauer-) Türme," which he understands, n. o, to be the east wall of Jerusalem (against Atwell-Hanson, 38, who regard the "neighboring towers" as "impossible to designate"). Similarly, van der Horst, *JHP*, 56, "onder de aangrenzende torens"; also, Attridge, 784, "under the neighboring towers," noting the importance of Jerusalem's towers in glorified descriptions of the city, e.g., *Ep. Arist.* 100, 105.

Once again, Hezekiah's tunnel seems an appropriate referent, especially since it was subterranean, bringing water "under" an upper structure; and, since it passed under one section of the southeastern wall, it is conceivable to think of the "neighboring towers" as some structural aspect of the east wall. The more likely possibility, however, is that the phrase refers to the northern wall of Jerusalem which was "neighboring" the pool of Bethesda (cf. above n. 51).

66. Literally, *στρωφᾶται*, pres. mid./pass. of *στρωφάω*, the frequentative form of *στρέφω*, would be rendered "be turned constantly." In the passive, it has the sense "turn oneself about," "keep turning," "roam about," "wander" (*LSJ*, 1657). Hence it is translated here "winds." Similarly, Ludwich, 7, n. 21, "winden sich die Fluth..."; Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, "tritt ... in Windungen," followed by Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, "fließt er gewunden dahin." If this is the sense, the term would be an apt description of the 533-meter S-shaped Hezekiah's tunnel, or even certain sections of the Jordan River, or any of dozens of wadis. The (constant) "turning motion," however, might refer to the powerful flow of the water itself rather than suggesting a circuitous, winding path in which the stream of water flows. In this case, the word might be rendered "(the stream) ... rolls." So, Gifford, 3.481; Attridge, 784; earlier, Viger, *PG* (21) 755, "volvitur"; also Philippson, 64, "walzt sich."

67. It is difficult to know how best to render this problematic phrase. Both *ξηρὰ* and *κεκονιμένα* appear to be neut. plu. nom./acc. forms, unless *ξηρὰ*, rather than being the adjectival form of *ξηρός*, is the substantive form (*ἡ*) *ξηρά*, "dry land" (*LSJ*, 1190). (Ludwich, 4, emends *ξηρὰ* to *ξηρὶ*). On

the other hand, *κεκονιμένα* is less open to dispute, i.e., perf. pass. part. of *κονίω*, "make dusty," "cover with clouds of dust" (*LSJ*, 978). And how is *πέδῳ* related to both terms? If the dative is retained, it presumably is to be understood as "on the ground or earth," from *πέδον*. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330 conjecture *πέδου*, thus perhaps "the earth's dry dust." Or, might *πέδον* be understood in the sense of "bottom," i.e., the bottom of a pool or fountain, in which case the phrase might be describing how the stream of water (finally) reaches the dry bottom of a pool or fountain. Viger, *PG* (21) 755, envisions the water flowing "on the ground" or "onto the field": "et sicco languentia pulvere circum arva rigans." Philippson, 65, envisions the water "breaking through the thirsty dust" ("den dürstenden Sand durchbrechend"); how he understands *πέδῳ* is not altogether clear. Similarly, Riessler, 734, "Dann bricht er durch den Sand, den dürstenden..." Ludwich, 7, n. 21, envisions a stream of water pouring into (onto) dry, dusty ground ("auf dem Boden sanderfüllte Trockene [den trockenen Sandboden]...") in a manner that becomes a popular marvel. He apparently conceives of the receptacle as an empty, dry basin into which the water pours, creating jets of water: "Die Fluth nimmt dann die Form eines halb zu Eis geronnenen Springbrunnens in wasserleerem Sandbecken an." What he means by "halb zu Eis" is not clear. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330, conjecturing that *πέδῳ* might be read *πέδου*, suggest as a possible translation: "sicca ista et pulverulenta alvei fontani conspicua reddit," noting Polyhistor's description of the fountain in *P.E.* 9.37.1 (= Frg. 4, lines 3-4). Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, understands the phrase to refer to the dry, dusty places in the plain ("die trockenen, bestaubten Stellen in der Ebene") that were watered by the stream. These he understands to

be areas adjoining the city. As they were watered and flourished, they became evidence to the people of the spring's marvelous capacity, especially when these irrigated areas were contrasted with the unwatered areas. This interpretation he bases on the quotation from Timochares in *P.E.* 9.35.1, in which it is reported that the city of Jerusalem itself has internal sources of water so abundant that excess water flows away from the city and waters gardens nearby, presumably outside the city walls. It is further reported that for approximately 40 furlongs the area around the city is without water, but beyond that, it becomes well watered again. Following Mras, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, renders the phrase "und die (sonst) ausgedörrten, staubigen (Flächen) in der Ebene," observing (n. p) that the dative of *πέδον* is difficult to relate to the rest of the phrase. He too understands it in the sense of "plain," i.e., the region outside the city wall supplied with water. Van der Horst, *JHP*, 56, "en de droge en stoffige (grond) in de vlakte." Similarly, Attridge, 784, "and the dry and dusty soil on the plain..."

As noted above (n. 51), water flowing from the Bethesda pool through the upper canal of the drainage system into the Kidron Valley would pour on to "dry, dusty ground," and presumably passerbys or onlookers would be amazed. Or, the phrase could be an apt description of the Gihon Spring, since some of its water was used, at various periods of history, to provide irrigation for the Kidron Valley as well as other regions of the city. It does not appear, however, as an apt description of the Lower Gihon or the Siloam pool, unless it is describing how the water reaches these areas when they are "dry and dusty."

68. The genitive form of *κρήνη* is here taken with

the following word τηλεφαῆ. So, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, "erstaunliche Wirkung der Quelle." Similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152; van der Horst, *JHP*, 57, "de van verre zichtbare (effecten) van de bron"; Attridge, 784, "the fountain's far-seen, marvelous deeds." Alternatively, it can be taken with the previous phrase, thus perhaps "as it hits the dry, dusty ground (bottom?) of the pool." So, Ludwich, 7, n. 21, "auf dem Boden sanderfüllte Trockene (den trockenen Sandboden) der Quelle." In this case, the image seems to be one of water flowing from a higher source, an aqueduct perhaps, into a lower pool or fountain, creating a type of waterfall. Or, it might be understood as a genitive of place; hence, Atwell-Hanson, 44, "the dry and dusty ground by the fountain."

69. Following Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, and Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, "deeds" is supplied. Conceivably, τηλεφαῆ can be taken with *ὑπέρτατα θάμβεα*, "far-shining, most astonishing marvels." Or, it can be taken with the two earlier acc. plur. forms *ξηρὰ ... κεκονιμένα*; so, Atwell-Hanson, 44, "it renders (*δείκνυσιν*) the dry and dusty ground by the fountain far-shining."

70. Here the subject of *δείκνυσιν* is understood to be ῥεῦμα from Frg. 5, line 3. It is taken in its usual sense of "show," "demonstrate," or "display." So, Gifford, 3.481, "the joyous stream ...far-shining shows the blessings of that wonder-working fount." Similarly, Ludwich, 7, n. 21, "zeigt"; also, Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546; Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152. Rather than being understood as "show," "display," it can be taken in the sense of "elicit," or "create," i.e., among the people. So, Philippson, 65, "erkundet den Völkern..." Similarly, Riessler, 734, "erregt er bei den Völkern größtes Staunen."

71. One might have expected, "...displays utter amazement to the people." Accordingly, Lloyd-Jones and Parson, *Supp. Hell.*, 330 conjecture λαοῖς. (Ludwich, 7, n. 23, reports the Attic and Ionic form of λαός read by E: λεῶν.) Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, "für die Leute." Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 152, "für jedermann," observing (n. q) that λαός has no eschatological overtones as is the case in Isa 2:2-3; Zech 8:20-22. Attridge, 784, "the wonders of the nations."

72. Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546, notes that ὑπέρτατα is similar to the earlier use of ὑπερτέρῳ in Frg. 1, line 5. Attridge, 784, n. i, cites *Ep. Arist.* 107, 112-14, as a relevant description of Palestine's fertility. He also observes that "the old aqueducts from the spring of Gihon to the king's pool also served to irrigate the terraced cultivation on the east of the City of David."

73. On the literary context of this fragment, cf. above n. 50.

74. As noted earlier (cf. above n. 51), Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 546-47, believes that Frg. 4, lines 6-8 and Frg. 5, lines 3-6 provide a description of the "ruler's bath," while Frg. 6, lines 3-4 describe the "high priest's bath." But, as Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), n. s, rightly observes, during the Hasmonean period, the high priest was the ruler. Thus the distinction appears to be a false one. But as he further notes, the interpreter must decide whether and how the structure described here (a canal?) is connected with the double-basin structure described in Frg. 5, lines 3-6.

75. Most likely, αἰπύ, from αἰπύς, -εῖα, -ύ, "high," "steep," is to be understood in its

ordinary spatial sense, although adverbially. Cf. Viger, *PG* (21) 756, "sublime"; Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 547, "in steilem Gefälle"; van der Horst, *JHP*, 57, "en steil steken..." Gifford, 3.481, renders it "headlong," followed by Atwell-Hanson, 44, "falling headlong." Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 153, n. t, proposes that it might be understood metaphorically, hence "suddenly" ("jäh"), citing its frequent use in Homer in this non-literal sense; esp., *αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος*. Also, cf. *LSJ*, 41. Similarly, Ludwich, 7, n. 24, "jäh."

Precisely what the reader is to imagine "up high," or appearing "suddenly," is not clear, whether a flow of water, or some structure, such as a pipe or spout, which otherwise supplies water.

76. Doubtless, the subject of *ἐκπτύουσι*, from *ἐκπτύω*, "spit out," is *σωλῆνες*, "pipes." Thus it appears that the pipes, or conduits (possibly grooves along which, or within which, water flows, i.e., spouts, gutters, or the canals of the drainage system within the pool of Bethesda [cf. above n. 51]) pour out a stream of water. Cf. *AnthGr* 6.224.5 [Theodoridas; Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* 3528] *σκολιὸς δ' ἐξέπτυσε ποροθμός*; so Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* 330; also *LSJ*, 518. It remains unclear whether it is the pipes or conduits which themselves "pour out," i.e., jut forth, from the fountain, or whether it is the water from the fountain that "pours out," or "spits forth." As it stands, the text actually suggests that the pipes themselves "pour out."

77. The translation "through the earth" (*διὰ χθονός*) leaves open the question whether this line envisions a subterranean conduit, thus e.g., Hezekiah's tunnel, or whether it merely describes some form of water transfer along the earth's surface. Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 153, renders the

expression "über die Erde hin...," observing, n. u, that χθών refers especially to the earth's surface (so *LSJ*, 1991). He does, however, allow for the possibility that it refers to some form of subterranean water passage.

78. In what sense ὑδροχόοισι is to be understood is not certain. Ὑδροχόος, from ὕδωρ + χέω, "water-pourer," also the name of the constellation Aquarius, appears to be used here in the sense of "that through which water pours/is poured" rather than "that which/one who pours water" (cf. *LSJ*, 1845). Thus, it is here translated "channels," although conceivably it might be rendered "spouts," or even "gutters." Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 547, understands it as "Kanäle." Similarly, Walter, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 153, "in Wasserstößen," understood as "Wasserguß," "Wasserausstoß." Cf. the closely related terms ὑδροχοεῖον, "well," "cistern"; ὑδροχόα, -χόη, "conduit," "aqueduct." Standing alone, the dat. form appears to express the means through which the water pours. So, Ludwich, 7, n. 24, "... mittels der Wassergiesser"; Gifford, 3.481, "in channels"; Atwell-Hanson, 44, "in conduits"; Attridge, 784, "from channels." Philippson, 65, (who reads ὑδροχέοισι) on the other hand, renders the term "Wassergequelle"; similarly, Riessler, 734, "es speien tief die Röhren aus der Erde Wasserquellen." Scaliger's emendation, *PG* (21) 1582, ὑδροχόοιο, is also adopted by Seguier, who also emends σωλῆνες to σωλῆνης. Precisely how they understand the gen. to be preferable to the dat., and how it relates syntactically to the rest of the line, is not at all clear.

79. Gifford, 4.322, understands σωλῆνες to refer to the underground tunnel (Hezekiah's tunnel) that supplied water to the pool of Siloam. He also cites Archilochus *Fragmenta* 98 οἷον ὡς παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ,

διὲξ σωλῆνος (διεκσωλῆνος; cf. J. Tarditi [ed.], 181; *Etymolog.* 324.14); Cyril of Jerusalem *Cat.* 4.9 οὐδὲ ὥσπερ διὰ σωλῆνος διελθὼν τῆς παρθένου. Walter, by contrast, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 153, n. d, understands the phrase with reference to the drainage canals of the pool of Bethesda.

80. There follows immediately a quotation from *Ep. Arist.* 88-90, which also describes the water supply system in Jerusalem, after which Eusebius resumes quoting from Polyhistor, citing a passage concerning a prophecy from Jeremiah (= Eupolemus, Frg. 4; cf. *FHJA* 1.132-35).

EZEKIEL THE TRAGEDIAN

Of the known Hellenistic Jewish poets. the most extensive set of literary remains comes from Ezekiel the Tragedian, whose tragic drama *The Exodus* is preserved chiefly in seventeen separate excerpts in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Book IX, chs. 28-29. These seventeen fragments comprise 269 lines of iambic trimeter verse.[1] In this rather lengthy section, Eusebius quotes the excerpts (with some interruptions) directly from the pagan author Alexander Polyhistor, who flourished in Rome in the mid-first century B.C.E. (ca. 105-35 B.C.E.). A portion of these excerpts (vv 7-40a and 50b-54) is also preserved in Clement of Alexandria *Stromata*. Thus, like most of the other literary remains from the fragmentary Hellenistic Jewish authors of this period, Ezekiel's work was first preserved by a pagan author and subsequently transmitted by Christian authors.

Another fragment (= Frg. 18), comprising ten lines, preserved first in Methodius *de resurrectione*, but transmitted in Epiphanius *Panarion*, has also been attributed, though not as confidently, to Ezekiel, even to the same work.[2]

Author. A poet named Ezekiel is attested only by

Alexander Polyhistor (in Eusebius *P.E.* 9.28.1 Ἐξεκιῆλος ὁ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής; cf. Frg. 1B) and Clement (*Strom.* 1.23.155.1 ὁ Ἐζεκίηλος ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής; cf. Frg. 1A). He is not mentioned by name in Pseudo-Eustathius *Hexameron*, which duplicates a portion of Frg. 17 = vv 256-269. Neither he nor his work is mentioned by Philo of Alexandria and Josephus. The latter omission is especially striking since Josephus occasionally mentions some of the fragmentary Hellenistic Jewish authors.

Conceivably, the name Ezekiel was a pseudonym, but more likely it was the poet's actual name.[3]

Since he is nowhere else attested, what is known about Ezekiel the person can only be derived from the surviving fragments of his poetry. Although he has occasionally been identified as a pagan author, he was almost certainly Jewish.[4] While Clement does not identify him explicitly as Jewish, he does specify that he is the author of "Jewish tragedies." In addition to the name Ezekiel itself, the subject matter of *The Exodus* is the most certain indicator of his Jewishness. From the numerous exact correspondences between the poem and the Greek Scriptures, as well as even more numerous echoes, he is clearly quite familiar with the biblical story, as

well as with extra-canonical Jewish traditions.

His re-telling of the biblical story also has propagandistic elements. This is seen not only in his glorification of Moses, the central figure in the play, but by the overall contours of his reinterpretation of the biblical story. He both omits (or tones down) details that might prove embarrassing to a pagan audience (or even to Jewish readers) and includes non-biblical features that enhance the attractiveness of the story.

Ezekiel has also been identified as a Samaritan, primarily because of his apparent confusion of Libya and Midian, as well as possible dependence on the Samaritan Pentateuch.[5] Even so, his Samaritan identity is not a widely held view. At one time, it was even suggested that Ezekiel was Christian,[6] but his use by Alexander Polyhistor clearly makes this an impossibility.

As striking as his generally close adherence to the Greek Scriptures is his thorough familiarity with classical authors, most notably Euripides and Aeschylus, but others as well, including Homer, Sophocles, and Herodotus. His familiarity with Greek authors, as well as his appropriation of Greek tragic technique, suggests that he was well-schooled in the classical Greek tradition.

Depending on what we make of Alexander Polyhistor's and Clement's references to Ezekiel as a poet of "Jewish *tragedies*," he may have been a productive author.[7] At the very least, it appears that he wrote other tragic works besides *The Exodus*.

Title and Content. The title of the work mentioned by both Polyhistor[8] and Clement[9] is Ἐξαγώγη.[10] The genre of the work is further indicated by references to it as *δρᾶμα*[11] and *τραγῳδία*.[12]

As the title indicates, the major focus of the drama is the story of Moses and the exodus as narrated in Exod 1-15. Although the opening lines allude to Jacob's migration to Egypt as described in Gen 46-49 and the transition under the "new Pharaoh" (Exod 1), the birth and infancy of Moses (Exod 2:1-10) are prominently featured at the beginning (Frg. 1, lines 20-39 = vv 12-31). The final biblical episode mentioned in the undisputed fragments (Frgs. 16-17) is the arrival of Israel at Elim (Exod 15:27).

The contents of the fragments may be summarized as follows:

Frg. 1 (vv 1-31) - A speech by Moses summarizing Jacob's migration to Egypt, the rise of the "new Pharaoh," the circumstances of his birth.

Frg. 2 (vv 32-58) - A speech by Moses recounting his upbringing by Pharaoh's daughter, his slaying the

Egyptian and escape to Midian.

Frg. 3 (v 59) - Moses' remark on seeing the daughters of Raguel.

Frg. 4 (vv 60-65) - Zipporah's response to Moses describing the land of Libya (Midian ?) and her father's position in the land.

Frg. 5 (vv 66-67) - A dialogue between Chum and Zipporah (presumably after her marriage to Moses) in which she gives justification for marrying a stranger.

Frg. 6 (vv 68-82) - A speech by Moses recounting to Raguel a dream of the throne vision.

Frg. 7 (vv 83-89) - Raguel's response to Moses providing an interpretation of the dream.

Frg. 8 (vv 90-95) - A speech by Moses recounting the burning bush episode.

Frg. 9 (vv 96-112) - A speech by God to Moses at the burning bush commissioning him to rescue the Israelites.

Frg. 10 (vv 113-115) - A speech by Moses to God apologizing for his limited speaking ability.

Frg. 11 (vv 116-119) - God's response to Moses appointing Aaron.

Frg. 12 (vv 120-131) - A dialogue between God and Moses concerning the rod and its miraculous powers.

Frg. 13 (vv 132-174) - A speech by God to Moses forecasting the ten plagues and prescribing

regulations for the observance of Passover.

Frg. 14 (vv 175-192) - An unattributed speech, possibly by God, probably by Moses, concerning Passover preparation.

Frg. 15 (vv 193-242) - A speech by a messenger relating the Israelites' departure from Egypt, Pharaoh's pursuit, and the Egyptians' destruction in the Red Sea.

Frg. 16 (vv 243-253) - A speech by a scout to Moses describing Elim.

Frg. 17 (vv 254-269) - An unattributed speech, presumably by the scout, describing a spectacular bird.

Frg. 18 (vv 270-280 ?) - An unattributed speech, possibly by Methodius, addressed to a serpent and castigating the devil for his evil works.

Structure. Though it is impossible to know how much of the original play has been lost, it has been estimated that the extant fragments preserve 20-25% of the play.[13] Analysis of these fragments has led most scholars to conclude that the play originally consisted of five acts, in keeping with dramatic conventions of the period.[14] Accordingly, it has been common to arrange the fragments according to the following dramatic structure, or at least one closely resembling this:[15]

Act I

Moses' monologue recounting events in Exod 1-2 (vv 1-58)

Dialogue involving Moses (v 59) and Zipporah (vv 60-65)

Act II

Dialogue between Chum and Zipporah (vv 66-67)

Moses' dream of the throne vision (vv 68-82)

Raguel's interpretation of Moses' dream (vv 83-89)

Act III

Dialogue between God and Moses at the burning bush (vv 90-192)

Act IV

A messenger's monologue reporting the exodus and the Egyptians'destruction in the Red Sea (vv 193-242)

Act V

A scout's report describing the oasis at Elim and a spectacular bird (vv 243-269).

One of the chief questions involving the dramatic structure is the degree to which the play required scene changes and presupposed time lapses between the various acts and scenes.[16] How these questions are resolved is important for determining the extent to

which Ezekiel conformed to, or violated, the well-known Aristotelian prescription for unity of time and place in composing tragedies.[17]

Even if some of the acts can be envisioned theoretically as having been set in the same time and place, in all likelihood, the drama presupposes at least three different locations, and perhaps as many as five.[18] Moreover, it clearly extends over a lengthy time period. In both of these respects, Ezekiel is exceptional when compared with most Greek tragedians.

In addition to relating the extant fragments to a reconstructed five-act dramatic structure is the question of the omitted material. Accordingly, various proposals have been offered in an effort to determine the context of certain portions of the fragments, as well as relate the various parts to a larger whole.

Date. Since Ezekiel was first preserved in Alexander Polyhistor, at the latest he can be dated sometime prior to the mid-first century B.C.E.[19] His *terminus post quem* is determined, partially at least, by his use of the Greek Scriptures, particularly the book of Exodus.[20] Even though the precise date for the first appearance of a Greek translation of Exodus is not known, it can reasonably be assumed to have been in the mid-third century B.C.E. Thus the range of dates within which Ezekiel might have flourished

extends from the mid-third to the mid-first century B.C.E.[21]

A more precise date has been suggested based on the contents of Frg. 17, generally taken to be a description of the phoenix. Kuiper proposes the period during or immediately following the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes ([247] 245-221).[22] The basis for his proposal is the report in Tacitus *Ann.* 6.28 that the "phoenix visited Egypt" during the consulate of Paulus Fabius and Lucius Vitellius (ca. 34 C.E.). In the course of describing the length of time between its periodic appearances, Tacitus mentions reported previous appearances in Egypt during the reigns of "Sesosis, then of Amasis, and finally of "Ptolemy (third of the Macedonian dynasty)," i.e., Ptolemy III Euergetes.[23] According to Kuiper, the excitement created by the phoenix during the period of Ptolemy III would have been sufficient reason for Ezekiel to have included it in his drama, and the popular notion that it had appeared at points in the distant past, most notably during the reign of an earlier Egyptian king Sesostris, made it credible to link the phoenix with the Pharaoh of the Exodus story.

Additional support for a third century dating is offered by Fraser, who suggests that Ezekiel's familiarity with Euripides especially fits a middle or

late third century dating.[24]

Other considerations, however, point to a second-century dating. One piece of evidence used to establish the date is *Ep.Arist.* 312-16, which mentions "Theodectes, the tragic poet" who is said to have experienced cataracts because he included biblical material in one of his plays. Even though a Jewish poet by this name is elsewhere unattested, the passage clearly presupposes the activity of Jews writing tragedies, and it may even be a veiled reference, perhaps even a critique, of Ezekiel himself. If so, this would tend to place him in the early second century B.C.E., since *Ep.Arist.* can be dated in the early part of the second century B.C.E.[25]

Another possibility, strongly argued by Jacobson, is the latter part of the second century B.C.E.[26] Among the considerations he proposes for this later date are the following:

(1) Certain features of the play suggest a situation in which there was a strong, confident Jewish community (in Alexandria), in which relations between Jews and Egyptians were strained, even hostile, and in which relations between Jews and Greeks were cordial but beginning to deteriorate. This would exclude a mid- to late-third century dating when the Alexandrian Jewish community was still relatively

weak and undeveloped. Instead, it would point to a time, at least a century later, when the Jewish community is much stronger and the likelihood for effective promulgation of the Jewish faith would have been greater.

(2) Other considerations point to a time when Judaea was under Seleucid rather than Ptolemaic control, viz., after 200 B.C.E. These include the lack of any explicit mention of Judaea, the land of Israel, the lack of references to Jerusalem or the temple, and his consistent use of Ἑβραῖοι to designate the Jews.

(3) Even more specifically, certain features of the play may point to a time after the Maccabean wars. For example, Ezekiel's concern to commend the Jewish faith to a *Greek* audience may have been designed to respond to the anti-Jewish sentiment the Maccabean wars created among Greeks outside Palestine. Moreover, the apologetic features of the drama may point to a time when native Egyptians are seeking to develop more cordial relations with Greeks, and consequently are engaging in anti-Jewish polemic.

Of these three sets of considerations, the first seems the most compelling, but it is based on a particular way of reading Ezekiel and reconstructing his *Sitz im Leben*.[27] Consequently, the question of dating Ezekiel is perhaps best left open and general,

i.e., during the second century B.C.E.

Setting/Provenance. Most commonly, an Alexandrian provenance is suggested for Ezekiel.[28] This is primarily because of the widespread assumption that Alexandria is the most likely setting in which a Jewish poet, thoroughly familiar with Greek tragedians such as Euripides and Aeschylus, might have flourished. In one sense, the subject matter of the play, with its focus on Moses in Egypt, might also point to an Egyptian provenance, although it might be argued that the portrait of Pharaoh and the Egyptians' defeat presented in the play would point to a setting other than Egypt.

At least two sets of considerations have been offered against an Alexandrian setting. First, Zipporah's speech (Frg. 4 = vv 60-65) appears to identify the land of Midian as Libya, and further states that it was inhabited by Ethiopians. Those who see this as an instance of Ezekiel's ignorance of elementary geographical details, or as evidence that he had a confused understanding of Libya and Ethiopians, find it difficult to regard him as an Alexandrian.[29]

Second, the choice of topic itself, particularly Ezekiel's portrayal of Pharaoh and the Egyptians as anti-heroes, has been regarded as strong evidence that

the drama was not written in an Egyptian setting or addressed to an Egyptian audience.[30]

Alternative settings have been proposed, including Samaria,[31] Cyrenaica,[32] and simply Palestine itself.[33]

Even though an Alexandrian setting is still widely favored, it is no longer possible to exclude a Palestinian setting on the grounds that it is unimaginable for someone as thoroughly Hellenized as Ezekiel to have lived and flourished there.[34]

Sources and Literary Character. In contrast to Theodotus, for whom it is difficult to identify exact points of contact with the LXX,[35] Ezekiel closely adheres to the Exodus account both in following (generally)[36] its narrative sequence and recording individual details.[37] More specifically, he used a Greek translation of the Scriptures, and there is no compelling reason to think that he knew or used the Hebrew Scriptures.[38]

There is also ample evidence that Ezekiel draws on extra-canonical Jewish traditions, which represent a broad spectrum of viewpoints. Many of these exhibit features also found in later rabbinic traditions, as Jacobson's commentary clearly shows.[39] But similarities with Samaritan traditions as well as merkavah mystical traditions are also evident.[40]

It has long been recognized, however, that as formative as the biblical story was in providing the subject matter for Ezekiel, he was also heavily influenced by classical Greek authors. His indebtedness to Euripides was especially demonstrated by Wieneke, who made a systematic effort to adduce parallels from the Greek tragedians.[41] While Wieneke, and others, have recognized the influence of Sophocles and Aeschylus, Jacobson has further extended the case for Aeschylan influence, especially in his comparison of Ezekiel with the Danaid trilogy.[42] He has also gone further in seeking to demonstrate correlations between Ezekiel and Herodotus.[43]

Assessments of Ezekiel's literary achievement have varied widely. While earlier scholarship, on the whole, tended either to ignore Ezekiel altogether or view his work negatively, more recently his importance as the most extensively preserved Hellenistic tragedian has been increasingly recognized. Accordingly, both biblical scholars and classicists have examined his work more closely, and evaluations of his work have become proportionately more positive.[44] If the history of scholarship on Ezekiel has shown anything, it is that objective evaluation of his achievement is best left to those in a position to judge.

Whether the drama was written in order to be performed or simply to be read continues to be debated. On the one hand, the unusually large number of scene changes speaks against the likelihood of performance. The practice of writing plays for a reading audience appears to have been well established in Alexandria by Ezekiel's time.[45] On the other hand, there is some indication that Ezekiel has recast the biblical material with a view to the technical demands of production and performance. Rather than treating the plagues in a manner that would have been technically challenging, if not impossible, Ezekiel incorporates them into a monologue by God (Frg. 13, lines 6-24 = vv 132-150), so that an audience would hear them related but not see them performed. Similarly, although God is an actor in the play, Ezekiel makes sure that God's presence is not required; indeed, he specifies that God cannot be seen (Frg. 9, line 7 = v 101).[46]

Whether the drama included a chorus remains an open question.[47] None of the extant fragments preserve any choral verses, but choral occasions have been suggested for various parts of the play.

Significance. Increasingly, classicists have come to recognize Ezekiel as an important source for reconstructing the history of Hellenistic drama.[48]

His indisputable importance is assured by the fact that his is the most extensively preserved Hellenistic tragedy.

He also remains an important source for understanding Judaism during the Hellenistic period.

1) Testimony for LXX. Like Demetrius, who was perhaps his contemporary in Alexandria,[49] Ezekiel serves as valuable source for investigating the state of the LXX text at a very early stage. At the very least, his text is based on an early Greek recension of Exodus, and further investigation of the textual basis for the play as it relates to the MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and other Greek recensions would seem to be worthwhile.

2) Testimony for midrashic traditions. Ezekiel shares with other Hellenistic Jewish authors, such as Artapanus and Pseudo-Eupolemus, the tendency to incorporate various midrashic and haggadic traditions into the biblical story. Now that more of these traditions have been adduced and are beginning to be compared with Ezekiel, he may become an important source for determining both the antiquity and widespread use of certain of these traditions.

3) History of interpretation of Scripture. Since the extant fragments of Ezekiel represent a clearly defined hermeneutical appropriation of a defined block

of biblical text, notably Exod 1-15, it becomes possible to conduct a history-of-tradition investigation of this portion of Scripture over a relatively long period, at least as it is later mediated through such interpreters as Philo of Alexandria and Josephus. For such questions as how Scripture came to be reinterpreted for apologetic purposes, this becomes a valuable enterprise, seen, for example, in the way LXX Exod 12:36, which reports the Israelites' despoiling of the Egyptians, is interpreted respectively by Ezekiel, Artapanus, Philo, and Josephus (cf. Frg. 13, line 40 = v 166; discussion in annotations, n. 167).

4) Philo and Josephus. Even though Ezekiel is not mentioned by Philo and Josephus, there are enough similarities between certain features of his drama and their accounts of Exod 1-15 to suggest that he may have served as a source for them.

5) Samaritan origins. As is the case with Theodotus, Ezekiel remains an intriguing figure for investigating Samaritan history during the Hellenistic period. Even though his Samaritan identity and a Samaritan origin for his work has been a minority position in the history of scholarship on Ezekiel, similarities between his portrait of Moses and that found in later Samaritan writings have long been

noted, and further investigation, especially as our understanding of Samaritanism increases, may alter our scholarly views of both Ezekiel and Samaritans during the Hellenistic period.

6) Merkavah mysticism. Enough similarity has been noted between Ezekiel's throne vision and texts from Jewish mysticism to warrant closer inspection of the relationship between the two. Indeed, with the considerable advances in scholarship on the Jewish pseudepigraphical writings and the much readier availability of translations and critical editions, the possible connections between Ezekiel and Jewish apocalyptic and mystical traditions can be explored much more fruitfully.

7) Christian origins. For such questions as the "divine man" debate, Ezekiel continues to remain an important source, as Goodenough and Meeks saw early on. The degree to which his portrait of Moses fits into a wider pattern of Jewish heroization still needs to be assessed.

NOTES

1. Snell's emendation of Frg. 13, line 9 (v 135) would yield a total of 270. Cf. Snell, *TrGF* 1.295 and annotations, n. 143.

2. Cf. discussion in annotations, n. 253.

3. The possibility of pseudonymity is raised by van der Horst, "Notes," 355, noting especially the attribution of certain pseudepigraphic writings to Ezekiel, most notably the Apocryphon of Ezekiel (cf. Denis, *Introduction*, 187-91; Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, 109-10; J. R. Mueller and S. E. Robinson, *OTP*, 1.487-95), as well as the possible connections between the poem and the biblical book of Ezekiel (cf. Frgs. 6-7, and annotations, nn. 70, 72, & 73).

Other references to persons named Ezekiel, noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 176, n. 4, and van der Horst, "Notes," 356, include the following: *Ep.Arist.* 50 Ἐζεκῆλος; *CPJ* 3.464.24 Ἀζακιέλ (2nd cent. C.E.); *CIJ* 1.630; Medinet-Habu ostracon inscription in F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* (Straßburg: K. J. Trübner, 1915) 1.56, No. 643.6 Ἐ]ζεκιὴλ (possibly Christian); *b. Ber.* 11a (3rd cent. C.E. Babylonian rabbi); early Byzantine uses in F. Preisigke *Namenbuch* (Heidelberg, 1922) 146, and D. Foraboschi *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum* (Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1967) 143 (Ἰεζηκιήλιος).

The name Ezekiel appears not to have been used commonly among Jews in the Hellenistic period, at least as compared with other Hebrew names, e.g., Sabbathai, Simon, and Joseph. As van der Horst, "Notes," 356, n. 8, observes, the name does not appear in Josephus. Apart from the one instance noted above,

it does not appear in the index of personal names in *CPJ*, 3.123-28. Cf. Tcherikover, *CPJ* 1.29-30; generally, Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 346, 522, n. 4; *CPJ* 1.29-30; also discussion in Theodotus introduction, n. 1.

On the orthography of the name, cf. annotations, n. 4.

4. Eusebius appears to have regarded him as non-Jewish (cf. *P.E. 9.1.1-4*). Delitzsch, *Geschichte*, 209, n. 1, raises the possibility that he may have been a proselyte. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 5; also further discussion in the introduction to Theodotus, nn. 1 and 12.

5. On his Samaritan identity, cf. further discussion below under *Setting/Provenance*, esp. n. 31; also annotations, nn. 90, 108. For a brief review of the history of scholarship on this question, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 14-15.

6. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 5.

7. Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, 100, noting the references in Eusebius and Clement to tragedies in the plural, concedes, "Apparently Ezekielos composed a number of such dramatizations." Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 2.987, n. 203, also notes these references in the plural but doubts that either Polyhistor or Clement knew any other work besides Ezekiel's *Exagoge*.

8. *P.E.* 9.28.12 = Frg. 13, line 4; *P.E.* 9.29.14 = Frg. 15, line 3; *P.E.* 9.29.15 = Frg. 16, line 10.

9. *Strom.* 1.23.55.1 = Frg. 1A, line 4.

10. This is the title Philo occasionally used by Philo for Exodus, e.g., *Migr. Abr.* 14; *Quis reres* 251; as noted by van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision," 21, n. 4.

11. Polyhistor in *P.E.* 9.29.14 = Frg. 15, line 2; Clement *Strom.* 1.23.155.1 = Frg. 1, line 4.

12. Polyhistor in *P.E.* 9.28.3 = Frg. 2B, line 2; also cf. τραγῳδιῶν in Polyhistor apud *P.E.* 9.28.1 = Frg. 1B, line 5; Clement *Strom.* 1.23.155.1 = Frg. 1A, line 3.

13. So, van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision," 21.

14. A five-act structure is proposed by Kappelmacher, 76-82; Wieneke, 30, 61, 71, 93, 108, 117; Zwierlin, 140; Snell, "Szenen," 172-75; Robertson, 805; and van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision," 22-23. Dieterich, 1701, proposes "six scenes."

On the convention of five-act plays, cf. Horace *A.P.* 189-190; also Ziegler, 1973; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 33-34.

15. Basic questions that have been raised concerning the dramatic structure include the following:

1) whether Acts I and II are continuous both temporally and spatially (Kappelmacher) or whether there is a scene change and a time lapse between them (Wieneke);

2) whether Act III is set at the same scene as Acts I and II (so Kappelmacher) or whether it involves a scene change (Wieneke);

3) whether Act IV can have occurred in the same scene as the previous acts (Kuiper), or whether it required a differing setting (Jacobson).

Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 28-29.

16. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 34-36, for example, proposes the following changes:

1) Another scene occurred immediately following the dialogue between Chum and Zipporah, in which Moses

defended his marriage to a foreign wife. After this occurred Moses' dream and its interpretation by Raguel.

2) The dialogue between Moses and God at the burning bush occurs at a location different from the one in Act II, and God's address to Moses, in which he previews the plagues that will occur and gives instructions for Passover, concludes with v 174. As part of the same scene, Aaron enters and is informed by Moses of his mission.

3) Between the burning bush episode and the messenger's report occurred a shift in location to Egypt and a scene in which Moses speaks to the elders of Israel; the unattributed monologue in vv 175-192 comprises part of this speech. Attributing this monologue to Moses, rather than seeing it as a continuation of God's speech in vv 132-174, helps account for the otherwise inexplicable repetition of material in vv 132-174 and vv 175-192 (cf. annotations, n. 171).

4) The setting in Egypt also included a scene describing the confrontation between Moses and Pharaoh. Through some feasible dramatic device Ezekiel presents the wrangling between Pharaoh and Moses and a rehearsal of the plagues, culminating in the death of the firstborn. After the exit of Moses and Aaron, and some dialogue between Pharaoh and his court, Pharaoh exits. Shortly thereafter, the messenger returns and delivers his monologue describing the fate of Pharaoh's army (vv 193-242).

5) The scene at Elim possibly included a celebratory performance fashioned after the Songs of Moses and Miriam.

In addition to these proposals, it has also been suggested that after the Elim episode occurred a final scene in which Raguel and Zipporah reunite with Moses to offer congratulations for his victory (Kuiper, Kappelmacher, Wieneke - cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 221, n. 58).

17. *Po.* 5.7-9 (1449^{b}).

18. As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 30, observes, the play quite clearly envisions three separate locations, at the very least: near Midian (vv 1-89), Egypt (vv 193-242), and Elim (vv 243-269). If the dialogue between Moses and God at the burning bush (vv 90-192) was set in its biblical site, Mount Horeb, a fourth scene is required. Possibly, a fifth site at Raguel's home is envisioned in the scene depicting Moses's dream and its interpretation (vv 68-89).

The positions held by various scholars on the number of scenes presupposed by the drama are summarized in Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 187, n. 7. Also, cf. his discussion (p. 30) comparing the time period and number of locations presupposed in Ezekiel's drama with those of other Greek tragedians.

19. For those who dated Ezekiel in 1st cent C.E. or later, cf. Philippson, 12; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 5.

20. It has even been suggested that Ezekiel was one of the translators of LXX; cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 6-7, 177, n. 14.

21. For an extensive list of the various proposed dates and their proponents, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 6, 177-78, nn. 14-32.

22. Kuiper, *Mnemosyne*, 274-75.

23. Possibly the phrase in Tacitus is to be construed as referring to Ptolemy II Euergetes; so, Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 2.989, n. 213.

24. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1.707-708. Robertson, 804, also mentions Ptolemy III Euergetes' acquisition of texts by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and

Euripides for the library in Alexandria and the writing and circulation of Satyrus' *Life of Euripides* in Egypt at this time (*P.Oxy.* 9.1176).

25. Cf. Robertson, 804; Trencsényi-Waldapfel, 161-62, identifies Theodectes with Ezekiel, but dates Ezekiel ca. 90 B.C.E. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 7.

26. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 8-13.

27. Cf. especially the remarks by van der Horst, "Notes," 356-57, who mentions the "many affinities" between Ezekiel's Ἐξαγώγη and Dan 7 (ca. 165 B.C.E.) and *Jub.* 47-49 (mid-second century B.C.E.), which, if anything, point to the second quarter of the second century. Yet he too recognizes the tenuousness of this proposal and urges that the question of dating remain open.

28. E.g., Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.707, thinks that a "purely dramatic work (even if perhaps not primarily destined for the stage) is most likely to have seen the light of day in a major literary centre, and in any case not in Palestine," the most likely site being Alexandria. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 13-17, esp., 17, "It would be surprising if Ezekiel wrote anywhere else but in Alexandria."

For an extensive list of those favoring an Alexandrian provenance, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge* 180, n. 1.

29. The case has been argued most notably by Kuiper, *Mnemosyne*, 277-78. For further discussion, cf. annotations, nn. 55-57.

30. Cf., e.g., Magnin, 200; Gutman, *Beginnings*, 2.66; also cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 13-14, for responses to both objections. He rightly distinguishes, for example, between Greeks and native Egyptians living in

Egypt, and observes that the play might well have been addressed to a Greek audience for whom the portrait of the Egyptians in the play would have been quite inoffensive.

31. Kuiper, *Mnemosyne*, 278-80, proposes a Samaritan provenance as a serious possibility, which Gaster, *Samaritans*, 143, finds convincing; similarly, Segal, *Hebrew Passover*, 25. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 14-15, summarizes (and responds to) Kuiper's arguments; he also notes more recent scholars who leave open the possibility of his Samaritan identity, e.g., Denis (p. 181, n. 17). While acknowledging the weakness of Kuiper's arguments, van der Horst, "Notes," 357, is not prepared to dismiss the proposal easily, noting especially similarities between Ezekiel's portrait of Moses and that found in Samaritan sources, most notably the fourth century Samaritan writing *Memar Marqah* (These connections are also noted by Gaster, *Samaritans* 143). As van der Horst notes, identifying Ezekiel as a Samaritan does not exclude an Alexandrian provenance, since Samaritan communites are known to have existed in Alexandria. Cf. annotations on Theodotus, n. 51.

On Ezekiel's possible affinities with Samaritan traditions and exegesis, cf. annotations, nn. 90, 108; also the list of affinities between Ezekiel and *Memar Marqah* in van der Horst, "Notes," 357, n. 13; also his "Moses' Throne Vision," 28, n. 47.

32. Gutman, *Beginnings*, 2.67-69, apud Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 15, on the basis of Ezekiel's mention of Libya (Frg. 4 = vv 60-65) and the likelihood that a Jewish amphitheatre existed in Cyrene.

33. Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, 101.

34. As for example, Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, has made amply clear. Also, cf. discussion in the

introduction to Theodotus. As noted in Schürer, *History*, 3(1). 565, the Alexandrian option is "based on nothing stronger than the suitability of the Alexandrian Jewish community for such writings. The Exodus theme was important enough for all Jews for its use to indicate no special relation to Egypt in the author."

35. Cf. introduction to Theodotus, esp. nn. 58-60.

36. He appears to reverse the order of certain episodes in the biblical text (cf. annotations, n. 125), and he rearranges slightly the order of the plagues (cf. annotations, nn. 139, 144, 145, 149, 150).

37. Philippson, 49-52, provides an appendix, "Vergleichung des Textes mit der Septuginta," in which he collects many of LXX passages that are either directly reflected or echoed in Ezekiel's text. Comparisons with the LXX are extended by Wieneke, 2-26, who prints the relevant LXX passages opposite his Greek text. These are noted, and sometimes supplemented, in his commentary on the text, although he gives much greater space to citing parallels from classical sources. For the most part, Snell, *TrGF* 1.288-301, draws on Wieneke in supplying in a middle register LXX parallels to Ezekiel's text, although there are occasional omissions. These biblical references are also cited, and in some instances expanded, in the translations by Vogt (in footnotes) and Robertson (in margins).

In this edition, I have also recognized Ezekiel's close dependence on the LXX and consequently have sought to improve on the previous editions in the following ways.

First, in the annotations, I have repeated the line of text from Ezekiel that is being commented on and followed that (usually) with either biblical

references that seem pertinent or LXX quotations, many of them noticed previously by Philippson, Wieneke, and Snell. In addition, however, I have sought to indicate with bold type instances of exact correspondence and with underlining, echoes, ranging from nearly exact correspondence to more remote reminiscences. This arrangement is intended to expedite close comparative work between Ezekiel and the LXX, and perhaps assist in further investigations of the text underlying his drama, a task recognized and encouraged by Robertson, 805.

Second, in commenting on particular words or phrases, in addition to selecting what seemed the most pertinent parallels from classical authors, and collecting other references from extra-canonical sources, mostly Jewish writings, I have tried to note LXX passages that might have contributed to Ezekiel's understanding or terminology, especially when previous editors have tended to see only influence from classical authors. For example, with reference to *ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς*, Frg. 2, line 14 = v 42, I have proposed in n. 41 2 Macc 5:14 as a relevant parallel; or, in n. 174, with reference to *μόσχους βοῶν ἄμωμα*, Frg. 14, lines 5-6 = vv 176-177, I have proposed LXX references to Exod 4:14; Num 5:24; Ezek 45:18 to be considered alongside Wieneke's references to Aeschylus and Hesiod.

38. This question is discussed extensively in Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 40-47, who summarizes the discussion beginning with Philippson and cites numerous specific instances of LXX dependence. Moreover, he mentions several cases where LXX and MT diverge and in which Ezekiel consistently follows LXX, e.g., Frg. 12, line 14 = v 130, Moses' hand becoming "like snow" (LXX) instead of "leprous" (MT); cf. annotations, n. 134. Other instances are discussed in the annotations as they occur.

39. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 3, acknowledges that Gutman had already sought to give balanced treatment to both Jewish and Greek sources in his analysis of Ezekiel, but further insists that due attention must be given "to those Jewish and Greek elements that were intrinsically a part of his culture, a culture infused with the sense of Jewish-Biblical history and law and their elaborations, both legal and exegetical" (p. 3). On the methodological question of how to assess Ezekiel's work in light of Jewish midrashic sources, cf. his discussion on pp. 20-23.

40. These have been especially noted more recently by van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision," 23-29; "Notes," 357.

41. Cf. Wieneke, 126, and passim.

42. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 24-25. Comparisons with Aeschylus are noted throughout the work, with an attempt to document further the degree of dependence, as e.g., the list of correspondences on p. 137 in his analysis of the messenger's speech depicting the crossing of the Red Sea in Frg. 15 (vv 193-242).

43. *Exagoge*, 138-140.

44. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 1-3, surveys the history of scholarship on Ezekiel, noting its general neglect by classical scholarship and citing various instances to illustrate the wide range of evaluations. Both Snell, "Jamben," and Strugnell, "Notes," have examined the metrical structure of the play, reaching much more positive conclusions about his compositional abilities than was previously the case. As Strugnell writes, "Notes," 453, "That Ezekiel's metrics are competent, and closest to those of the late Euripides and his immediate successors, needs to be stressed a) against the natural assumption that his practice would be

closer to that of contemporary tragedians and b) against Mras's astounding statement "dass der Versbau sich nach den freieren Regeln der attischen Komödie richtet." This slander on our Author can only be refuted by the monotonous exposition of the facts; let us hope they never need spelling out in detail again."

Also, cf. the appendix "The metre and prosody of the *Exagoge*," in Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 167-73.

45. So, Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, 100.

46. These examples are noted by Robertson, 806; also cf. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1.707. On the technical difficulties involved in Hellenistic drama generally, and in the possible staging of Ezekiel, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 28-36.

47. For a summary of views on whether the drama had a chorus, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 31-33, who concludes that there is no compelling evidence for the existence of a chorus. Also, Robertson, 805-806. Hadas, *Hellenistic Cultures*, 100, "The action was apparently divided into five episdoes by regular choral interludes."

48. As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 1-2, observes, perhaps the clearest indication of the change is the inclusion of Ezekiel in Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (1971^1; 1986^2), in contrast to his omission in A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (1889^2).

49. So, Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.708.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, R. "Ezechiele, *Exagoghê*" (in "Note di filologia greca" [2]), *Siculorum Gymnasium* (Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell' Università di Catania) 26 (1973) 102-109.

Bernhardy, G. *Grundriss*, 1.532; 2 (2).70, 76.

Bousset-Gressmann, *RJ*, 20-21, 25-26, n. 4.

Broek, R. van den. *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions.* Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain, 24. Ed. M. J. Vermaseren. Trans. I. Seeger. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Broyde, I. "Ezekielus," *JE* 5 (1903) 320.

Cancik, H. "Ezechiel," *LAW* (1965) 936.

Cerfaux, L. "Influence des Mystères sur le Judaïsme Alexandrin avant Philon," *Le Muséon* 37 (1924) 29--88, esp. 54-58; reprinted in *Recueil L. Cerfaux* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 6-7; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1954) 1.65-112 (= 29-88), esp. 110-12 (= 85-88).

Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, 110-11.

Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 53 (n. 29), 142, 177, 179, 207-11, 238-39 (nn. 45-66).

Conzelmann, *HJC*, 152-53.

Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.199-200.

Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 52-65.

Delitzsch, *Geschichte*, 28, 209, 211-19.

Delling, *Bibliographie*, 55.

_____, "Perspektiven," 159-60.

Denis, *Introduction*, 273-77.

Dieterich, A. "Ezechiel," *PW* 6 (1909) 1701-1702.

Dübner, F. *Christus Patiens, Ezechieli et christianorum poetarum reliquiae dramaticae. Ex codicibus emendavit et annotatione critica instruxit Fr. Dübner.* Pp. i-xvi, 1-8 as appendix in *Fragmenta Euripidis iterum edidit,*

perditorum tragicorum omnium nunc primum collegit Fr. G. Wagner. Paris: Editore Ambrosio Firmin Didot, 1846. See review by Magnin, *Journal des Savants* (1848) 193-208.

Eichhorn, I. G. "De Judaeorum Re Scenica Commentatio," *Commentationes Societatis Regiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Recentiores*, Bd. 2, 1811-1813; Classis Historicae, Teil 2 (Göttingen: H. Dieterich, 1813) 22 pp.

Ewald, *Geschichte* 4.338; *History* 2.88; 5.260-61.

Fiebig, P. "Ezechiel," *RGG*^{2} 2 (1928) 484.

Fornaro, P. *La voce fuori scena: saggio sull' Exagoge di Ezechiele con testo greco, note e traduzione.* Turin: Giappichelli, 1982. See review by P. W. van der Horst in *Mnemosyne* 39 (1986) 482-83.

Frankel, Z. *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1851) 113-22.

Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.707-708; 2.987, n. 203; 989, n. 216.

Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, 172.

Freyhan, M. "Ezechiel der Tragiker," *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* 31 (1938) 46-83.

Funke, H. "Euripides," *JAC* 8/9 (1965-1966) 233-79, esp. 252-53.

Gaster, *The Samaritans* (London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1925) 143.

Geffcken, J. "Antike Kulturkämpfe," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 15 [29] (1912) 593-611, esp. 601-602.

Georgi, *Gegner*, 133-34.

Girardi, G. B. *Di un dramma greco-giudaico nell'età Alessandrina.* Venice: C. Ferrari, 1902. See review by A. Ludwich, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 23 (1903) 933-35.

Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3.625.

Gutmann, J. "Ezekielus," *EncJud* 6 (1930) 885-87.

_____ (= Gutman, Y). *Beginnings*, 2.9-69.
Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*, 99-101, 131.
Halévy, M. A. "Moïse dans l'histoire et dans la légende," (Judaïsme, 6; Paris, 1927) 62-69.
Heinemann, I. "Moses," *PW* 16.1 (1933) 365.
Hengel, "Anonymität," 243-44.
_____, *Aspects*, 98, 165, n. 36.
_____, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1. 19, 109; 2.52, n. 139; 71, n. 352; 73, n. 10; 109, n. 396.
Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 2.517-20, 579.
Holladay, C. R. "The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian," *SBL 1976 Seminar Papers* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976) 447-52.
Horbury, W. "Ezekiel Tragicus 106: *δωρήματα*," *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986) 37-51.
Horst, P. W. van der. "De joodse toneelschrijver Ezechiël," *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 36 (1982) 97-112.
_____. "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34 (1983) 21-29.
_____. "Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel," *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 354-75.
_____, *Joods-hellenistische poëzie*, 11-50.
_____. Review of Fornaro (see above under Fornaro).
Hubaux, J. and M. Leroy. *Le mythe du phénix dans les littératures grecque et latine*. Bibliotheque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fascicule 82. Liege: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres/Paris: Libraire E. Droz, 1939.
Hurwitz, M. S. "Ezekiel the Poet," *EncJud* 6 (1971) 1102-1103.
Jacobson, H. "Ezekielos 12-13 (TrGF 128)," *American Journal of Philology* 98 (1977) 415-16.
_____. "Ezekiel the Tragedian and the Primeval Serpent," *American Journal of Philology* 102 (1981) 316-20.
_____. "The Identity and Role of Chum in Ezekiel's

Exagoge," *Hebrew University Studies in Literature* 9 (1981) 139-46.

_____. "Mysticism and Apocalyptic in Ezekiel's *Exagoge*," *Illinois Classical Studies* 6 (1981) 272-93.

_____. Two Studies on Ezekiel the Tragedian," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 22 (1981) 167-78.

_____. *The* Exagoge *of Ezekiel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. See review by A. Hilhorst, *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 14 (1983) 202-204.

_____. "Phoenix Resurrected," *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987) 229-33.

Jellinek, A. *Bet ha-Midrasch. Sammlung.* 3. Aufl. 6 vols. in 2. Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1967.

Kappelmacher, A. "Zur Tragödie der hellenistischen Zeit," *Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie* 44 (1924-25) 69-86.

Karpeles, *Geschichte*, 1.181-83.

Kraus, C. "Ezechiele Poeta Tragico," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 96 (1968) 164-75.

Kraus Reggiani, C. "Per una revisione di Ezechiele tragico in chiave aristotelica," *Vichiana* 4 (1975) 3-21.

Kuiper, K. "Ad Ezechielem poetam judaeum curae secundae," *Rivista di storia antica* 8 (1904) 62-94.

_____. "De Ezechiele Poeta Iudaeo," *Mnemosyne* N.S. 28 (1900) 237-80.

_____. "Le poète juif Ezéchiel," *REJ* 46 (1903) 48-73, 161-77.

Lesky, A. *Greek Tragic Poetry* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1972) 403-404.

_____. "Das hellenistische Gyges-Drama," *Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie* 81 (1953) 1-10.

_____, *History*, 745, 802.
_____. Review of Wieneke (see below under Wieneke).
Levy, I. "Moïse en Ethiopie," *REJ* 53 (1907) 210-11.
Loewenstamm, S. E. *The Tradition of the Exodus in Its Development* (in Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1972[2]).
Lohse, E. "Ezechiel, Tragiker" *RGG*[3] 2 (1958) 847.
Ludwich, A. Review of Girardi (see above under Girardi).
Magnin. Review of Dübner (see above under Dübner).
Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature" (1952) 48; "Hellenistic Jewish Literature" (1960) 767-68.
McKay, J. W. "The Date of Passover and its Significance," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 435-47.
Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 147-49, 153, 156-57.
Momigliano, F. "Il primo dramma d'argomento sacro," *La Nuova Rassegna* 1 (1893) 309-15.
Morel, W. "Das älteste biblische Drama," *Frankfurter Israelitisches Gemeindeblatt* 10 (1932) 165.
Müller, B. A. "Zu Ezechiels 'Εξαγωγή," *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 54 (1934) 701-704.
Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "Ezekiel the Tragedian," in Stone, *Jewish Writings*, 125-30, 154-55.
Page, D. L. *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy*. (Inaugural lecture delivered in Cambridge, 18 January 1951; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), esp. 35-38.
Petsch, R. "Ein Mosedrama aus hellenistischer Zeit," *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung* 1 (1925) 803-807.
Pfeiffer, *History*, 211-12.
Philippson, L. M. *Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Älteren Jerusalem*. Berlin: J. A. List, 1830.
Reggiani, C. Kraus (see above under Kraus).
Reicke, B. "Hesekiel (3)," *BHH* 2 (1964) 710.
Renehan, R. *Studies in Greek Texts*. (Hypomnemata, 43; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976) 68-69.
Robertson, J. "Ezekiel the Tragedian." Unpublished seminar paper. Harvard New Testament Seminar.

May 1, 1980. 64 pp.
_____ (Robertson, R. G.). "Ezekiel the Tragedian," *OTP* 2.803-19.
Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2.1, 607-608.
Schlatter, *Geschichte*, 199, 215.
Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.500-503; *History*, 3(1).563-66.
Segal, J. B. *The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times* (London Oriental Series, 12; London: Oxford University Press, 1963) 1, 23-25, 233 n. 4.
Sifakis, G. M. *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama* (University of London Classical Studies, 4; London: Athlone Press, 1967) 113-35, esp. 122-24, 135.
Snell, B. "Die Jamben in Ezechiels Moses-Drama," *Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache* 44 (1966) 25-32.
_____. "Ezechiels Moses-Drama," *Antike und Abendland. Beiträge zum Verständnis der Griechen und Römer und ihres Nachlebens* 13 (1967) 150-64 (included in the following work, 170-93, though not in the English edition).
_____. *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971 = *Scenes from Greek Drama* (Sather Classical Lectures, 34) Berkeley, 1964.
_____. *TrGF* 1.288-301 (= No. 128), 357.
Stählin, O. Review of Wieneke (see below under Wieneke).
Starobinski-Safran, E. "Un poète judéo-hellénistique: Ezéchiel le tragique," *Museum Helveticum* 31 (1974) 216-24.
Stearns, *Fragments*, 106-26.
Stein, Edmund (Menahem). "Ein jüdisch-hellenistischer Midrasch über den Auszug aus Ägypten," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 78 (1934) 558-75.
Stein, Elchanan. "Een merkwaardige griekse tragedie," *Hermeneus* 9 (1936-1937) 17-23.
Strugnell, J. "Notes on the Text and Metre of Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge*," *HTR* 60 (1967) 449-57.

Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.653-54.
Sutton, D. F. "Notes on the Vocabulary of Minor Tragic Poets," *Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache* 55 (1977) 208-12.
Swete, *Introduction*, 369-71.
Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. "Une tragédie grecque à sujet biblique," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 2 (1952) 143-63.
Venini, P. "Note sulla tragedia ellenistica," *Dioniso. Bollettino dell' instituto nazionale del dramma antico* N.S. 16 (1953) 3-26.
Vogt, E. "Tragiker Ezechiel," in *JSHRZ* (4.3), 115-33.
Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 65, 73, 262, 295-87.
_____ and S. Bowman. "Ezechielus the Dramatist and Ezekiel the Prophet: Is the Mysterious ζῷον in the Ἐξαγωγή a Phoenix?" *HTR* 78 (1986) 253-77.
Wagner, F. G. (= F. W.). *Fragmenta Euripidis* ... (see above under Dübner).
Walla, M. *Der Vogel Phoenix in der antiken Literatur und der Dichtung des Laktanz*. Dissertation, Universität Wien, 29. Wien: Notring, 1969.
Walter, *Aristobulos*, 42, 53. 255.
_____, "Ezekielos," in *ANRW*, Part II, Principate (20.1), 107-108.
Weinreich, O. "Gebet und Wunder. Zwei Abhandlungen zur Religions- und Literaturgeschichte," in *Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmid* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 5; Stuttgart, 1929) 169-452, esp. 337-38, 340.
West, M. L. *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).
Wieneke, J. *Ezechielis Iudaei poetae Alexandrini fabulae quae inscribitur* Ἐξαγωγή *fragmenta*. Münster: Monasterii Westfalorum, 1931. See reviews by A. Lesky, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 53 (1932) 2217-21; W. Windfuhr, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 52 (1932) 1279-80;

O. Stählin, *Gnomon. Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft* 9 (1933) 56-58.

Ziegler, J. "Ezechiel der Tragiker," *LTK*^{2} 3 (1959) 1328.

Ziegler, K. "Ezechiel," *KP* 2 (1967) 486.

_____. "Tragoedia," *PW* 6, 2nd series (1937) 1899-2075; "Die hellenistische Tragödie," 1967-77; "Ezechiel," 1979-81.

Zwierlein, O. "Ezechiels Exagoge," in *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas mit einem kritisch-exegetischen Anhang* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 20; Meisenheim am Glan: A. Hain, 1966), 138-46.

INDEX TO EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

Fragments One Through Five (vv 1-67)

Frg. 1
a - Clement, *Strom.* 1.23.155.1-5 (vv 7-31)
b - Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.1-2 (vv 1-31)
Frg. 2
a - Clement, *Strom.* 1.23.155.6-7 (vv 32-40a); 156.1-2 (vv 50b-54)
b - Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.3 (vv 32-58)
Frg. 3 - *P.E.* 9.28.4a (v 59)
Frg. 4 - *P.E.* 9.28.4b (vv 60-65)
Frg. 5 - *P.E.* 9.28.4c (vv 66-67)

Frgs. 1a & 2a

Source: Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.23.155.1-7; 156.1-2.
Greek Text Used: Stählin-Früchtel, *GCS* (52 [15]) p. 96, line 19 - p. 98, line 15.
Editions: Sylburg, F. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera Quae Exstant.* (Hieronymus Commelinus, 1592) p. 149, lines 7-30; Dindorf, G. (W.) *Clementis Alexandrini Opera.* (4 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1869), 2.124-26; Freu. (om.); Migne, *PG* (8) cols. 901 A - 904 A; Jac., *FGrH* 3. (om.); Denis, 207-208 (om. Clement; cites only Eusebius).
Translations:
English: Wilson (*ANF*), 2.335-36.
French: Caster (*SC*, 30), 1.156-57.
German: Stählin (*BK*, 17), 3.129-30.

Fragments 1b, 2b, 3-5

Source: Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.1-4.
Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 255-57; Viger, 436d - 439b.
Greek Text Used: Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, p. 524, line 13 - p. 527, line 26.
Editions: Steph., 255-57; Vig., 436d-439b; Philippson, 22-26 (= vv 1-67); Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 211-13; Hein., 2.38-41; Gais., 2.404-408; Müll., *FHG* 3 (om., though cf. p. 224, No. 15); Migne, *PG* (21), cols. 736 C - 737 D (notes, cols. 1574-75); Dind., 1.505-507; Freu., (om.); Kuiper, *Mnemosyne*, 241-47 (= vv 1-67); Kuiper, *REJ*, 52-56 (= vv 1-67); Giff., 1.547-50 (notes, 4.315); Stearns, 107-11 (= Frgs. 1-3); Wieneke, 2-8 (= vv 1-67); Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, 524-27; Jac., *FGrH* 3. (om.); Denis, 207-209 (= Frg. 1); Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 50-55; Snell, *TrGF* 1.288-91 (= No. 128).
Translations:
English: Giff., 3.467-69; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 50-55; Robertson, *OTP*, 2.808-11.
French: Magnin, 201-203; Kuiper, *REJ*, 53-57 (= vv 1-67).
German: Philippson, 23-27 (= vv 1-67); Riessler, 337-39 (= vv 1-67; notes, 1289); Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 121-24.
Dutch: van der Horst, *JHP*, 21-25.

Fragments Six Through Fifteen (vv 68-242)

Frg. 6 - *P.E.* 9.29.4-5 (vv 68-82)
Frg. 7 - *P.E.* 9.29.6 (vv 83-89)
Frg. 8 - *P.E.* 9.29.7 (vv 90-95)
Frg. 9 - *P.E.* 9.29.8 (vv 96-112)
Frg. 10 - *P.E.* 9.29.9 (vv 113-115)
Frg. 11 - *P.E.* 9.29.10 (vv 116-119)
Frg. 12 - *P.E.* 9.29.11 (vv 120-131)
Frg. 13 - *P.E.* 9.29.12 (vv 132-174)
Frg. 14 - *P.E.* 9.29.13 (vv 175-192)
Frg. 15 - *P.E.* 9.29.14 (vv 193-242)

Source: Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.4-14.
Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 257-62; Viger, 439d - 445d.
Greek Text Used: Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, p. 529, line 1 - p. 536, line 20.
Editions: Steph., 257-62; Vig., 439d - 445d; Philippson, 26-36 (= vv 68-242); Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 213-18; Hein., 2.42-48; Gais., 2.410-21; Müll., *FHG* 3 (om., though cf. p. 225, No. 17); Migne, *PG* (21), cols. 740 C - 745 C (notes, cols. 1577-78); Dind., 1.508-14; Freu., (om.); Kuiper, *Mnemosyne*, 247-62 (= vv 68-242); Kuiper, *REJ*, 56-70 (= vv 68-242); Giff., 1.551-56 (notes, 4.316-17); Stearns, 111-24 (= Frgs. 4-9); Wieneke, 8-22 (= vv 68-242); Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, 529-36; Jac., *FGrH* 3. (om).; Denis, 209-215 (= Frg. 2); Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 54-65; Snell, *TrGF* 1.292-300 (= No. 128).
Translations:
English: Giff., 3.469-74; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 54-65; Robertson, *OTP*, 2.811-818.
French: Magnin, 204-207; Kuiper, *REJ*, 57-71 (= vv 68-242).

German: Philippson, 27-37 (= vv 68-242); Riessler, 339-44 (= vv 68-242; notes, 1289); Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 124-31.
Dutch: van der Horst, *JHP*, 26-45
Hebrew: Translation of vv 68-89 = Frgs. 6 & 7, in Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch* (Jerusalem, 1872; repr. 1967) 5.159.

Fragments Sixteen and Seventeen (vv 243-269)

Frg. 16 - *P.E.* 9.29.15-16a (vv 243-253)
Frg. 17 - *P.E.* 9.29.16b (vv 254-269)

Source: Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.15-16.
Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 262; Viger, 445d - 446d.
Greek Text Used: Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, p. 536, line 26 - p. 538, line 6.
Editions: Steph., 262; Vig., 445d - 446d; Philippson, 38 (= vv 243-70); Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 219; Hein., 2.48-49; Gais., 2.421-23; Müll., *FHG* 3 (om.); Migne, *PG* (21), cols. 745 D - 748 A (notes, col. 1578); Dind., 1.514-15; Freu., (om.).; Kuiper, *Mnemosyne*, 262-64 (= vv 243-269); Kuiper, *REJ*, 70-72 (= vv 243-269); Giff., 1.557 (notes, 4.317); Stearns, 124-26 (= Frg. 10); Wieneke, 22-26 (= vv 243-269); Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 8.1, 536-38; Jac., *FGrH* 3. (om.); Denis, 215-16 (= Frg. 3); Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 66-67; Snell, *TrGF* 1.300-301 (= No. 128).
Translations:
English: Giff., 3.474-75; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 66-67; Robertson, *OTP*, 2.818-19.
French: Magnin, 208; Kuiper, *REJ*, 71-73 (= vv 243-269).

German: Philippson, 38 (= vv 243-270); Riessler, 344-45 (= vv 243-270; notes, 1289); Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 132-33.
Dutch: van der Horst, *JHP*, 49-50.

Frg. 17 parallel (vv 256-69): Pseudo-Eustathius

Source: Pseudo-Eustathius of Antioch, *Commentary on the Hexameron.*
Greek Text Used: *PG* (18) 729D (which prints edition by Leo Allatius, Lugduni, 1629, included in his edition of Eustathius, *Contra Origenem de engastrimytho Disputatio*; also, cf. notes by Leo Allatius in *PG* (18) 896 B.

Fragment Eighteen

Source: Epiphanius, *Haer.* 64.29.6 - 30.1
Greek Text Used: Holl-Dummer, *GCS* (31) 2, p. 447, line 14 - p. 448, line 4.
Editions: *PG* (41 = ed. Petavius, 1662), col. 1104 C; Dindorf, 2.622 (notes, 3.776); Holl, *GCS* (31) 2.447-48; Denis, 216 (= Frg. 4).
Translations:
English:
French:
German: Philippson, 40-41; Riessler, 345 (= vv 271-280).
Dutch:
Latin: Dübner, 8.

Earlier Parallel Source: Methodius, *de resurrectione* 1.37.6 (preserved in Old Slavonic; on the Old Slavonic MSS tradition, cf. Bonwetsch, *GCS* [27] xx-xxiv; on its relation to the Epiphanius tradition, cf. pp. xxxv.)

Greek Text Used: G. N. Bonwetsch, *Methodius*, *GCS* (Leipzig, 1917) [27], p. 279, lines 6-16. (Greek text based on Epiphanius' later incorporation of *de resurr.* 1.20-2.8,10 into *Panarion* 64.12-62; cf. Quasten, *Patrology*, 2.136).

Editions: Cf. *PG* (18) 293-294.

Translations:

English: Cf. *ANF* 6.370 (= *Ante-Nicene Library* 14.154). (This is not an exact translation of this fragment.)

Fragment One

A. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.23.155.1-5

(155.1) Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀνατροφῆς τοῦ Μωυσέως συνάσεται ἡμῖν καὶ ὁ Ἐζεκίηλος ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητὴς ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ δράματι "Ἐξαγωγή" γράφων ὧδε ἐκ προσώπου Μωυσέως·

(2) "ἰδὼν γὰρ ... [7]

....

(5) ... ἀπ' ἠόνος." [31]

B. Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.1-2

ΕΖΕΚ<Ι>ΗΛΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΜΩΣΕΩΣ

(28.1) "Περὶ δὲ τοῦ τὸν Μώϋσον ἐκτεθῆναι (1) ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς εἰς τὸ ἕλος καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως θυγατρὸς ἀναιρεθῆναι καὶ τραφῆναι ἱστορεῖ καὶ Ἐζεκιῆλος ὁ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής, ἄνωθεν ἀναλαβὼν τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀπὸ τῶν σὺν Ἰακὼβ παραγενομένων εἰς Αἴγυπτον πρὸς Ἰωσήφ. λέγει δὲ οὕτως, τὸν Μώϋσον παρεισάγων λέγοντα· | 437a

---

Frg. 1B

BION

1 ΕΖΕΚ. -- ΜΩΣ. BON: om. I | Ἐζεκήλου BON | Μωυσέος B | 4 ἀναιρ. B[1] (ex ἀνευρ.) | καὶ τραφῆναι I: om. BON | 5 Ἐζεκιῆλος: Ἐζεκῆλος ION: Ἐζεκίλος B |

Fragment One

A. Clement of Alexandria[1]

(155.1) And concerning the education of Moses, Ezekiel the poet of Jewish tragedies provides us a harmonious account in the drama entitled *Exodus*, in which he writes in the person of Moses:

[7] (2) "For, seeing ...

....

[31] (5) ..."from the wet bank of the river."

B. Eusebius[2]

Ezekiel's Remarks Concerning Moses

(1) (28.1) "Now concerning Moses'[3] being exposed in a swamp by his mother, and his being rescued and reared by the king's daughter, Ezekiel[4] the poet who wrote tragedies provides an account, rehearsing from the beginning the story of those who came with Jacob into Egypt to be with Joseph. Thus he says, introducing Moses as the speaker:

(2) ''Αφ' οὗ δ' Ἰακὼβ γῆν λιπὼν Χαναναίαν (2)
κατῆλθ' ἔχων Αἴγυπτον ἑπτάκις δέκα
ψυχὰς σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπεγέννησεν πολὺν
λαὸν κακῶς πράσσοντα καὶ τεθλιμμένον,
ἐς ἄχρι τούτων τῶν χρόνων κακούμενον [5]
κακῶν ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν καὶ δυναστείας χερός.
ἰδὼν γὰρ ἡμῶν γένναν ἄλις ηὐξημένην
δόλον καθ' ἡμῶν πολὺν ἐμηχανήσατο
βασιλεὺς Φαραώ, τοὺς μὲν ἐν πλινθεύμασιν 437b
οἰκοδομίαις τε βαρέσιν αἰκίζων βροτοὺς [10]
πόλεις τ' ἐπύργου σφῶν ἔκατι δυσμόρων.

BION

9 δ' om. Steph. | Χαν. λιπὼν Giff. | 10 κατῆλθεν B | ἔχων Αἴγ.: εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἔχων Steph. | 11 αὐτῷ Mras: αὐτῷ MSS | 13 τούτων τῶν χρόνων BI: τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ON | κακούμεθα Dübner, *Praef.*, vii | 14 δυναστείᾳ Dübner | χειρός B | 15 ὑμῶν B | ηὐξημένα B | 16 ἐμηχανήσατο (η^1 ex α corr.) Clem L^1 | 17 πλινθεύμασιν I: πλιθεύμασιν ON (πλινθ- corr. N, fort. prima manus? ν superscript. [Wieneke]): πληθεύμασιν B | 18 οἰκοδομίαις N^2 Clem.: οἰκοδομαῖς $BION^1$: οἰκοδομίας Clem. (Sylburg) | βαρέσιν ON: βάρεσιν I | οἰκοδομίας τε βάρ. Clem. (Sylburg) Hein. | βαρείαις ἀεικίζων Steph. | 19 πόλεσί Clem. L | τ' ἐπύργου cj. Sylburg: τε πύργους BION Clem. L (also read in Sylburg's text): τε πυργῶν Kuiper | πόλεις τε, πύργους τε Steph. | ἔκητι Clem. | post l. 19 ante l. 20 <ἄλλους δὲ τρύχων ποταμίοις ἐν χώμασιν> cj. Kuiper (cf. Josephus *Ant* 2.9.1 ¶ 203) |

(2) (2) 'From the time when Jacob left the land of Canaan[5]

And came down to Egypt bringing with him seventy souls,[6]

He became the father of a populous people,[7]

A people badly treated[8] and oppressed,[9]

[5] To this very day ill-treated[10]

By evil men and the government's hand.

For, seeing that our descendants became numerically strong,[11]

King Pharaoh[12] devised quite a sinister strategy[13] against us,

Maltreating[14] these mortals with bricks, buildings, and burdens.[15]

[10] Using these unfortunate souls,

He began to fortify his cities with towers.[16]

ἔπειτα κηρύσσει μὲν Ἑβραίων γένει
τἀρσενικὰ ῥίπτειν ποταμὸν ἐς βαθύρροον.
ἐνταῦθα μήτηρ ἡ τεκοῦσ' ἔκρυπτέ με
τρεῖς μῆνας, ὡς ἔφασκεν. οὐ λαθοῦσα δὲ [15]
ὑπεξέθηκε, κόσμον ἀμφιθεῖσά μοι,
παρ' ἄκρα ποταμοῦ λάσιον εἰς ἕλος δασύ·
Μαριὰμ δ' ἀδελφή μου κατώπτευεν πέλας.
κἄπειτα θυγάτηρ βασιλέως ἄβραις ὁμοῦ
κατῆλθε λουτροῖς χρῶτα φαιδρῦναι νέον· [20]
ἰδοῦσα δ' εὐθὺς καὶ λαβοῦσ' ἀνείλετο,

BION

20 ἔπειτα κηρύσσει μὲν BION: ἔπειτα κηρύσσ' ἡμῖν Clem. L: ἔπειτ' ἐκήρυσσ' ἡμῖν Clem. (Wilamowitz, Stählin-Früchtel) | γένει BION Clem. L: γονῆς Clem. (Wilamowitz): γένη Jacobson | 21 εἰς B | βαθύρρον Clem. L | 23 ὡς Clem.: οὓς BION | 25 παρ' ἄκρα (ἄκραι Clem. L) ποταμοῦ: παρ' ὄχθην ποταμοῦ Steph.: παρ' ἄρθρα ποταμοῦ Wieneke: παρὰ κρᾶτα ποταμοῦ Ludwich: ποταμοῦ παρ' ἀκτὴν Kuiper | τοῦ ποταμοῦ B | δασύ: βαθύ Clem. | 26 ἀδελφή μου Steph.: ἀδελφ' ἡμῶν BION Clem. L | κατώπτευε BON | 27 sqq. ὅτι βασιλικῶς καὶ τέθραπται καὶ πεπαίδευται Μωσῆς I^{mg} 27 ἄβραις: αὔραις B | ὅμου Steph. | 28 κατ. -- νέον: κατ. λουτ. φαιδρῦναι τὸ ἑὸν δέμας Steph. | 29 δ': μ' Clem. L | καὶ om. B | καὶ λαβοῦσ' ION Clem. L: κἀλεοῦσ' Clem. (Wilamowitz) | ἀνείλετο λαβοῦσα B | ἰδ. -- ἀνείλ.: νέον δ' ἰδοῦσα καὶ λαβοῦσ' ἀνείλετο Steph. |

Then he issued a proclamation for the Hebrew
race
To throw its male children into the deep-
flowing river.[17]
Then the mother who bore me hid me
[15] Three months, as she told me.[18] Unable to
escape notice,
Wrapping me in a covering,[19] she set me out,
At the edge of the river in a thickly grown
marsh.[20]
Miriam my sister kept watch close by.[21]
Then the king's daughter, together with her
maids,
[20] Came down to clean her youthful skin by
bathing[22],
Immediately, when she saw me, she took
me, lifted me from the water,[23]

ἔγνω δ' Ἑβραῖον ὄντα· καὶ λέγει τάδε
Μαριὰμ ἀδελφὴ προσδραμοῦσα βασιλίδι· 437d
'θέλεις τροφόν σοι παιδὶ τῷδ' εὕρω ταχὺ
ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραίων;' ἡ δ' ἐπέσπευσεν κόρην. [25]
μολοῦσα δ' εἶπε μητρὶ καὶ παρῆν ταχὺ
αὐτή τε μήτηρ καὶ ἔλαβέν μ' ἐς ἀγκάλας.
εἶπεν δὲ θυγάτηρ βασιλέως· Τοῦτον, γύναι,
τρόφευε, κἀγὼ μισθὸν ἀποδώσω σέθεν.
ὄνομα δὲ Μωσῆν ὠνόμαζε, τοῦ χάριν [30]
ὑγρᾶς ἀνεῖλε ποταμίας ἀπ' ἠόνος.'"

BION

31 δ' ἀδελφὴ Clem. (Sylburg) | 32 παιδὶ τῷδ' Sylburg: τῶ παιδὶ BION: τῶιδε παιδὶ Clem. L: τῷ παιδίῳ Steph. | 33 ἐπέσπευσε B: ἐπέπευσε I: ἔσπευσε Clem. L: ἐπένευσεν Steph. | κόρῃ Steph. Clem. (Sylburg): κόριν B apud Wieneke | 35 αὐτῇ Clem. (Victorius) | τε: γε Steph. | καὶ ἔλαβέ MSS: καὶ ἔλαβεν Clem. L: κἄλαβέν Clem. (Stähelin-Früchtel) | μ' om. Clem. | εἰς ἀγκ. Clem. | 36 εἶπεν Steph.: εἶπε MSS | 38 Μωυσῆν Clem. | ὠνόμαζε B: ὀνόμαζε ION Clem. L | τοῦ: ὅτου Clem. (Cobet, Stähelin-Früchtel) | 39 ἀνῆλε N apud Wieneke: ἀνεῖλεν Steph. | <μ'> ἀνεῖλε Kuiper |

And she knew that I was a Hebrew child.[24] And then said
My sister Miriam as she ran to the princess,
"Do you want me quickly to find you a nurse for this child
[25] From the Hebrews?"[25] And she hastened the girl on her way.[26]
She went and told my mother, and right away came
My very mother and she took me in her arms.[27]
And the king's daughter said, "Woman,
Nurse this child, and I will repay your expenses."[28]
[30] And she named me Moses, because
She drew me up from the wet bank of the river.'"[29]

Fragment Two

A. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.23.155.

6-7; 156.1-2.

(155.6) "ἐπεὶ δὲ καιρὸς ... [32]

....

(7) ... βασιλικῶν." [40]

(156.1) ἔπειτα τὴν διαμάχην τοῦ θ' Ἑβραίου καὶ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου δηγησάμενος καὶ τὴν ταφὴν τὴν ἐν τῇ φάμμῳ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου, ἐπὶ τῆς ἑτέρας μάχης φησὶν οὕτως·

(2) "τί τύπτεις ἀσθενέστερον σέθεν; [50]

....

... συμφανὲς τόδε;" [54]

B. Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.3

(3) |"τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει καὶ περὶ 438a τούτων ὁ Ἐξεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, τὸν (3) Μωυσῆν παρεισάγων λέγοντα·

Fragment 2A

3 θ': τ' L | 5 φάμμωι (φ et μ^2 in ras.) L^1 | 6 οὕτως Sylburg: οὗτος L |

Fragment 2B

BION

1-3 τούτοις -- λέγοντα om. B | 2 Ἐξεκιῆλος: Ἐξεκῆλος ION |

Fragment Two

A. Clement of Alexandria[30]

[32] (155.6) "When the time ...

....

[40] (7) ... the royal palace."

(156.1) Then after relating the fight between the Hebrew and the Egyptian, and the burial of the Egyptian in the sand, he speaks of the other contest thusly:

[50] (2) "Why do you strike one who is weaker than you?

....

[54] ... public knowledge?"

B. Eusebius[31]

(3) (3) "After some other remarks, he[32] elaborates on these things, and concerning them Ezekiel, in his tragedy, introduces Moses saying:

''Επεὶ δὲ καιρὸς νηπίων παρῆλθέ μοι,
ἤγαγέ με μήτηρ βασιλίδος πρὸς δώματα,
ἅπαντα μυθεύσασα καὶ λέξασά μοι
γένος πατρῷον καὶ θεοῦ δωρήματα. [35]
ἕως μὲν οὖν τὸν παιδὸς εἶχομεν χρόνον,
τροφαῖσι βασιλικαῖσι καὶ παιδεύμασιν
ἄπανθ' ὑπισχνεῖθ', ὡς ἀπὸ σπλάγχνων ἐῶν·
ἐπεὶ δὲ πλήρης κόλπος ἡμερῶν παρῆν, 438b
ἐξῆλθον οἴκων βασιλικῶν (πρὸς ἔργα γὰρ [40]
θυμός μ' ἄνωγε καὶ τέχνασμα βασιλέως).
ὁρῶ δὲ πρῶτον ἄνδρας ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ,
τὸν μέν γ' Ἑβραῖον, τὸν δὲ γένος Αἰγύπτιον.
ἰδὼν δ' ἐρήμους καὶ παρόντα μηδένα
ἐρρυσάμην ἀδελφόν, ὃν δ' ἔκτειν' ἐγώ, [45]

BION

4 παρῆλθέν με Clem. L (παρῆλθέ με Sylburg) | 5 ἤγαγέ ON: ἦγχ I^{ac}: ἦγέ I^{1}: ἤ γε B: ἦγέν Clem. (Eus. Steph. edd.) | 10 ὑπισχνεῖτο ON Clem. | ἐῶν: ἕνα Clem. L | 11 κόλπος I Clem. L: κόλτος BON: κύκλος Kuiper: καιρὸς Müller, *PhW* 54 (1934) 703 | παρῆν: ἐῆν B | 12-27 πρὸς -- ταχύ om. B | 14 νόμῳ Steph.: νομαῖς MSS | 15 τὸν -- Αἰγ.: τὸν μέν <γ'> Ἑβραῖον, τὸν <δὲ γένος> Αἰγύπτιον Giff.: τὸν μὲν γένος Ἑβραῖον (Ἑβραίων I) τὸν δ' (τόνδ' ON) Αἰγύπτιον ION Steph.: τὸ γένος Ἑβραῖον ὄντα, τὸν δ' Αἰγύπτιον Gais. app. crit. (citing Porson on Euripides *Orest.* 891): τὸν μὲν γεγῶθ' (also Dübner, *Praef.*, viii) Ἑβραῖον, ὃν δ' Αἰγύπτιον Dind.: τὸν μὲν <τὸ> γένος Ἑβραῖον, τὸν δ' Αἰγύπτιον Kuiper: τὸν μὲν τὸ γένος Ἑβραῖον, ὃν δ' Αἰγύπτιον Wieneke: τὸν μὲν <τὸ> γένος Ἑβραῖον, ὃν δ' Αἰγύπτιον Snell Jacobson | 16 δὲ I | 17 ἐρυσ. ON | μὲν ἀδελφὸν, τὸν δ' Steph. |

'When the time of my childhood had passed,[33]
My mother brought me to the house of the princess,[34]
Recounting everything and telling me about
[35] The race of our fathers and the gifts of God.[35]
Now as long as I was a child in years,
A royal upbringing and education[36]
In every respect she undertook to provide me, as if I were her own child.
But when the full complement of days[37] had passed,
[40] I left the royal palace[38] (for my spirit
Alerted me[39] to the works and wiles of the king).[40]
The first thing I saw was men fighting,
The one a Hebrew, the other an Egyptian.[41]
When I saw them alone, with no one around,
[45] I rescued the brother,[42] but the other one I killed,

ἔκρυφα δ' ἄμμῳ τοῦτον, ὥστε μὴ εἰσιδεῖν
ἕτερόν τιν' ἡμᾶς κἀπογυμνῶσαι φόνον. 438c
τῇ 'παύριον δὲ πάλιν ἰδὼν ἄνδρας δύο,
μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς συγγενεῖς, πατουμένους
λέγω· Τί τύπτεις ἀσθενέστερον σέθεν; [[50]]
ὁ δ' εἶπεν· 'Ημῖν τίς σ' ἀπέστειλε κριτὴν
ἢ 'πιστάτην ἐνταῦθα; μὴ κτενεῖς σύ με,
ὥσπερ τὸν ἐχθὲς ἄνδρα; καὶ δείσας ἐγὼ
ἔλεξα· Πῶς ἐγένετο συμφανὲς τόδε;
καὶ πάντα βασιλεῖ ταῦτ' ἀπήγγειλεν ταχύ· [[55]]
ζητεῖ δὲ Φαραὼ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν λαβεῖν· 438d
ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας ἐκποδὼν μεθίσταμαι
καὶ νῦν πλανῶμαι γῆν ἐπ' ἀλλοτέρμονα.'"

BION

18 φάμμῳ Clement | ἐσιδεῖν Kuiper | 21 δι' αὐτῶν Steph.: δ' αὐτῶν Philippson | πατουμένους Dübner, *Praef.*, viii: παρουμένους ION: κακουμένους Steph. | 23 Ὃ δ' Clem. | 24 κτείνεις δέ με Clem. L | 27 καὶ: τίς Steph. | ἀπήγγειλεν Steph. edd.: -λε ION: ἀπηγγέλη Kuiper | 28 ζήτει Steph. | ἀκούσας δὲ ζητεῖ φαραῶ B |

And hid in the sand, so that no one else
Would see us and disclose the murder.[43]
But on the next day when I saw two men again,
And indeed they were kinsmen, trampling each other,[44]
[50] I said, "Why do you strike one who is weaker than you?"[45]
But he said, "Who sent you here as a judge for us,
Or even as a commander? Surely you will not slay me,
As you did the man yesterday?"[46] And being fearful,
I said, "How did this become public knowledge?"[47]
[55] And all these things he quickly announced to the king;
Pharaoh then sought to take my life.[48]
When I heard it, I escaped from there,
And now I am wandering to a foreign land.'"[49]

Fragment Three (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.4a)

(4a) "εἶτα περὶ τῶν τοῦ Ῥαγουὴλ θυγατέ- (4a)
ρων οὕτως ἐπιβάλλει·
'Ὁρῶ δὲ ταύτας ἑπτὰ παρθένους τινάς.'" [59]

BION

3 παρθένους ἑπτὰ B |

Fragment Four (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.4b)

(4b) "ἐρωτήσαντός τε αὐτὰς τίνες εἴησαν (4b)
αἱ παρθένοι, φησὶν ἡ Σεπφώρα·
Λιβύη μὲν ἡ γῆ πᾶσα κλήζεται, ξένε, [60]
οἰκοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν φῦλα παντοίων γενῶν,
Αἰθίοπες ἄνδρες μέλανες· ἄρχων δ' ἐστὶ γῆς
| εἷς καὶ τύραννος καὶ στρατηλάτης μόνος. 439a
ἄρχει δὲ πόλεως τῆσδε καὶ κρίνει βροτοὺς
ἱερεύς, ὅς ἐστ' ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τούτων πατήρ.'" [65]

BION

1 αὐτοῦ, τίνος Steph. | 3 κλήξεται I |

Fragment Three[50]

(4a) (4a) "Then, concerning the daughters of Raguel,[51] he[52] adds this:

⟦59⟧ 'I see these maidens, some seven of them.'"[53]

Fragment Four[54]

(4b) (4b) "When he asked them what maidens they were, Zipporah said:[55]

⟦60⟧ 'Now the whole land is called Libya,[56]
Stranger,
But tribes of various races inhabit it,
Ethiopians, dark-skinned men.[57] There is one
ruler of the land[58]
Who is both lord and sole commander.
A priest[59] rules this city[60] and judges men[61]
⟦65⟧ Who is father of both me and these maidens.'"

Fragment Five (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.4c)

(4c) "εἶτα περὶ τοῦ ποτισμοῦ τῶν θρεμμάτων (4c) διελθὼν περὶ τοῦ Σεπφώρας ἐπιβάλλει γάμου, δι' ἀμοιβαίων παρεισάγων τόν τε Χοὺμ καὶ 439b τὴν Σεπφώραν λέγοντας·

(Χ.) '"Ομως κατειπεῖν χρή σε, Σεπφώρα, τάδε.

(Σ.) ξένῳ πατήρ με τῷδ' ἔδωκεν εὐνέτιν.'" [67]

BION

2 τῆς Σεπφώρας Steph. | 4 λέγοντας I: λέγουσαν BON |

Fragment Five[62]

(4c) (4c) "Then having recounted the story of the watering of the animals,[63] he[64] goes on to treat the marriage to Zipporah,[65] introducing Chum[66] and Zipporah speaking[67] in dialogue:[68]

5 (Chum): 'Zipporah, it is necessary for you to tell me this.

[67] (Zipporah): My father gave me to this stranger as a wife.'"[69]

Fragment Six (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.4-5)

ΕΖΕΚ<Ι>ΗΛΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΜΟΙΩΣ

(29.4) "Λέγει δὲ περὶ τούτων καὶ 'Εζεκιῆ- (4)
λος ἐν τῇ 'Εξαγωγῇ, προσπαρειληφὼς τὸν
ὄνειρον τὸν ὑπὸ Μωσέως μὲν ἑωραμένον, ὑπὸ
5 δὲ πενθεροῦ διακεκριμένον. λέγει δὲ | αὐτὸς 440a
ὁ Μωσῆς δι' ἀμοιβαίων πρὸς τὸν πενθερὸν
οὕτως πως·

(5) '"Εδοξ' ὄρους κατ' ἄκρα Σιναίου θρόνον (5)
μέγαν τιν' εἶναι μέχρις οὐρανοῦ πτυχός,
10 ἐν τῷ καθῆσθαι φῶτα γενναῖόν τινα [[70]]
διάδημ' ἔχοντα καὶ μέγα σκῆπτρον χερὶ
εὐωνύμῳ μάλιστα. δεξιᾷ δέ μοι
ἔνευσε, κἀγὼ πρόσθεν ἐστάθην θρόνου.

BION

1 ΕΖΕΚ. -- OM. BON: om. I | 2 'Εζεκιῆλος I: 'Εζεκῆλος BON | 3 προσπαρειληφὸν I | 5 πενθεροῦ I: τοῦ π. BON | δὲ²: δ' B | αὐτὸς om. B | 6 δι' ἀμοιβ. om. B | 7 οὕτως: οὕτω Steph. | πως I: om. BON | 8-9 ἔδοξ' -- τίν': ἐδόκουν ὁρᾶν κατ' ἄκρας (ἄκρα Viger, Philippson, Hein.) που θρόνον μέγαν | τίν' κτλ. Steph. | 8 "Εδοξ' Dübner: ἐξ MSS | κατ' ἄκρα Σιναίου Dübner Dind. Kuiper Giff.: κατ' ἄκρα Σιν<αί>ου Snell Jacobson: κατ' ἄκρα Σιναϊκοῦ Wieneke: κατ' ἄκρας ἰνοῦ B: ινου κατ' ἄκρασ
β α
O^ac: ινου κατ' ἄκρασ O: κατ' ἄκρασ ινοὺ N: κατ' ἄκρας οὖ I Gais.: κατ' ἄκρον αἰπεινοῦ cj. Jacobson | θρόνου B | 9 τιν': τε B | μέχρις MSS: μέκρ' ἐς cj. Kuiper Wieneke: μέκρι 'ς Snell Jacobson Vogt | πτυχός I: πτύχας BON: βεβηκότα Steph. | 10 τῷ: ᾧ Steph. | 11 χειρὶ B |

Fragment Six[70]

Ezekiel's Remarks Concerning the Same Man -- In Similar Fashion

(4) (29.4) "Ezekiel also mentions these things in his work *The Exodus* and includes the dream[71] seen
5 by Moses and interpreted by his father-in-law. Moses himself speaks in dialogue with his father-in-law, as follows:

(5) (5) 'I dreamt there was on the summit of mount Sinai
A certain great throne extending up to heaven's cleft,[72]
10 On which there sat a certain noble man[73]
[71] Wearing a crown and holding a great sceptre
In his left hand.[74] With his right hand
He beckoned to me, and I stood before the throne.[75]

σκῆπτρον δέ μοι παρέδωκε καὶ εἰς θρόνον μέγαν
εἶπεν καθῆσθαι· βασιλικὸν δ' ἔδωκέ μοι 440b
διάδημα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ θρόνων χωρίζεται. [76]
ἐγὼ δ' ἐσεῖδον γῆν ἅπασαν ἔγκυκλον
καὶ ἔνερθε γαίας καὶ ἐξύπερθεν οὐρανοῦ,
καί μοί τι πλῆθος ἀστέρων πρὸς γούνατα
ἔπιπτ', ἐγὼ δὲ πάντας ἠριθμησάμην, [80]
κἀμοῦ παρῆγεν ὡς παρεμβολὴ βροτῶν.
εἶτ' ἐμφοβηθεὶς ἐξανίσταμ' ἐξ ὕπνου.'" 440c

BION

14 πάρδωκε Snell | κ' εἰς Philippson: κεἰς Dind. | 14-15 θρόνου | μέγαν μ' εἶπεν Steph. | 15 εἶπε MSS: εἶπεν Steph. edd. | δ' ἔδωκέ μοι Gais.: δέ μοι ἔδωκε MSS: δέ μοι ἔδωκεν Steph.: δέ μοι δίδου Philippson | 16 καὐτὸς Dind. | ἐκ θρόνων: ἐκὼν ἐκ θρόνου Steph.: ἐκ θρόνου Philippson | 17 δ' ἐσεῖδον ON: δ' ὡς εἶδον I: δὲ εἶδον B: δ' εἰσεῖδον Steph.| ἐν κύκλῳ cj. Kuiper Wieneke | 18 καὶ ἔνερθε ION: καὶ ἔρρεθε B: καὶ ἔνερθεν Steph.: τὰ τ' ἔνερθε Münscher in Wieneke: κἄνερθε Viger | καὶ²: κ' Viger | κἀξ ὕπερθεν Viger: κἀξύπερθεν Hein. | 19 πρὸς γούνατα: πρὸς γοῦν τ' B | 20 ἔπιπτεν B | ἐγὼ -- ἠριθ.: ἐγὼ δὲ ἐξῆς πάντας ἐξηριθμησάμην Steph. | 21 κἀμοῦ: κἀμοὶ Steph.: καὶ ἐμοὶ Kuiper: καί που cj. Dübner: καὶ ἰδού Renehan | δὴ παρῆγεν Steph. | 22 εἶτα φοβηθείς ποτ' ἐξαν. Steph. | ἐξανίσταμαι ἐξ ὕπνου I: ἐξανίσταμαι ὕπνου Philippson |

He gave me the sceptre and told me to sit
On the great throne.[76] He gave me the royal crown
[76] And he himself left the throne.[77]
I beheld the entire circled earth
Both beneath the earth and above the heaven,[78]
And a host of stars fell on its knees before me;[79]
I numbered them all,
[81] They passed before me like a squadron of soldiers.[80]
Then, seized with fear, I rose from my sleep.'"[81]

Fragment Seven (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.6)

(6) "ὁ δὲ πενθερὸς αὐτοῦ τὸν ὄνειρον ἐπι- (6)
κρίνει οὕτως·

'Ὦ ξένε, καλόν σοι τοῦτ' ἐσήμηνεν θεός·
ζῴην δ', ὅταν σοι ταῦτα συμβαί<ν>ῃ ποτέ.
ἆρά γε μέγαν τιν' ἐξαναστήσεις θρόνον [[85]]
καὶ αὐτὸς βραβεύσεις καὶ καθηγήσῃ βροτῶν;
τὸ δ' εἰσθεᾶσθαι γῆν ὅλην τ' οἰκουμένην
καὶ τὰ ὑπένερθε καὶ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν θεοῦ· 440
ὄψει τά τ' ὄντα τά τε προτοῦ τά θ' ὕστερον.'" d

BION

3 ὦ ξεῖνε Steph. | καλόν Steph.: καλοῦ ION: om. B | σοι om. B | ἐσήμηνεν (B apud Wieneke) Steph.: ἐσόμην ε I: ἐμήνυσε BON | 4 ζῴην Steph.: ζώοιν I: ζωοῖν BON | συμβαίνῃ Steph.: συμβαίη MSS | 5 γε BI: om. ON | θρόνου Stählin, *Gnomon* 9 (1933) 57 Snell | 6 καὐτὸς Steph. | 7 τὸ δέ σε τεθεᾶσθαι Steph.: τὸ δέ σ' εἰσθεᾶσθαι Philippson | ὅλην οἰκουμένην Steph. | τ' BON: τὴν I | 8 καὶ θ' ὑπένερθεν, χ' ὑπὲρ Gais.: τά θ' ὑπένερθεν, καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ Steph. | καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ B | 9 τά τ' Steph.: τά τε MSS | προτοῦ Steph.: πρὸ τούτου MSS: πρὸ τοῦ Kuiper |

Fragment Seven[82]

(6) (6) "His father-in-law interprets the dream thusly:[83]

'O Friend,[84] that which God has signified to you is good;[85]
Might I live until the time when these things happen to you.[86]
Then you will raise up a great throne
[86] And it is you who will judge and lead humankind;[87]
As you beheld the whole inhabited earth,[88]
The things beneath and the things above God's heaven,[89]
So will you see things present, past, and future.'"[90]

Fragment Eight (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.7)

(7) "περὶ δὲ τῆς καιομένης βάτου καὶ τῆς (7)
ἀποστολῆς αὐτοῦ τῆς πρὸς Φαραὼ πάλιν παρει-
σάγει δι' ἀμοιβαίων τὸν Μωσῆν τῷ θεῷ διαλε-
γόμενον. φησὶ δὲ ὁ Μωσῆς·

'"Εα· τί μοι σημεῖον ἐκ βάτου τόδε, [90]
τεράστιόν τε καὶ βροτοῖς ἀπιστία;
ἄφνω βάτος μὲν καίεται πολλῷ πυρί,
αὐτοῦ δὲ χλωρὸν πᾶν μένει τὸ βλαστάνον.
τί δή; προελθὼν ὄψομαι τεράστιον
μέγιστον· οὐ γὰρ πίστιν ἀνθρώποις φέρει.'" [95]

BION

1-10 περὶ -- φέρει om. B | 3 δι' ἀμοιβαίων om. Kuiper | 4 δὲ ὁ Μωσῆς I: δ' ὅμως ON | 6 ἄπιστον ὄν Steph. | 9 προσελθὼν Kuiper | τέρας τόδε Kuiper |

Fragment Eight[91]

(7) (7) "In reference to the burning bush and his commission to Pharaoh,[92] again he[93] introduces Moses who engages in dialogue with God in alternate verses.[94] Moses says:

'Ah! What sign comes to me from this bush,[95]
⟦91⟧ Wondrous and indeed incredible to mortals?[96]
Suddenly, a bush is burning with a great fire
Yet its growth remains green throughout.[97]
⟦94⟧ What then? I will go forward and examine this
great marvel;[98]
For it is incredible to men.'"[99]

Fragment Nine (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.8)

(8) "εἶτα ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ προσομιλεῖ· (8)
'"Επίσχες, ὦ φέριστε, μὴ προσεγγίσῃς,
Μωσῆ, πρὶν ἢ τῶν σῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι δέσιν·
| ἁγία γὰρ ἧς σὺ γῆς ἐφέστηκας πέλει, 441a
ὁ δ' ἐκ βάτου σοι θεῖος ἐκλάμπει λόγος.
θάρσησον, ὦ παῖ, καὶ λόγων ἄκου' ἐμῶν· [100]
ἰδεῖν γὰρ ὄψιν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀμήχανον
θνητὸν γεγῶτα, τῶν λόγων δ' ἔξεστί σοι
ἐμῶν ἀκούειν, τῶν ἔκατ' ἐλήλυθα.
ἐγὼ θεὸς σῶν, ὧν λέγεις, γεννητόρων,
Ἀβραάμ τε καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβου τρίτου. [105]
μνησθεὶς δ' ἐκείνων καὶ ἔτ' ἐμῶν δωρημάτων 441b
πάρειμι σῶσαι λαὸν Ἑβραίων ἐμόν,
ἰδὼν κάκωσιν καὶ πόνον δούλων ἐμῶν.
ἀλλ' ἕρπε καὶ σήμαινε τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις
πρῶτον μὲν αὐτοῖς πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ, [110]
ἔπειτα βασιλεῖ τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ τεταγμένα,
ὅπως σὺ λαὸν τὸν ἐμὸν ἐξάγοις χθονός.'"

BION

1-15 εἶτα -- λόγοις om. B | 3 Μωσεῖ I | 4 ἧς σὺ γῆς Dübner: ἡ γῆ ὅπου σὺ ION: ἡ γῆ ἐφ' ἧς Kuiper | 5 sqq. περὶ τῆς βάτου I^{mg} | 6 ἄκουε I | 9 ἔκατ' Gais.: ἔκατι ON: ἕκατον I: εἵνεκεν Steph.: ἕνεκεν Philippson: ὧν ἔκατ' Kuiper | 11 κ' Ἰσαὰκ κ' Ἰακώβου Dübner | καὶ^2 om. Hein. | 12 κἄτ' Philippson | ἐμῶν δὴ ῥημάτων cj. Jacobson | 16 καὶ πρῶτον B | 17 θὑπ' ἐμοῦ Dübner | 18 ἐξάγῃς Steph. |

Fragment Nine[100]

(8) (8) "Then God converses with him:[101]
'Halt, O bravest one! Do not draw near,
Moses, until you remove your shoes from your
feet.[102]
For the ground where you are standing is holy.[103]
And from this bush the divine word beams forth
to you.[104]
[100] Take courage, O child, and listen to my words.[105]
For you cannot see my face
Since you are mortal,[106] but my words you are
allowed
To hear, those which I have come here to speak.[107]
I am the God of your ancestors, of whom
you speak,
[105] Of Abraham and Isaac, and Jacob the third.[108]
Remembering them, as well as my gifts to them,[109]
I have come to save my people, the Hebrews,[110]
Having seen the misfortunes and toil of my
servants.[111]
But go and declare in my own words[112]
[110] First to all the assembled Hebrews
themselves,[113]
Then to the king those things I have commanded
So that you might lead my people forth from the
land.'"[114]

Fragment Ten (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.9)

(9) "εἶτα ὑποβάς τινα ἀμοιβαῖα αὐτὸς ὁ (9)
Μωσῆς λέγει·

'Οὐκ εὔλογος πέφυκα, γλῶσσα δ' ἐστί μοι 441c
δύσφραστος, ἰσχνόφωνος, ὥστε μὴ λόγους
ἐμοὺς γενέσθαι βασιλέως ἐναντίον.'" [115]

BION

1 τινα ἀμοιβ. om. B | 3 μοι I: μου BON | 5 ἐναντίον Steph.: ἐναντίους ION: om. B |

Fragment Eleven (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.10)

(10) "εἶτα πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ ἀποκρί- (10)
νεται· 441c

''Ααρωνα πέμψω σὸν κασίγνητον ταχύ,
ᾧ πάντα λέξεις τἀξ ἐμοῦ λελεγμένα, [117]
καὶ αὐτὸς λαλήσει βασιλέως ἐναντίον,
σὺ μὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὁ δὲ λαβὼν σέθεν πάρα.'"

BION

1 εἶτα -- ταῦτα: καὶ B | αὐτῷ om. B | 3 πέμψω: πέμψον Steph. | ταχύ Steph.: ταχύν MSS | 4 τἀξ BI: τὰ ἐξ ON | 5 κἀυτὸς Steph. | βασιλέως BI: βασιλέων ON | 6 ἡμῶν Steph. | λαβὼν: λεὼν cj. Jacobson | post πάρα lacuna cj. Jacobson |

Fragment Ten[115]

(9) (9) "Then, farther down, Moses himself speaks some dialogue:[116]

'I am not a convincing speaker;[117] in fact my speech is

⟦114⟧ Too coarse, even halting, for any words of
5 Mine to come before a king.'"[118]

Fragment Eleven[119]

(10) (10) "Then, in response to these remarks, God answers him:[120]

'I will send quickly Aaron your brother[121]

⟦117⟧ Whom you will tell everything I have said,[122]
5 And it is he who will speak before the king;[123]
You will speak for us, but he will speak only what he receives from you.'"[124]

Fragment Twelve (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.11)

(11) "περὶ δὲ τῆς ῥάβδου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τερά- (11)
των οὕτω δι' ἀμοιβαίων εἴρηκε·

'(Θ.) τί δ' ἐν χεροῖν σοῖν τοῦτ' ἔχεις; 441d
λέξον τάχος. [120]

(Μ.) ῥάβδον τετραπόδων καὶ βροτῶν κολάστριαν.
(Θ.) ῥῖψον πρὸς οὖδας καὶ ἀποχώρησον ταχύ.
δράκων γὰρ ἔσται φοβερός, ὥστε θαυμάσαι.
(Μ.) ἰδοὺ βέβληται· δέσποθ', ἵλεως γενοῦ·
ὡς φοβερός, ὡς πέλωρος· οἴκτειρον σύ με·
πέφρικ' ἰδών, μέλη δὲ σώματος τρέμει. [126]
(Θ.) μηδὲν φοβηθῇς, χεῖρα δ' ἐκτείνας λαβὲ
οὐράν, πάλιν δὲ ῥάβδος ἔσσεθ' ὥσπερ ἦν.
| ἔνθες δὲ χεῖρ' εἰς κόλπον ἐξένεγκέ τε. 442a
(Μ.) ἰδοὺ τὸ ταχθέν, γέγονεν ὡσπερεὶ χιών. [130]
(Θ.) ἔνθες πάλιν δ' εἰς κόλπον, ἔσται δ'
ὥσπερ ἦν.'"

BION

1 sqq. περὶ τῆς ῥάβδου I^{mg} | 3 χεροῖν σὺ Steph. | 4 ταχὺ Steph. | 6 κἀποχώρησον Philippson | 7 ἔσται Steph.: ἐστι MSS | 8-16 ἰδοὺ -- ἦν om. B | 8 δέσποθ': δέ ποθ' I: σὺ δέ μοί ποθ' Steph.: σὺ δέ μοι Philippson | 10 πέφρικα MSS | 11 φοβηθῇς I: φοβηθεὶς ON | 12 ἔσσεθ' Steph.: ἔσσετ' ON: ἔσετ' I | ὥσπερ ON: χπερ I^{ac}: ὅπερ I^{1}: ἥπερ Steph. | 13 χεῖρα MSS | 14 ἰδοῦ -- χιών attrib. Moses Dübner (et Kuiper; cf. Mras); contra Viger, Dind. (= Θεός) | τὸ ταχθέν: τὸ προχθέν Vig. (*PG* [21] 741, n. 81) |

Fragment Twelve[125]

(11) (11) "Now concerning the rod and the other wonders,[126] he thus speaks in alternate verses:[127]

〖120〗 'God: What is this you have in your hand?
Answer quickly![128]

Moses: A rod for disciplining animals and men.[129]

God: Throw it on the ground and flee quickly.
For it will become a serpent,
astonishingly fearful.[130]

Moses: Behold, I have thrown it down. O Lord, be gracious.

〖125〗 How terrifying! How monstrous! Have pity on me!
I shutter at the sight of it, and the members of my body tremble.[131]

God: Fear nothing. Extend your hand and seize its tail.
It will become a rod again, as it was before.[132]
Then, place your hand in your bosom, and then remove it.[133]

〖130〗 Moses: Behold! At your command, it has become like snow.[134]

God: Place it in your bosom again, and it shall become as it was.'"[135]

Fragment Thirteen (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.28.12)

(12) Τούτοις ἐπάγει, μετά τινα τὰ μεταξὺ (12)
αὐτῷ εἰρημένα, λέγων·

"Ταῦτα δέ φησιν οὕτως καὶ 'Εζεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ
'Εξαγωγῇ λέγων, περὶ μὲν τῶν σημείων τὸν θεὸν
παρεισάγων λέγοντα οὕτως·

''Εν τῇδε ῥάβδῳ πάντα ποιήσεις κακά·
πρῶτον μὲν αἷμα ποτάμιον ῥυήσεται
πηγαί τε πᾶσαι καὶ ὑδάτων συστήματα· ⟦134⟧
βατράχων τε πλῆθος καὶ σκνίπας ἐμβαλῶ χθονί. 442b
ἔπειτα τέφραν οἷς καμιναίαν πάσω,
ἀναβρυήσει δ' ἐν βροτοῖς ἕλκη πικρά.
κυνόμυια δ' ἥξει καὶ βροτοὺς Αἰγυπτίων
πολλοὺς κακώσει. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἔσται πάλιν
λοιμός, θανοῦνται δ' οἷς ἔνεστι καρδία ⟦140⟧
σκληρά. πικράνω δ' οὐρανόν· χάλαζα νῦν

BION

1-25 τούτοις -- ταχύ om. B | 3 οὕτως I: οὕτω ON | 'Εζεκιῆλος I: 'Εζεκῆλος ON | 4 λέγει Steph. | 5 λέγων I | 8 πᾶσαι I: πᾶσι ON | χὐδάτων Dind. | 9 post πλῆθος ante καὶ lacuna cj. Snell 9 ... πλῆθος <-˘-x-˘-> 10 <x-˘-> καὶ ... | καὶ -- χθονί: σκνῖπά τ' ἐμβαλῶ χθονί Strugnell | ἐμβάλxx I^{ac}: ἐμβάλλω I^{1} | 10 οἷς: οἷον Steph.: ὡς Philippson | πάσσω I: σπερῶ Steph. | 11 ἀναβρυήσει ON: ἀναβρύσει I: ἀναβλήσει Steph.: ἀναβλύσει E apud Wieneke Philippson: ἀναβρυάσεται Giff.: ἀμβλυστονήσει Wieneke | δ' ἐν: δείν' ἐν Dübner: δ' ἐνὶ cj. Kuiper: δ' ἄρ' ἐν cj. Kuiper | 12 κυνόμυα ON^{ac}: κυνομυια $N^{2?}$ | 13 ταῦτα I | 15 πικρᾱνω (= "coniunctivus voluntativus") Mras (cf. *Rheinisches Museum*, N.F. 92 [1944] 229): πικρανῶ MSS: 'πιπικρανῶ Wieneke: πικρανέω Dübner, *Praef.*, viii: πικρώσω cj. Kuiper | δ': τὸν Philippson |

Fragment Thirteen[135a]

(12) (12) After some intervening remarks, he[136] adds to these some other things, saying:[137]

"Ezekiel, in his work *The Exodus*,[138] also says this about the signs,[139] introducing God speaking as follows:[140]

'With this staff you will work all the woes:[141]

First, the river will flow as blood,
As well as every stream and body of water;[142]
[135] A horde of frogs and insects will strike the land.[143]
Then I will scatter furnace ashes on them,
And bitter sores will break out among mortals.[144]
The dog-fly will come and it will afflict
Many Egyptian mortals.[145] After these things, again there will occur
[140] A plague, and it will bring death to those whose hearts are hard.[146]
I will make the heavens bitter. Now hail

σὺν πυρὶ πεσεῖται καὶ νεκροὺς θήσει βροτούς. 442c
καρποί τ' ὀλοῦνται τετραπόδων τε σώματα·
σκότος τε θήσω τρεῖς ἐφ' ἡμέρας ὅλας
ἀκρίδας τε πέμψω, καὶ περισσὰ βρώματα [145]
ἅπαντ' ἀναλώσουσι καὶ καρποῦ χλόην.
ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις τέκν' ἀποκτενῶ βροτῶν
πρωτόγονα. παύσω δ' ὕβριν ἀνθρώπων κακῶν.
Φαραὼ δὲ βασιλεὺς πείσετ' οὐδὲν ὧν λέγω, 442d
πλὴν τέκνον αὐτοῦ πρωτόγονον ἕξει νεκρόν· [150]
καὶ τότε φοβηθεὶς λαὸν ἐκπέμψει ταχύ·
πρὸς τοῖσδε λέξεις πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ·
Ὁ μεὶς ὅδ' ὑμῖν πρῶτος ἐνιαυτῶν πέλει·
ἐν τῷδ' ἀπάξω λαὸν εἰς ἄλλην χθόνα,
εἰς ἣν ὑπέστην πατράσιν Ἑβραίων γένους. [155]
| λέξεις δὲ λαῷ παντί, μηνὸς οὗ λέγω 443a
διχομηνίᾳ τὸ πάσχα θύσαντας θεῷ
τῇ πρόσθε νυκτὶ αἵματι φαῦσαι θύρας,
ὅπως παρέλθῃ σῆμα δεινὸς ἄγγελος.

BION

17 τ': τε I | 18 σκότος -- ὅλας post lin. 20 ante lin. 21 posuit Philippson | σκότος δὲ Steph. | 19 πέμψω ON: πέμψαι I | καὶ περισσὰ: καὶ περισσαὶ Dübner: αἳ πέριξ τὰ Steph. | 23 Φαρ. δὲ βασ.: βασιλεὺς Φαραὼ Philippson | 24 αὐτῷ Philippson | 25 post ταχύ (ante 26 πρὸς) verba περὶ δὲ τῆς θυσίας καὶ τῶν ἀζύμων ὁ θεὸς τῷ Μωσεῖ ὑποτίθεται add. ON | 26 καὶ πρὸς B | 27 Ὁ μεὶς I: ὁ μὶς ON (ὁ μεὶς N^{2mg}): ἡμεῖς B | ἡμῖν B | ἐνιαυτῶν ION: ἐνιαυτὸς B: ἐνιαυτοῦ Steph. | 29 ὕπεστιν B | 31 διχομήνια O | 32 τῆς ... νυκτὸς cj. Kuiper Snell | πρόσθεν B |

And fire will fall together and cause
men to die.[147]
Fruits and the bodies of beasts will die.[148]
And darkness I will impose for three whole days.[149]
[145] I will send locusts, and in abundance
Will they consume all foods and every
seedling's sprout.[150]
After all these things, I will kill
the firstborn of their children.[151]
I will put a stop to the pride of
these evil men.[152]
And king Pharaoh will not be persuaded by
anything I say,[153]
[150] Until he holds his firstborn son dead.[154]
And then, terrified, he will swiftly send
the people forth.[155]
To all the Hebrews together you will speak
these words:[156]
"This month will become the first of the
year for you;[157]
In this month I will lead the people to
another land
[155] Which I set aside for the fathers of the
Hebrew race."[158]
You will say to the entire people, "In the
month of which I speak,
At the full moon,[159] when you have sacrificed
the Passover to God,[160]
On the evening before, smear the door with blood[161]
So the deadly angel might pass over the sign."[162]

ὑμεῖς δὲ νυκτὸς ὀπτὰ δαίσεσθε κρέα. ⟦160⟧
σπουδῇ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐκβαλεῖ πρόπαντ' ὄχλον.
ὅταν δὲ μέλλητ' ἀποτρέχειν, δώσω χάριν
λαῷ, γυνή τε παρὰ γυναικὸς λήψεται
σκεύη κόσμον τε πάνθ', ὃν ἄνθρωπος φέρει, 443b
χρυσόν τε καὶ <τὸν> ἄργυρον ἠδὲ καὶ στολάς,
ἵν' ὧν ἔπραξαν μισθὸν ἀποδῶσι βροτοῖς. ⟦166⟧
ὅταν δ' ἐς ἴδιον χῶρον εἰσέλθηθ', ὅπως
ἀφ' ἧσπερ ἠοῦς ἐφύγετ', Αἰγύπτου δ' ἄπο
ἑπτὰ διοδοιποροῦντες ἡμέρας ὁδόν,
πάντες τοσαύτας ἡμέρας ἔτος κάτα ⟦170⟧
ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε καὶ θεῷ λατρεύσετε,
τὰ πρωτότευκτα ζῷα θύοντες θεῷ,
ὅσ' ἂν τέκωσι παρθένοι πρώτως τέκνα 443c
τἀρσενικὰ διανοίγοντα μήτρας μητέρων.'"

BION

38 σκεύη τε κόσμον θ' ὅλον cj. Snell | πάντα MSS | 39 χρυσόν τε καὶ <τὸν> ἄργυρον Mras: χρυσόν τε καὶ ἄργυρον MSS Dind.: χρυσοῦν τε καὶ ἀργυροῦν Steph.: χρυσοῦν τε κἀργυροῦν Philippson: χρυσοῦν τε κἀργύρειον Dübner: χρυσοῦν τε καὶ ἀργύρειον Wieneke | 39-40 ἠδὲ καὶ στολάς, | ἵν' ὧν ON: ἠδὲ στολάς, | ἵν' ὧν I: ἠδὲ καὶ στολάς | ἵν' ὧνπερ B: ἠδὲ (ἰδὲ Philippson) στολὰς, ἵνα | ἀνθ' ὧν Steph.: ἠδὲ καὶ στολὰς, ἵνα | ἀνθ' ὧν Dind.: τε καὶ στολάς, ἵνα | <ἀνθ'> ὧν Snell | ἀποδῶσι ION: ἀποδόσει B: ἀποδῶσιν edd. | 41 εἰς B | εἰσέλθη B | ὅπως: ὅσον Kannicht apud Snell | 42 δ' ἄπο: ἄπο Steph.: πέδον cj. Kuiper: νομὸν Münscher apud Wieneke | 43 ἑπτὰ διοδοιποροῦντες Steph.: ἑπτὰ δ' ὁδοιποροῦντες I: ἑπτὰ ὁδοιπ. BON: ἕπτ' <ἦτ'> ὁδοιποροῦντες Snell | ἡμερῶν Steph. | 46 τά τε Steph. | πρωτότοκα B | 47 ὃς I | ὅσα τ' ἂν Steph. | 48 μήτραν B | ματέρων Steph. |

⟦160⟧ In the night you will eat roasted flesh.[163]
In haste the king will send forth the
entire group.[164]
Whenever the people are destined to depart,
I will extend them favor,[165] and a woman shall
take from another woman,
Vessels and clothing of every kind, whatever
a person can carry,
⟦165⟧ The gold and silver, and the garments as
well,[166]
In order to repay those mortals for what they
did.[167]
Whenever you have entered into your own land,
Just as on that very morning on which you fled
and from Egypt
Made your way for seven days,[168]
⟦170⟧ Everyone for that same number of days each year
Will eat unleavened bread and worship God,[169]
Offering the first born of all living things
as a sacrifice to God,
Whatever male children mothers first bring
forth,
Those having opened their mothers' womb.'"[170]

Fragment Fourteen (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.13)

(13) Καὶ πάλιν περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ταύτης ἑορτῆς φησὶν ἐπεξεργαζόμενον ἀκριβέστερον εἰρηκέναι·

"'Ἀνδρῶν Ἑβραίων τοῦδε τοῦ μηνὸς λαβὼν [175]
κατὰ συγγενείας πρόβατα καὶ μόσχους βοῶν
ἄμωμα δεκάτῃ· καὶ φυλαχθήτω μέχρι
τετρὰς ἐπιλάμψει δεκάδι, καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέραν 443d
θύσαντες ὀπτὰ πάντα σὺν τοῖς ἔνδοθεν
οὕτως φάγεσθε ταῦτα· περιεζωσμένοι [180]
καὶ κοῖλα ποσσὶν ὑποδέδεσθε καὶ χερὶ
βακτηρίαν ἔχοντες. ἐν σπουδῇ τε γὰρ
βασιλεὺς κελεύσει πάντας ἐκβαλεῖν χθονός·

BION

1 ταύτης om. B | 2-3 ἐπεξ. -- εἰρηκέναι om. B | 2 ἐπεξεργαζόμενον (viz., Ezekiel) Steph.: -μενος ON: -μένης I | 4 λαβὲ Steph. | 7 προλάμψει cj. Snell | 8 ὀπτὰ: ἑπτὰ B | πάντα om. B | 9 οὕτω Steph. | ταῦτα I: πάντα BON | 10 κῶλα Dübner | ποσσὶν Steph.: ποσὶν MSS | ὑποδέδεσθε ON: ὑποδεδέσθαι B: ὑποδεδῆσθε I | χερὶ Steph.: χερσὶ MSS | 11 βακτηρίαν BI: -ίας ON | τε om. B | 12 πάντα B | ἐκβαλεῖν χθονός om. B |

Fragment Fourteen[171]

(13) (13) And again, concerning this same festival, he[172] says that the one who elaborates on this has spoken in greater detail:[173]

⟦175⟧ "'And on the tenth day of this month,
Let the Hebrew men according to families take unblemished
Sheep and young bulls.[174] And let the sacrificial animals be protected until
The fourteenth day dawns.[175] And towards evening,
When you have sacrificed them, eat them all in this way,
⟦180⟧ Roasted, with their inward parts.[176] And when you have girded your loins,
Bind up the sides of your feet, and in your hand
Hold a staff.[177] For in haste
The king will order all of you expelled from the land;[178]

κεκλήσεται δὲ πᾶς. καὶ ὅταν θύσητε δέ,
δέσμην λαβόντες χερσὶν ὑσσώπου κόμης [185]
εἰς αἷμα βάψαι καὶ θιγεῖν σταθμῶν δυοῖν,
ὅπως παρέλθῃ θάνατος Ἑβραίων ἄπο.
ταύτην δ' ἑορτὴν δεσπότῃ τηρήσετε,
| ἔφθ' ἡμέρας ἄζυμα· καὶ οὐ βρωθήσεται 444a
ζύμη. κακῶν γὰρ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγήσεται, [190]
καὶ τοῦδε μηνὸς ἔξοδον διδοῖ θεός·
ἀρχὴ δὲ μηνῶν καὶ χρόνων οὗτος πέλει.'"

BION

13 πάσχ', ὅταν Strugnell, *HTR* 60 (1967) 451 Snell | καὶ ὅταν: Χ̓ὅταν Gais.: Χ' ὅταν Dübner: ὅταν Dind. | δέ²: δεῖ Steph. | 14 δεσμὴν Steph. | λαβόντας Steph. | ὑσσώπου I: ὑσώπου ON: ὑσσώπω B | 14-15 κόμης εἰς: κομίσεις I | 15 θίγειν BI: θήγειν ON: θιγεῖν Gais. | 17 τηρήσεται B^{ac} (corr. B^{1}) O | 18 ἔφθ' Steph.: ἑπτὰ MSS | κοὐ Philippson: βρωθήσετα Viger | 19 ἀπαλλαγήσεται: ἀπαλλαγὴ ἔσσεται Steph.: ἀπαλλαγή (post γάρ ἐστι τῶνδ') Kuiper: ἀπαλλαγήν τε σοι Münscher apud Wieneke: ἀπαλλαγήσετε Gais. (homoeoteleuton βρωθήσεται cj. van der Horst) | 21 δὲ: δὲ καὶ B | οὗτος: οὕτω
σσ
ON^{ac}: οὕτω N^{2} |

Everyone will be summoned.[179] And when you have
sacrificed,
[185] Take in your hands a bunch of hyssop twigs,
Dip them in blood and smear the two door posts,
So that Death may pass the Hebrews by.[180]
Keep this feast unto the Lord
Seven days unleavened.[181] And there shall be
eaten no
[190] Leaven.[182] For they will be set free from
these evils,[183]
And in this month God will provide their
Exodus.[184]
This marks the beginning of their months and
seasons.'"[185]

Fragment Fifteen (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.14)

(14) πάλιν μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει· (14)

"Φησὶ δὲ καὶ 'Εζεκιῆλος ἐν τῷ δράματι τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ 'Εξαγωγή, παρεισάγων ἄγγελον λέγοντα τήν τε τῶν 'Εβραίων διάθεσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φθορὰν οὕτως·

''Ως γὰρ σὺν ὄχλῳ τῷδ' ἀφώρμησεν δόμων 444b
βασιλεὺς Φαραὼ μυρίων ὅπλων μέτα
ἵππου τε πάσης καὶ ἁρμάτων τετραόρων [195]
καὶ προστάταισι καὶ παραστάταις ὁμοῦ,
ἦν φρικτὸς ἀνδρῶν ἐκτεταγμένων ὄχλος.
πεζοὶ μὲν ἐν μέσοισι καὶ φαλαγγικοὶ
διεκδρομὰς ἔχοντες ἅρμασιν τόπους·
ἱππεῖς δ' ἔταξε τοὺς μὲν ἐξ εὐωνύμων, [200]
ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ πάντας Αἰγυπτίου στρατοῦ.

BION

2 'Εζεκιῆλος I: 'Εζεκῆλος BON | 3 ἐπιγραφομένῳ BON: ἐπιλεγομένῳ I | 'Εξαγωγή IO: 'Εξαγωγῇ BN | παρεισάγει B | 5 τὴν om. B | 6-8 'Ως -- τετραόρων om. B | 8 καὶ ἁρμάτων: κἀρμάτων Philippson: χ' ἁρμάτων Gais.: ἁρμάτων Steph. | τε τετραόρων Steph. | 10 ἦν πᾶσι φρικτὸς ἐκτεταγ. Steph. | ἀνδρῶν: om. I | 11 πεζοὶ μὲν ἐν μέσοισιν ἦν φαλλαγγικοί Kuiper (n.) | 12 διεκδρομὰς (cf. Dübner, *Praef.*, ix): διεκδρομῆς Steph. | 14 πάντας: τίνας Steph. | Αἰγύπτου E apud Wieneke Gais. |

Fragment Fifteen[186]

(14) (14) Again, after other material, he[187] adds:[188]

"And Ezekiel, in the drama entitled *The Exodus*,[189] introduces a messenger who relates the conditions of the Hebrews and the destruction of the Egyptians as follows:[190]

'For when King Pharaoh departed from home[191]
With his host of countless armed men,
[195] With all his cavalry and four-horsed chariots
Both in the front ranks and on each flank,[192]
The host of men arrayed in battle order was awesome.[193]
Now the footmen and phalanxes were in the middle,
Leaving passages for the chariots to pass through.[194]
[200] The cavalry he stationed on the left
While on the right he placed all the others of the Egyptian army.[195]

τὸν πάντα δ' αὐτῶν ἀριθμὸν ἠρόμην ἐγώ 444c
{στρατοῦ}·
μυριάδες <ἦσαν> ἑκατὸν εὐάνδρου λεώ{ς}.
ἐπεὶ δ' Ἑβραίων οὐμὸς ἤντησε στρατός,
οἱ μὲν παρ' ἀκτὴν πλησίον βεβλημένοι [[205]]
Ἐρυθρᾶς Θαλάσσης ᾖεσαν ἠθροϊσμένοι·
οἱ μὲν τέκνοισι νηπίοις δίδουν βορὰν
ὁμοῦ τε καὶ δάμαρσιν, ἔμπονοι κόπῳ·
κτήνη τε πολλὰ καὶ δόμων ἀποσκευή· [[209]]
αὐτοὶ δ' ἄνοπλοι πάντες εἰς μάχην χέρας 444d

BION

15 δ' αὐτῶν ἀριθμὸν Giff. Wieneke Mras Snell Jacobson: δ' ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν MSS Steph.: δ' ἀριθμὸν (ἠρόμην) αὐτῶν Kuiper: ἀριθμὸν δ' αὐτὸς Philippson: δ' ἀριθμὸν Gais. ὸν Dind. | αὐτῶν: αὐτῶν N^2 | 15-17 ἐγώ | στρατοῦ μυρ. ἑκ. εὐ. λεώς MSS Steph. Philippson Giff.: ἐγὼ στρατοῦ | μυρ. <εἰσὶν> ἑκ. εὐ. λεώς Gais.: ἐγὼ στρατοῦ | μυρ. <ἦσαν> ἑκ. εὐ. λεώ{ς} Dind.: ἐγώ {στρατοῦ} | μυρ. <ἦσαν> ἑκ. εὐ. λεώ{ς} Kuiper Wieneke Mras Snell Jacobson | 17 μυριάδες I: μυριάδε B: μυριάνδες ON^{ac}: μυριάχδες N^{pc} | <ἦσαν> Dübner (= *erant*) Kuiper: <εἶπεν> cj. Dübner | 18 οὐμὸς: ἡμῖν Steph.: ὁ ἐμός F apud Wieneke Kuiper | ἤντησε BON: ἤντη I | 20 ᾖεσαν: ἦεσαν MSS: ἦσαν Gais. (app. crit.) | ἠθροϊσμ. Gais. (app. crit.): ἠθροισμ. MSS | 21 ante lin. 21 post lin. 20 lin. 23 posuit Wieneke = lin. 20, 23, 21, 22, 24 | τέκνησι νηπίοις B: τέκνοισιν ἠπίοις I | ἐδίδουν B | 22 δήμαρσιν N | ἔγκοποι cj. Jacobson | 24 χέρας om. B: χερός Steph. |

I inquired about the total number of the
army.[196]
There were a million good men altogether.[197]
When our army encountered the Hebrews,
Some of them were lying near the edge
Of the Red Sea, gathered in groups.[198]
And the men, in trying to care for their young,
As well as for their wives, became exhausted
from exertion.[199]
They had countless flocks and household
goods.[200]
And as they were all unarmed for fighting,[201]

ἰδόντες ἡμᾶς ἠλάλαξαν ἔνδακρυν
φωνὴν πρὸς αἰθέρα τ' ἐτάθησαν ἀθρόοι,
θεὸν πατρῷον. ἦν πολὺς δ' ἀνδρῶν ὄχλος.
ἡμᾶς δὲ χάρμα πάντας εἶχεν ἐν μέρει.
ἔπειθ' ὑπ' αὐτοὺς θήκαμεν παρεμβολήν [215]
(Βεελζεφών τις κλῄζεται πόλις βροτοῖς).
ἐπεὶ δὲ Τιτὰν ἥλιος δυσμαῖς προσῆν,
ἐπέσχομεν, θέλοντες ὄρθριον μάχην,
πεποιθότες λαοῖσι καὶ φρικτοῖς ὅπλοις.
ἔπειτα θείων ἄρχεται τεραστίων [220]
| θαυμάστ' ἰδέσθαι. καί τις ἐξαίφνης μέγας 445a
στῦλος νεφώδης ἐστάθη πρὸ γῆς, μέγας,
παρεμβολῆς ἡμῶν τε καὶ 'Εβραίων μέσος.

BION

25-26 κἄνδακρυν | φωνὴν πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἐξέτειναν cj. Snell | 26 πρὸς αἰθερ' ἀπετάθησαν Strugnell *HTR* 60 (1967) 450, n. 3 | αἰθέρ', ἀνεβόησάν τ' ἀθρόοι Kuiper | τ' ἐτάθησαν Gais.: τε τάθησαν B: τ' ἐστάθησαν ON: τε ἐστάθησαν I | 27 πατρῴόν <τε> cj. Snell | ἦν πολὺς δ' Gais.: πολὺς ἦν δ' MSS: πολὺς δ' ἦν Steph.: πολὺς δ' ἔην Philippson: πολὺς ἔην δ' Dübner | ὄκνος Kuiper | 29 ἔπειθ': ἐκεῖθ' Kuiper | lin. 29 post lin. 30 posuit Kuiper | 30 Βεελζεφών τις: Βεελζεφόντης B: Βεελζεφώντις Steph. | 32-35 ὄρθριον -- ἰδέσθαι om. B | 33 ὄχλοις I^{ac}: ὅπλοις $I^{1}NG^{mg}O^{mg}$: ὄχλοις OG | 34 θεῖον Wieneke | τεράστιον Wieneke | 35 θαυμάστ' edd.: θαυμαστὰ MSS: θαῦμ' ἔστ' Münscher apud Wieneke | 36 πρὸ γῆς μέγας: πυριφλεγὴς cj. Kuiper: πρὸ ἡμέρας Stein, *Hermeneus* 9 (1936/37) 20 | μέγας: μέλας Dübner | 37 χ' 'Εβραίων Gais. |

When they saw us, they cried out, a tearful
Sound they raised in unison to heaven,
Their ancestral deity.[202] The crowd of people
was enormous.[203]
On our side, all of us were jubilant.[204]
Then, we pitched camp behind them
(At a certain Baal-Zephon, a city widely
acclaimed).[205]
Since Titan Helios was setting,[206]
We waited, since we wanted a morning battle,
Fully confident of our numbers and dreadful
arms.[207]
But then, divine wonders began to occur,
Incredible sights![208] Suddenly, a great
Pillar of cloud rose from the earth -- vast,
indeed! --[209]
Midway between our camp and that of the
Hebrews.[210]

κἄπειθ' ὁ κείνων ἡγεμὼν Μωσῆς, λαβὼν
ῥάβδον θεοῦ, τῇ δὴ πρὶν Αἰγύπτῳ κακὰ [225]
σημεῖα καὶ τεράατ' ἐξεμήσατο,
ἔτυψ' Ἐρυθρᾶς νῶτα καὶ ἔσχισεν μέσον 445b
βάθος θαλάσσης· οἱ δὲ σύμπαντες σθένει
ὥρουσαν ὠκεῖς ἁλμυρᾶς δι' ἀτραποῦ.
ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς ᾠχόμεσθα συντόμως [230]
κατ' ἴχνος αὐτῶν· νυκτὸς εἰσεκύρσαμεν
βοηδρομοῦντες· ἁρμάτων δ' ἄφνω τροχοὶ
οὐκ ἐστρέφοντο, δέσμιοι δ' ὡς ἥρμοσαν. 445c
ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ δὲ φέγγος ὡς πυρὸς μέγα
ὤφθη τι ἡμῖν· ὡς μὲν εἰκάζειν, παρὴν [235]
αὐτοῖς ἀρωγὸς ὁ θεός. ὡς δ' ἤδη πέραν

BION

38 κἄπειθ' ὁ κείνων: κἄπειθ' ὁ ἐκείνων I: κἄπειτ' ἐκείνων Philippson: καὶ ἔπειθ' ὁ κείνων Kuiper | 39 δὴ BI: om. ON | 40 τεράατ' Mras: τέρατα MSS: τεράστι' Gais. (app. crit.) | τέρατ' ἐξεμηχανήσατο Steph. | 41 καὶ ἔσχισεν Steph.: καὶ ἔσχισε MSS: κἄσχισεν Philippson: κ' ἔσχισεν Gais. | 43 ὥρουσαν BI: ὥρμησαν ON | 44-54 ἡμεῖς -- ἀρωγός om. B | 44 ᾠχόμεσθα O: ὠχόμεθα IN | συντόνως cj. Kuiper | 45 κατ' ἴχνος τ' αὐτῶν Steph. | εἰσεκύσαμεν I: εἰσεδύσαμεν Steph.: ἐν δ' ἐκύρσαμεν ? Kuiper |

Then, Moses, their leader, taking
[225] The rod of God with which he had previously
Poured out awful signs and wonders upon
Egypt,[211]
Struck the surface of the Red Sea and split it,
deep
In the middle;[212] And the whole host mightily
Rushed forward in full force through the path
of the salty sea.[213]
[230] And we immediately entered upon the same path,
On their tracks.[214] We entered at night
Shouting as we ran.[215] Suddenly, the wheels of
our chariots
Refused to turn, as if chains bound them.[216]
And from heaven a great flame, like fire,
[235] Appeared to us.[217] As far as we could guess,
there came
To them as their helper God.[218] And just as
they were already

ἦσαν θαλάσσης, κῦμα δ' ἐρροίβδει μέγα
σύνεγγυς ἡμῶν. καί τις ἠλάλαξ' ἰδών·
Φεύγωμεν οἴκοι πρόσθεν Ὑψίστου χέρας·
οἷς μὲν γάρ ἐστ' ἀρωγός, ἡμῖν δ' ἀθλίοις [240]
ὄλεθρον ἔρδει. καὶ συνεκλύσθη πόρος
Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης καὶ στρατὸν διώλεσε.'" 445d

BION

51 κύματ' Kuiper | 53 χερός Steph. | 54 τοῖς μὲν Steph. | 55 συνεκλύσθη I: συνεκλείσθη BON | 56 στρατὸν Steph.: πόρον MSS: στόλον Wieneke |

Well beyond the sea, great waves rushed in,
Closing around us.[219] And, someone, seeing
this, shouted,[220]
"Let us flee homeward before the hand of the
Most High![221]
〖240〗 For He is their helper, but on us
55 He wreaks destruction!"[222] The passageway of
the Red Sea
Closed over us and completely destroyed our
army."'"[223]

Fragment Sixteen (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.15-16a)

(15) καὶ πάλιν μετ' ὀλίγα· (15)

"'Εκεῖθεν ἦλθον ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ὡς αὐτός τε ὁ Δημήτριος λέγει καὶ συμφώνως τούτῳ ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος. μὴ ἔχοντα δὲ ὕδωρ ἐκεῖ γλυκύ, ἀλλὰ πικρόν, τοῦ θεοῦ εἰπόντος ξύλον τι ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν πηγὴν καὶ γενέσθαι γλυκὺ τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰς 'Ελεὶμ ἐλθεῖν καὶ εὑρεῖν ἐκεῖ δώδεκα μὲν πηγὰς ὑδάτων, ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ στελέχη φοινίκων. περὶ τούτων καὶ τοῦ φανέντος ὀρνέου 'Εζεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ 'Εξαγωγῇ παρεισάγει τινὰ λέγοντα τῷ Μωσεῖ περὶ μὲν τῶν φοινίκων καὶ τῶν δώδεκα πηγῶν οὕτως·

BION

2 ἦλθεν ἐκεῖθεν B | αὐτός τε om. B | 6 καὶ om. B | 7 'Ελεὶμ I: 'Ελιμ B: 'Ελεὶν ON | 8 ἑβδ. δὲ: καὶ ἑβδ. B | 10-23 'Εζεκιῆλος -- χορτάσματα om. B; cf. app. crit. Frg. 17, lin. 1-12. | 10 'Εζεκιῆλος I: 'Εζεκῆλος ON | 11 λέγ. τῷ Μωσεῖ I: τῷ Μωσεῖ λέγ. ON |

Fragment Sixteen[224]

(15) (15) And again, after a few things:[225]

"From there they traveled three days, as Demetrius himself says -- and the Holy Book agrees with this. But finding no sweet water there, only bitter water, as God had commanded, he threw a piece of wood into the spring and the water became sweet. From there they came to Elim and there they found twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees.[226] Concerning these things and the bird which appeared,[227] Ezekiel, in *The Exodus*,[228] introduces someone speaking to Moses about the palm trees and the twelve springs, as follows:[229]

(16) 'Κράτιστε Μωσῆ, πρόσχες, οἷον εὕρομεν (16)
τόπον πρὸς αὐτῇ τῇδέ γ' εὐαεῖ νάπῃ. [244]
15 | ἔστιν γάρ, ὥς που καὶ σὺ τυγχάνεις ὁρῶν, 446a
ἐκεῖ· τόθεν δὲ φέγγος ἐξέλαμφέ νυν
κατ' εὐφρόνης σημεῖον ὡς στῦλος πυρός.
ἐνταῦθα λειμῶν' εὕρομεν κατάσκιον
ὑγρὰς τε λιβάδας· δαφιλὴς χῶρος βαθύς,
20 πηγὰς ἀφύσσων δώδεκ' ἐκ μιᾶς πέτρας, [250]
στελέχη δ' ἐρυμνὰ πολλὰ φοινίκων πέλει
ἔγκαρπα, δεκάκις ἑπτά, καὶ ἐπίρρυτος
χλόη πέφυκε θρέμμασιν χορτάσματα.'" 446b

BION

13 πρόσσχες Kuiper | 14 πρὸς αὖλιν Kuiper | τῇδέ γ' εὐαεῖ Dübner: τῇδ' ἐπ' εὐαεῖ I: τῇδ' ἐπευνάει O: τῇδ' ἐπευνάι N: τῇδε εὐαεῖ Steph. | 15 ἔστιν Gais.: ἔστι ION | ἔστιν -- που: ὅθεν γάρ ἐστι Philippson | 15-16 ὁρῶν, ἐκεῖ· I: ὁρῶν· ἐκεῖ ON | 16 τόθεν I: πόθεν ON: τὸ θεοῦ cj. Kuiper | ἐξελάμψατο Giff. (app. crit.) | νυν Mras: νιν ION: νῷν cj. Jacobson | 17 κατ' εὐφρόνης ON: κατ' εὐφροσύνης I: κατ' εὐφρόνην Dübner: καὶ εὐφροσύνης Steph.: τῆς εὐφρόνης Philippson | 19 δαφιλὴς I: δαφιλὸς ON | 22 ἐπίρρυτος: κατάρρυτος Kuiper: περίρρυτος Wieneke | 23 χλόη πέφυκε Gais. (app. crit.): πέφυκε χλόη ION: πέφυκε χλοίη Dübner | θρέμμασι ON | οἷς θρέμ. Steph. |

(16) (16) 'Most Excellent Moses, notice what sort
of spot we have found
Near this same, indeed favorable vale.[230]
For it is where you can just now see.
[245] There! [231] From there a light shone forth,
indeed
A signal in the night, like a pillar of
fire.[232]
In this place we have found a shaded meadow
And well-watered streams.[233] The land is deep
and plentiful,[234]
Drawing twelve springs of water from a single
[250] rock,[235]
There are many strong palm trunks
Bearing fruit, ten times seven, and plentiful
vegetation
Produces fodder for the animals.'"[236]

Fragment Seventeen (Eusebius, *P.E.* 9.29.16b)

(16b) "εἶτα ὑποβὰς περὶ τοῦ φανέντος (16b) ὀρνέου διεξέρχεται·

'"Ετερον δὲ πρὸς τοῖσδ' εἴδομεν ζῷον ξένον,
θαυμαστόν, οἷον οὐδέπω ὥρακέ τις. [255]
διπλοῦν γὰρ ἦν τὸ μῆκος ἀετοῦ σχεδόν,
πτεροῖσι ποικίλοισιν ἠδὲ χρώμασι.
στῆθος μὲν αὐτοῦ πορφυροῦν ἐφαίνετο,
σκέλη δὲ μιλτόχρωτα, καὶ κατ' αὐχένων
κροκωτίνοις μαλλοῖσιν εὐτρεπίζετο. [260]

BION

5-18 [256-69]= Pseudo-Eustathius (*PG* [18] 729D)

BION

1-12 εἶτα -- κύκλῳ om. B; cf. app. crit. Frg. 16, lin. 10-23 | 4 οὐδεπώποτ' εἶδέ τις cj. Kuiper | 5 γάρ ἐστι Ps.-Eust. | αἰετοῦ Vig. 6-7 πτερ. -- ἐφαίν. [257-258]: πτεροῖς δὲ ποικίλοισιν ἅπερ χρώμασι | αὐτοῦ κέκασται σῶμα πᾶν. στῆθος μὲν οὖν | τὸ πρῶτον αὐτοῦ πορφυροῦν ἐφαίνετο [=257-259] Philippson | 6 πτεροῖς δὲ Ps.-Eust. | ἅπερ Philippson | χρώμασιν· | σῶμα αὐτοῦ κέκαυται Ps.-Eust. | 7 μὲν: μὲν οὖν Ps.-Eust. | φαίνεται Ps.-Eust. | 8 κατ' αὐχένων ION: κατ' αὐχένα Ps.-Eust. Steph. | 9 κροκωτίνοις I (κροκοπίνοις Ps.-Eust.): κροκωτοῖσι ON: κροκοπίνεσιν Philippson | μαλχοῖσιν I^{ac}: μαλλοῖσιν I^{1}: μαλοῖσιν ON | εὐτρεπίζεται Ps.-Eust. |

Fragment Seventeen[237]

(16b) (16b) "Then, farther down, he[238] describes the bird that appeared:[239]

'Near that place we saw another strange creature,

〚255〛 An amazing thing, as had never been seen before.[240]

5 For it was nearly double the length of an eagle,[241]

With wings of many colors, splendid indeed.[242]

Its breast appeared to be purple,[243]

Its legs red, its neck

〚260〛 Adorned with saffron-colored plumes.[244]

κάρα δὲ κοττοῖς ἡμέροις παρεμφερές, 446c
καὶ μηλίνῃ μὲν τῇ κόρῃ προσέβλεπε
κύκλῳ· κόρη δὲ κόκκος ὣς ἐφαίνετο.
φωνὴν δὲ πάντων εἶχεν ἐκπρεπεστάτην.
βασιλεὺς δὲ πάντων ὀρνέων ἐφαίνετο, [265]
ὡς ἦν νοῆσαι· πάντα γὰρ τὰ πτήν' ὁμοῦ
ὄπισθεν αὐτοῦ δειλιῶντ' ἐπέσσυτο,
αὐτὸς δὲ πρόσθεν, ταῦρος ὣς γαυρούμενος,
ἔβαινε κραιπνὸν βῆμα βαστάζων ποδός.'" 446d

5-18 [256-69]= Pseudo-Eustathius (*PG* [18] 729D)

BION

10 κοττοῖς Voss apud Philippson: κοίτης ION Ps.-Eust. | ἡμέροις Steph.: ἱμέροις ION: ἡμέρας Ps.-Eust. | παρεμφερής Ps.-Eust. Philippson | 11 -πεν ON | 12 κύκλῳ δὲ κόρῃσι Ps.-Eust.: κύκλῳ κόρῃσι Philippson | κόρρη B | ὃσ B | 13 εὐπρεπεδεστάτην Ps.-Eust. | 14 βασιλεύς τε Philippson | 15 ὥστε πτοῆσαι Philippson | ὡς I Ps. -Eust.: ὥστ' BON | πτήν' Steph.: πτηνὰ MSS | 16 δειλιῶντ' ἐπέσσυτο: δειλ. ἐπύσσετο B: δολιχεύοντες ἐπέσσυντο Ps.-Eust.: δολιχ. ἐπύσσετο Philippson | 17 πρόσθε Ps.-Eust. | γαβρούμενος B |

And its head resembled that of domesticated
cocks,[245]
And it gazed with a pupil, encircled in
yellow;[246]
The pupil itself appeared scarlet.[247]
It had the most extraordinary call of all the
others.[248]
[265] It looked like the king of all birds
(As was proved).[249] For all the birds
Followed together behind it, in fear,[250]
While it, like an exultant bull, marched
in front,[251]
Lifting its foot in a swift pace.'"[252]

Fragment Eighteen (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 64.29.6-30.1)

(6) ἐπέρχεταί δέ μοι καὶ ἐμμέτρως εἰπεῖν·
"Ὦ πᾶσιν ἀρχὴ καὶ πέρας κακῶν ὄφις,
σὺ τ' Ὦ βαρὺν τίκτουσα θησαυρὸν κακῶν
πλάνη τυφλοῦ ποδηγὲ ἀγνοίας βίου,
χαίρουσα θρήνοις καὶ στενάγμασι βροτῶν,
ὑμεῖς ἀθέσμους εἰς ὕβρεις ὁμοσπόρων
τὰς μισαδέλφους ὁπλίσαντες ὠλένας
Κάϊν μολῦναι φοινίῳ πρῶτον λύθρῳ
ἐπείσατον γῆν καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀκηράτων
πεσεῖν αἰώνων πρωτόπλαστον εἰς χθόνα
ὑμεῖς ἐτεκτήνασθε."
(30.1) Καὶ ὁ μὲν διάβολος οὕτως·

1-12 = Methodius, *de resurrectione* 1.37.6 (*GCS* [27] 279, lines 6-16).

MU (Epiphanius)
S (old Slavonic version of Methodius, *de resurr.*)

1 *μοι* om. U | *ἐν μέτρως* M: *ἐμμετρόν* S cj. Bonwetsch | *εἰπεῖν*: *τίκτειν* (ex *τι εἰπεῖν*) S; ergo <*τι*> *εἰπεῖν* cj. Bonwetsch | 2 *Ὦ*: *ὡς* U | *πάντων* S cj. Bonwetsch | *ὄφις*: *ὄφις ὄφις* M: *ὁ ὄφις* U: *φησι* S | 3 *σύ τ' Ὦ* Mendelssohn apud Holl: *οὐ τῶ* M: *οὕτω* U: *σὺ* vel *σὺ τὸν* S: *ἥ τ' Ὦ* Scaliger apud Bonwetsch | 4 *ποδηγὸς* Scaliger apud Bonwetsch | *ἀγνοίας* fort. corrupt. = *κ' ἀνόου* S cj. Bonwetsch | 6 *ὑμεῖς* om. S | 7 *ὠλένας* om. S | 8 *Κάϊν γὰρ* S | 9 *ἐπείσατον*: *ἔπισα τὸν* M: *ἐπείσατο* U: om. S | *τὸν* Petavius (= *PG*): *τῶν* MU | 10 *εἰς χθόνα*: *εἰς αἰῶνα* (*ἀιώναν* om.) S | 11 *ἐτεκτ.* Scaliger Petavius: *ἐτεκτήνασθαι* M: *ἐτεκτήνασθαι* U | 12 *καὶ* om. S |

Fragment Eighteen[253]

(6) (6) Now it occurs to me also to speak in meters:[254]

"O Serpent,[255] you who are in everything the beginning and end of evil,
You, the begetter of a veritable storehouse of evils,
Deceiver of the blind, leader of the life of ignorance,
Rejoicing in the laments and groanings of mortals --
For unlawful acts of violence against kindred
You equipped the arms bent on fratricide,
When you first persuaded Cain to defile the earth
With red-blooded gore, and when you contrived
For the first-formed of the undefiled ages to fall
To the earth."

(1) (30.1) So much for the devil.

ANNOTATIONS

1. In chapter 23, Clement begins his treatment of Moses, which extends through chapter 29, the end of Book I. His account draws on several sources, including Philo *V. Mos*, Eupolemus (Frg. 1 A; *FHJA* 1.112-113), and Artapanus (Frg. 3B; *FHJA* 1.218-219). Then occurs this selection from Ezekiel treating the education of Moses, after which Clement resumes summarizing the biblical account.

2. In *P.E.* 9.26 begins Eusebius' treatment of Moses. Drawing on Polyhistor, he first cites an excerpt from Eupolemus (9.26; Frg. 1B; *FHJA* 1.112-113), then a lengthy excerpt from Artapanus (9.27; Frg. 3; *FHJA* 1. 208-225), which summarizes the story of Moses from his birth until the period of the wilderness wanderings. Then Ezekiel's testimony is introduced (9.28), even though it again rehearses the birth of Moses and the flight to Midian. Except for two brief sections in which Polyhistor quotes Demetrius, one at the beginning (9.29.1-3; Frg. 3; *FHJA* 1.74-77), the other near the end (9.29.15; Frg. 4; *FHJA* 1.76-77), the entirety of chapter 29 consists of excerpts from Ezekiel. After Demetrius' excerpt which describes Moses' flight to Midian, the excerpts from Ezekiel take the story from Moses' experiences in the wilderness, including a dream experienced by Moses and interpreted by his father-in-law Raguel, the burning bush episode, Moses' return to Egypt, and the events surrounding the Exodus. After Demetrius' brief mention of the bitter water episode, Polyhistor gives Ezekiel's description of Elim, and finally of a spectacular bird commonly identified as the phoenix. Following this is a lengthy excerpt

from Eupolemus (9.30-34; Frg. 2B-3; *FHJA* 1.114-133), which summarizes events from the time of Moses down to the time of Solomon.

3. N.B. Polyhistor's use of Μώϋσον here and in line 8 (as throughout the Artapanus excerpt immediately preceding [*P.E.* 9.27.1-37 = Frg. 3; cf. *FHJA*, 1.208-25]); however, after his first citation of Ezekiel, who consistently uses Μω(υ)σῆν (Frg. 1B, line 38; Frg. 9, line 3; Frg. 15, line 38; Frg. 16, line 13), Polyhistor follows suit (Frg. 2, line 3; Frg. 6, lines 4 & 6; Frg. 8, lines 3 & 4; Frg. 10, line 2); cf. Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 524, n. on line 14.

4. Though Ἐζεκῆλος is read by ION (also Frg. 2B, line 2) and Ἐξεκίλος by B, Mras reads Ἐξεκιῆλος here, since it is consistently read by I subsequently (Frg. 6, line 2; Frg. 13, line 3; Frg. 15, line 2; Frg. 16, line 10); similarly, Clement (Frg. 1A, line 2). The headings are emended accordingly (cf. Frg. 1B, line 1; Frg. 6, line 1).

5. Ἀφ' οὗ δ' Ἰακὼβ γῆν λιπὼν Χαναναίαν (v 1).

On the shortening of the diphthong αι in Χαναναΐαν, in conformity to the free rules of Attic comedy, cf. Wieneke, 35-36, contra Gifford's emendation; also Kuiper, ad loc.

On the "inceptive δέ," cf. P. W. van der Horst, "Some Late Instances of Inceptive ΔΕ," *Mnemosyne* 32 (1979) 377-79.

6. κατῆλθ' ἔχων Αἴγυπτον ἑπτάκις δέκα | ψυχὰς σὺν αὑτῷ (vv 2-3).

ἑπτάκις δέκα ψυχὰς. MT Gen 46:26: "sixty-six souls" (excluding Jacob's daughters-in-law) accompanied Jacob to Egypt. MT Gen 46:27: the previously mentioned sixty-six plus Joseph, Joseph's two sons born in Egypt (Ephraim and

Manasseh, Gen 46:20), and Jacob himself, total seventy (שבעים). LXX Gen 46:26: "sixty-six souls" (*πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ ἑξήκοντα ἕξ*), excluding Jacob's daughters-in-law, came into Egypt. LXX 46:27 says that *nine* (*ψυχαὶ ἐννέα*) sons of Joseph came into Egypt. If these are added to the previously mentioned sixty-six, the total becomes seventy-five (*πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ οἴκου Ιακωβ αἱ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε*). Similarly, Acts 7:14 (*ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε*). Cf. Exod 1:5 (MT: 70; LXX: 75); Deut 10:22 (MT: 70; LXX: 70). Josephus *Ant* 2.7.4 ¶¶ 176-183, esp. ¶ 176 *ἑβδομήκοντα*. Also, cf. Philo *Migr Abr* 198-207, esp. 199-201; also 4QExod[a]; Jub 44:33-34 (70); *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 46:27 (70).

Read another way, MT Gen 46:26-27 presented a discrepancy: 66 persons in v 26 + Joseph's two sons in v 27 + Joseph himself = 69; thus, if Jacob is excluded, the total comes to 69. Accordingly, in one tradition, Jochebed, the daughter born to Levi in Egypt (Num 26:59), filled the gap. So *Ber.R.* 94:9: "R. Levi said in the name of R. Samuel b. Nahman: 'Can a man give his friend 66, then 3, then call them 70? But the extra one is Jochebed, who brought the number up in Egypt ... Jochebed was conceived in Canaan but born in Egypt ... She was born at the gates of Egypt'" (cited in Bowker, *Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 270).

On whether Ezekiel's "seventy" reflects his use of the Hebrew text, cf. Robertson, 808, n. b; also Kuiper, 241; Wieneke, 36. Conceivably, he is using a LXX textual tradition that had been corrected in light of the MT (e.g., Deut. 10:22); so, van der Horst, *JHP*, 21, n. 2. For full discussion, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 81-84.

7. *καὶ ἐπεγέννησεν πολὺν | λαόν* (vv 3-4).

LXX Exod 1:7 *οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ηὐξήθησαν καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο καὶ κατίσχυον*

σφόδρα σφόδρα, ἐπλήθυνεν δὲ ἡ γῆ αὐτούς. Also, cf. LXX Ps 104:24; Acts 13:17. For λαὸς πολύς, cf. Gen 50:20; also Num 21:6; Deut 9:2; Josh 17:14; Judg 7:2; etc. Also, cf. Deut 26:5, which contrasts the "few in number" (ἐν ἀριθμῷ βραχεῖ) who went down to Egypt and the populous nation that resulted (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐκεῖ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ καὶ μέγα).

ἐπιγεννάω not in LXX; on its relative rarity, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 12-13, 73.

On the populousness of the Jews, cf. Pseudo-Hecateus, Frg. 1.194 (cf. *FHJA* 1.309, 329, n. 26).

8. LXX Deut 26:6 ἐκάκωσαν ἡμᾶς οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι.

9. κακῶς πράσσοντα καὶ <u>τεθλιμμένον</u> (v 4).

LXX Exod 3:9 κἀγὼ ἑώρακα τὸν <u>θλιμμόν</u>, ὃν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι θλίβουσιν αὐτούς; also Deut. 26:7 κύριος ... εἶδεν ... τὸν <u>θλιμμὸν</u> ἡμῶν. Cf. Exod 4:31 εἶδεν αὐτῶν τὴν θλῖψιν.

10. ἐς ἄχρι τούτων τῶν χρόνων <u>κακούμενον</u> (v 5).

LXX Exod 1:11 ἵνα <u>κακώσωσιν</u> αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις (also 1:13). Also, cf. Exod 3:7; 5:22-23; also Deut 26:6; Josh 24:4. Cf. above, n. 15.

11. κακῶν ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν καὶ δυναστείας χερός. | ἰδὼν γὰρ ἡμῶν γέννναν ἄλις ηὐξημένην (vv 6-7).

ἄλις ηὐξημένην. LXX Exod 1:9-10 εἶπεν (Pharaoh) δὲ τῷ ἔθνει αὐτοῦ Ἰδοὺ τὸ γένος τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ μέγα πλῆθος καὶ ἰσχύει ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς· δεῦτε οὖν κατασοφισώμεθα αὐτούς, μήποτε πληθυνθῇ.

12. βασιλεὺς Φαραώ. Cf. Gen 40:17; 45:21 (Φαρ. βασ.); or, Φαρ. βασ. Αἰγύπτου (Gen 41:46; 47:5; Exod 3:10-11, 18-19; 6:11, 13, 27, 29; 14:8).

13. δόλον καθ' ἡμῶν πολὺν ἐμηχανήσατο | βασιλεὺς Φαραώ (vv 8-9).

δόλον ... ἐμηχανήσατο. Cf. Euripides *Ba* 805 *δόλιον εἷς με μηχανᾷ*. Cf. Wieneke, 39. LXX Exod 1:10a *δεῦτε οὖν κατασοφισώμεθα αὐτούς, μήποτε πληθυνθῇ*. LXX Exod 1:11 specifies the appointment of taskmasters: *καὶ ἐπέστησεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστάτας τῶν ἔργων, ἵνα κακώσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις*.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.8 *τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν ἀφαιρεῖν ἐπινοίαις ἀνοσιουργοῖς ἐμηχανᾶτο*, noted by Wieneke, 78, as an instance of possible dependence on Ezekiel.

14. *αἰκίζων* rare in LXX (*αἰκίζομαι* cf. 2 Macc 7:1, 13, 15; 8:28, 30; 3 Macc 5:42; 4 Macc 1:11; 6:16; *αἰκισμός* 2 Macc 8:17; 4 Macc 6:9; 7:4; 14:1; 15:19). On its use in the poetic tradition, cf. Wieneke, 42.

15. *τοὺς μὲν ἐν* <u>*πλινθεύμασιν*</u> | <u>*οἰκοδομίαις*</u> *τε βαρέσιν αἰκίζων βροτοὺς* (vv 9-10).

Cf. LXX Exod 1:14 *τῇ* <u>*πλινθείᾳ*</u>. *πλίνθευμα* not in LXX, but in tragic tradition (cf. Adespota Frg. 269a [Kannicht-Snell, *TrGF* 2.84, Aeschylus ?; cf. Wieneke, 40; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 185, n. 7). LXX Gen 11:3 *πλινθεύσωμεν πλίνθους*.

LXX Exod 1:11 *καὶ* <u>*ὠκοδόμησαν*</u> *πόλεις ὀχυρὰς τῷ Φαραω*. On the text-critical problem, cf. app. crit. and Wieneke, 41-42; Robertson, 808, n. f.

βαρέσιν. LXX Exod 1:13-14 describes the Israelites' hard service: *καὶ κατεδυνάστευον οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ισραηλ βίᾳ καὶ κατωδύνων αὐτῶν τὴν ζωὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς σκληροῖς, τῷ πηλῷ καὶ τῇ πλινθείᾳ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις, κατὰ πάντα τὰ ἔργα, ὧν κατεδουλοῦντο αὐτοὺς μετὰ βίας*. Also, Deut. 26:6 *οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ... ἐπέθηκαν ἡμῖν ἔργα σκληρά*. *βάρος* is rare in LXX (cf. *BAG*^{2}, 133). On its use in the poetic tradition, cf. Wieneke, 42.

16. <u>***πόλεις***</u> *τ'* <u>*ἐπύργου*</u> *σφῶν ἕκατι δυσμόρων* (v 11).

On Pharaoh's use of the Israelites to build cities, cf. LXX Exod 1:11 *καὶ ᾠκοδόμησαν* **πόλεις** *ὀχυρὰς τῷ Φαραω*. On *πόλεις τε πύργους*, cf. Gen 11:4 *πόλιν καὶ πύργου*; also 11:5, 8.

ἐπύργου. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 192; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 185, n. 192.

Mras adopts Sylburg's emendation: *τ' ἐπύργου* for *τε πύργους* (MSS Clem. L). Here *ἐπύργου* is understood as an inceptive imperfect (cf. Moule, *Idiom Book*, 9). *πυργοῦν* does not occur in LXX (*πύργος* Gen 11:4-5, 8 etc.). On *ἔκατι*, Dor. of *ἕκητι*, usually with genitive preceding, in tragic poets, cf. Wieneke, 43; also *LSJ*, 506. Neither form occurs in LXX, nor does *δύσμορος*; on the use of the latter in tragic poetry, cf. Wieneke, 43.

Since *τοὺς μὲν* in line 17 (v 9) has no counterpart in the succeeding lines, Kuiper proposes adding a line between lines 19 and 20: *ἄλλους δὲ τρύχων ποταμίοις ἐν χώμασιν*. His conjecture is based on the extra-biblical tradition reported in Josephus *Ant* 2.9.1 ¶ 203 that the Israelites were also forced to dig canals and build dikes. Cf. Robertson, 808, n. e.

17. *ἔπειτα κηρύσσει μὲν 'Εβραίων γένει | τἀρσενικὰ ῥίπτειν* **ποταμὸν** *ἐς βαθύρροον* (vv 12-13).

LXX Exod 1:22 *συνέταξεν δὲ Φαραὼ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ λέγων Πᾶν ἄρσεν, ὃ ἐὰν τεχθῇ τοῖς 'Εβραίοις, εἰς τὸν* **ποταμὸν** *ῥίψατε· καὶ πᾶν θῆλυ, ζωογονεῖτε αὐτό*.

Literally, "he announces to the nation of Hebrews (for them) to throw their male children into the deep-flowing river" (*κηρύσσειν* with the personal dative + infinitive; cf. *LSJ*, 949, s.v. III.3, e.g., Pindar *P*. 4.200). In this form, the responsibility for exposing the infant males clearly rests on the Hebrews themselves (apparently intensified in Clement, who reads *ἡμῖν* instead of *μὲν*; cf. app. crit.); similarly, *Jub*. 47:2;

probably Acts 7:19. Conceivably, "he issued a proclamation to throw the infant males of Hebrew descent into the deep-flowing river" (Robertson, 808, n. g), but this requires a forced interpretation of *Ἑβραίων γένει*. In Exod 1:22, it is the Egyptian people who are commanded by Pharaoh to throw the Israelite male infants into the Nile. Accordingly, Jacobson, *AJP* 98 (1977) 415-16, emends *γένει* to *γένη*, thus supplying a more natural subject for the infinitive; yet his translation (*Exagoge*, 51) requires *ῥίπτειν* to be understood in the passive sense: "he ordered that the Hebrew male children be cast into ..." Ezekiel's text may represent the conflation of Pharaoh's earlier order to the Hebrew midwives (Exod 1:15-20) and his subsequent, broader mandate to the Egyptian people (Exod 1:22); so, Robertson, 808, n. g.

Line 21 illustrates Ezekiel's fusion of the biblical tradition with the Greek poetic tradition: *ῥίπτειν ποταμὸν ἐς βαθύρροον* -- LXX Exod 1:22 *εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ῥίψατε*. Sophocles *Tr.* 559 *τὸν βαθύρρουν ποταμὸν Εὔηνον*. Cf. Wieneke, 43. *βαθύρροος/βαθύρους* does not occur in LXX.

Cf. Heb 11:23 *καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως*.

18. *ἐνταῦθα μήτηρ ἡ τεκοῦσ' <u>ἔκρυπτέ</u> με | τρεῖς μῆνας* (vv 14-15).

LXX Exod 2:2-3 *καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβεν καὶ ἔτεκεν ἄρσεν· ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀστεῖον ἐσκέπασαν αὐτὸ μῆνας τρεῖς. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἠδύνατο αὐτὸ ἔτι <u>κρύπτειν</u>* ...

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.9; Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.4 ¶ 218.

Cf. Heb 11:23 *πίστει Μωϋσῆς γεννηθεὶς ἐκρύβη τρίμηνον ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ*.

On whether Ezekiel's *ἔκρυπτε* reflects knowledge of the Hebrew text (so Gutman), cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 84-85.

On the "almost total lack of miraculous and

supernatural elements" in Ezekiel's account of Moses' birth, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 81, citing numerous examples to the contrary in other traditions.

19. *οὐ λαθοῦσα δὲ | ὑπεξέθηκε, κόσμον ἀμφιθεῖσά μοι* (vv 15-16).

LXX Exod 2:3 *ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἠδύναντο αὐτὸ ἔτι κρύπτειν, ἔλαβεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ θῖβιν ...*

Ezekiel omits the biblical motif of the papyrus basket (*θῖβις*), substituting instead the "ornamental covering" (*κόσμος*; in this sense, cf. Exod 33:5-6; 2 Sam 1:24; Jth 10:4; 12:15; Sir 6:30; 21:21; etc.). Also, cf. Menander *Epitr.* 28; Wieneke, 44.

On *ὑπεκτίθημι*, "exposing" an infant, cf. Libanius *Decl.* 34.14; *LSJ*, 1856. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.3 ¶ 10 *τὸν παῖδα ἐκτιθέασι*; also ¶ 11. On *ἐκτίθημι*, exposing a new-born child, cf. Euripides *Ion* 344-45; also Herodotus 1.112; other references in Wieneke, 44. Cf. also *POxy.* 4.744, letter from Hilarion (cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 167-70); Justin *Apol* 1.29; E. Weiss, "Kinderaussetzung," *PW* 11 (1921) 463-72. On the Greek literary motif of the exposed child who later rises to success, Robertson, 809, n. h, notes R. Lattimore, *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy* (London, 1964) 74, n. 21.

20. *παρ' ἄκρα ποταμοῦ λάσιον εἰς ἕλος δασύ* (v 17).

LXX Exod 2:3 *καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὴν (θῖβιν) εἰς τὸ ἕλος παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν*; 2:5 *καὶ αἱ ἄβραι αὐτῆς παρεπορεύοντο παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν· καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὴν θῖβιν ἐν τῷ ἕλει* ....

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.10 *ἐκτιθέασι παρὰ τὰς ὄχθας τοῦ ποταμοῦ*; 1.14 *ἐν τῷ δασυτάτῳ τῶν ἑλῶν*. Does this reflect Philo's dependence on Ezekiel? Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 195, n. 26. Contrast Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.4 ¶ 221 *καὶ κατὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*

βαλόντες; ¶ 224 αὕτη παίζουσα παρὰ τὰς ἠόνας τοῦ ποταμοῦ.

παρ' ἄκρα ποταμοῦ, perhaps "on the surface of the river" (cf. Plato *Phd.* 109 D τὰ ἄκρα τῆς θαλάσσης). The difficulty of ἄκρα is recognized as early as Stephanus, who proposes ὄχθην, "bank," as more appropriate with ποταμός (similarly, Philo; cf. above), though usually in plural (cf. Homer *Il.* 4.487 ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας; also, Aeschylus *Th.* 392; cf. *Pr.* 810; *LSJ*, 1281). On ἀκτὴν (Kuiper), used of river banks, cf. Pindar *I.* 2.42 Νείλου; cf. *LSJ*, 58. For detailed discussion of the various readings, cf. Wieneke, 44-45; also Kuiper, 242-43. On Wieneke's conjecture and the possible underlying Hebrew text, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 85.

λάσιον εἰς ἕλος δασύ, literally, "into the overgrown, bushy marsh." Robertson, 809, n. i., prefers βαθύ (Clement) as the more original reading, hence "in a deep bushy marsh," following Wieneke's suggestion, 45, that δασύ is likely a gloss on λάσιον, once βαθύ had been removed. Cf. Frg. 16, line 19 (v 249).

21. Μαριὰμ δ' **ἀδελφή** μου κατώπτευεν πέλας (v 18).

LXX Exod 2:4 καὶ κατεσκόπευεν ἡ **ἀδελφὴ** αὐτοῦ μακρόθεν μαθεῖν, τί τὸ ἀποβησόμενον αὐτῷ.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.12 μικρὸν ἄποθεν; Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.4 ¶ 221.

κατοπτεύειν, LXX hapax, cf. Esth 8:13 (=8:12d); also 2 Macc 15:21 R. πέλας, LXX hapax (Prov 27:2), but not as adverb, as it is often among tragedians, e.g., Aeschylus *Th.* 669. Cf. Wieneke, 46.

In the biblical account Miriam is not named until Exod 15:20-21; also cf. Num 26:59.

Stephanus' emendation μου (MSS ἡμῶν), adopted by Mras, is widely accepted in the editorial tradition. Cf. Robertson, 809, n. j.

22. κἄπειτα **θυγάτηρ** βασιλέως ἅβραις ὁμοῦ | κατῆλθε λουτροῖς χρῶτα φαιδρῦναι νέον (vv 19-20).

LXX Exod 2:5 κατέβη δὲ ἡ **θυγάτηρ Φαραω** λούσασθαι ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν, καὶ αἱ ἅβραι αὐτῆς παρεπορεύοντο παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν.

Ezekiel's use of ἅβρα, which is unattested prior to Menander (cf. Wieneke, 46; *LSJ*, 3), doubtless reflects his dependence on LXX (also cf. Gen 24:61), not the tragic tradition. However, his embellishment of LXX is clear; φαιδρύνειν, cited only in Al. Ps. 19 (20):4, is well attested among tragic, as well as other poets, e.g., Aeschylus *A.* 1108-9 πόσιν | λουτροῖσι φαιδρύνασα. Also, cf. Hesiod *Op.* 753-4 μηδὲ γυναικείῳ λουτρῷ χρόα φαιδρύνεσθαι ἀνέρα. Other e.g.'s cited in Wieneke, 47.

Some similarity between Ezekiel and Philo is evident, e.g., *V. Mos.* 1.14 κἄπειτα λουτροῖς. Instead of ἅβρα, however, Philo uses θεραπαινίς (1.14). In Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.5 ¶ 224, Pharaoh's daughter commissions "swimmers" (κολυμβητάς) to fetch the basket (κοιτίς).

νέον may be taken adverbially as "customarily"; so, Robertson, "as was her wont," cf. 809, n. k.

23. **ἰδοῦσα** δ' εὐθὺς καὶ λαβοῦσ' ἀνείλετο (v 21).

LXX Exod 2:5 καὶ **ἰδοῦσα** τὴν θῖβιν ἐν τῷ ἕλει ἀποστείλασα τὴν ἅβραν ἀνείλατο αὐτήν.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.14 ἀυτὸν θεάσασθαι καὶ κελεῦσαι προσφέρειν. Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.5 ¶ 224 καὶ φερόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ ῥεύματος θεασαμένη τὸ πλέγμα κολυμβητὰς ἐπιπέμπει κελεύσασα τὴν κοιτίδα πρὸς αὑτὴν ἐκκομίσαι.

In Ezekiel, the princess lifts the child, whereas in Exodus she commissions her maids to do so; similarly, Philo and Josephus. Cf. van der Horst, *JHP*, 21, n. 21, who notes Ezekiel's similarity with *Tg. Onq.*, *Tg. Ps.-J.*, and the

murals at Dura Europos; also the rabbinic debate, e.g., *b. Sotah* 12b.

Ezekiel's close dependence on LXX is reflected in his use of *ἰδοῦσα* and *ἀνείλετο*. Unlike LXX, however, Ezekiel provides no clear object for the verbs. Robertson, 809, n. 1, follows Clement, who reads *μ'* instead of the MSS *δ'*, hence "seeing me." Another solution is provided by Stephanus who takes *νέον* as the object of *ἰδοῦσα* (cf. app. crit.). Our translation follows Robertson; similarly, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 51.

24. *ἔγνω δ' Ἑβραῖον ὄντα* (v 22).

LXX Exod 2:6 *ἀνοίξασα δὲ ὁρᾷ παιδίον κλαῖον ἐν τῇ θίβει, καὶ ἐφείσατο αὐτοῦ ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραω καὶ ἔφη Ἀπὸ τῶν παιδίων τῶν Ἑβραίων τοῦτο.*

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.15 *γνοῦσαν δ' ὅτι τῶν Ἑβραίων ἐστι.* In Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.5 ¶¶ 225-26, Thermuthis does not immediately recognize the child as "a Hebrew"; rather, she is impressed with its "size and beauty" (*μεγέθους ... κάλλους*). Instead, the child's Hebrew identity is revealed to her by Miriam after unsuccessful attempts to find a wet nurse. In this sense, Josephus' account is more "rationalistic" than the account of instant identity in Exodus, Ezekiel, and Philo, an intriguing motif that prompted numerous Midrashic explanations (cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 77). If anything, Ezekiel intensifies the miracle, assuming *εὐθύς* also modifies the moment of recognition.

25. *καὶ λέγει τάδε | Μαριὰμ ἀδελφὴ προσδραμοῦσα βασιλίδι· | 'θέλεις τροφόν σοι παιδὶ τῷδ' εὕρω ταχὺ | ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραίων;'* (vv 22-25).

LXX Exod 2:7 *καὶ εἶπεν ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ τῇ θυγατρὶ Φαραω θέλεις καλέσω σοι γυναῖκα τροφεύουσαν ἐκ τῶν Εβραίων καὶ θηλάσει σοι τὸ παιδίον;*

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.16 *τὴν ἀδελφὴν τοῦ παιδὸς καθάπερ ἀπὸ σκοπῆς τὸν ἐνδοιασμὸν στοχασαμένην*

πυνθάνεσθαι προσδραμοῦσαν, εἰ βουλήσεται γαλακτοτροφηθῆναι τοῦτον παρὰ γυναίῳ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ κυήσαντι (noted by Wieneke, 78, as possible dependence on Ezekiel). In Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.5 ¶ 226, Thermuthis tries unsuccessfully to find a wet nurse whom the child will accept. Ostensibly happening by, Miriam explains that the child needs a nurse from its own people, then asks εἰ μέντοι τινὰ τῶν Ἑβραΐδων γυναικῶν ἀχθῆναι ποιήσειας, τάχα ἂν προσοῖτο θηλὴν ὁμοφύλου.

26. ἡ δ' ἐπέσπευσεν κόρην (v 25).

LXX Exod 2:8 ἡ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραω Πορεύου.

Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.5 ¶ 227 κελεύει τοῦτ' αὐτὴν ἐκπορίσαι καὶ τῶν γαλουχουσῶν τινὰ μεταθεῖν.

27. <u>μολοῦσα δ'</u> εἶπε <u>μητρὶ</u> καὶ παρῆν ταχὺ | αὐτή τε μήτηρ καὶ ἔλαβέν μ' ἐς ἀγκάλας (vv 26-27).

LXX Exod 2:8 <u>ἐλθοῦσα δὲ</u> ἡ νεᾶνις ἐκάλεσεν τὴν <u>μητέρα</u> τοῦ παιδίου.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.17 τὴν αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ βρέφους μητέρα παραγαγεῖν ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν. Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.5 ¶ 227 ἡ δὲ τοιαύτης ἐξουσίας λαβομένη παρῆν ἄγουσα τὴν μητέρα μηδενὶ γινωσκομένην.

On μολοῦσα, in poetic use, cf. Theodotus, Frg. 7, line 5; also annotations, n. 126.

Cf. Luke 2:28 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδέξατο αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας.

28. **εἶπεν δὲ θυγάτηρ** <u>βασιλέως</u>· Τοῦτον, γύναι, | τρόφευε, <u>κἀγὼ</u> **μισθὸν** <u>ἀποδώσω σέθεν</u> (vv 28-29).

LXX Exod 2:9 **εἶπεν δὲ** πρὸς αὐτὴν ἡ **θυγάτηρ** <u>Φαραω</u> Διατήρησόν μοι τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο καὶ θήλασόν μοι αὐτό, <u>ἐγὼ δὲ δώσω σοι</u> τὸν **μισθόν**. ἔλαβεν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἐθήλαζεν αὐτό.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.17 ἣν ἑτοιμότερον ἀσμένην ὑπισχνεῖσθαι πρόφασιν ὡς ἐπὶ μισθῷ τροφεύσειν. Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.5 ¶ 227 καὶ δεηθείσης τε τῆς

βασιλίδος πιστεύεται τὴν τροφὴν τοῦ παιδίου πρὸς τὸ πᾶν.

Like LXX, and in contrast to Philo and Josephus, Ezekiel has the king's daughter speak in direct discourse. Moreover, Ezekiel retains the LXX's basic sentence structure and vocabulary. Certain features Philo could have drawn from LXX, e.g., μισθῷ, yet τροφεύσειν echoes Ezekiel.

29. **ὄνομα δὲ** Μωσῆν ὠνόμαζε, τοῦ χαριν | ὑγρᾶς ἀνεῖλε ποταμίας ἀπ' ἠόνος (vv 30-31).

LXX Exod 2:10 ἀδρυνθέντος δὲ τοῦ παιδίου εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸ πρὸς τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω, καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτῇ εἰς υἱόν· ἐπωνόμασεν **δὲ** τὸ **ὄνομα** αὐτοῦ Μωυσῆν λέγουσα Ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος αὐτὸν ἀνειλόμην.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.17 εἶτα δίδωσιν ὄνομα θεμένη Μωυσῆν ἐτύμως διὰ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος αὐτὸν ἀνελέσθαι· τὸ γὰρ ὕδωρ μῶυ ὀνομάζουσιν Αἰγύπτιοι. Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.6. ¶ 228 Κἀπ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἐπίκλησιν ταύτην τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἔθετο εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ἐμπεσόντι· τὸ γὰρ ὕδωρ μῶυ Αἰγύπτιοι καλοῦσιν, ἐσῆς δὲ τοὺς σωθέντας· συνθέντες οὖν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τὴν προσηγορίαν αὐτῷ ταύτην τίθενται; also *Ag.Ap.* 1.31 ¶ 286.

Ezekiel's use of LXX is seen once again in his close adherence to the sentence structure of LXX Exod 2:10, his retention of the idiom ὄνομα ... ὠνόμαζε (MT ותקרא שמו; Cf. Euripides *Ion* 80, 800; Sophocles *Ph.* 605), also his use of ἀνεῖλε. Philo's use of ἀνελέσθαι cannot be regarded as a clear echo of Ezekiel, since he virtually reproduces ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος αὐτὸν ἀνειλόμην (Exod 2:10b) from LXX.

In the biblical account, the naming of Moses does not occur until after a period of growth and his mother formally hands him over to Pharaoh's daughter (MT & LXX Exod 2:10). In both Ezekiel and Philo the order is reversed (cf. Frg. 2, lines 4-10 [vv 32-38]; *V. Mos.* 1.17-19; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 77) -- another instance in which Philo resembles

Ezekiel. Similarly, Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.6-7 ¶¶ 228-37 mentions Moses' naming before giving his highly embellished description of his growth and development, complete with childhood legends.

Ezekiel is distinguished from both Philo and Josephus in adhering more closely to the biblical basis for the etymology of Moses' name, which is based on the Hebrew משה, "draw out" (so, Robertson, 809, n. m). In this case, the key term in both Ezekiel and Exodus is ἀναιρέω, whereas Philo and Josephus seize on the Egyptian term for water μῶυ. On the etymology of Moses, cf. R. F. Johnson, "Moses," *IDB* 3 (1962) 440-50, esp. 443 (sect. 2c); also Wieneke, 49, n. 42.

Cf. Artapanus, Frg. 3, ¶ 3; *FHJA* 1.208-209; annotations, 231, n. 42.

In the translation, I have supplied "me" as the understood object throughout. Kuiper is more explicit in supplying μ' (cf. app. crit.).

30. This excerpt from Clement continues where Frg. 1A left off. Thus, Frgs 1A and 1B constitute a single quotation in Clement. Cf. above, n. 1 for the literary context.

31. This excerpt from Eusebius continues where Frg. 1B left off. Mras's punctuation and typestyle indicate his belief that Eusebius continues to quote directly from Polyhistor. Cf. below, n. 32.

32. It is not clear whether the subject of ἐπιλέγει is Polyhistor or Ezekiel. Our translation renders Mras's text, and in a sense leaves it ambiguous. As already noted (cf. above, n. 31), Mras attributes the entire introductory summary to Polyhistor (followed by Vogt, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 122, n. on 31a) and thus implies that the subject of ἐπιλέγει is Ezekiel (even though introducing his name in the next line seems redundant).

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 195, n. 34, convincingly suggests that *τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει* be attributed to Eusebius and the rest of the introductory summary to Polyhistor. He notes that the language is more typical of Eusebius than Polyhistor and cites numerous supporting references, e.g., the following introductory phrase (which Mras attributes to Eusebius) used to introduce Ezekiel material : *πάλιν μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει* (*P.E.* 9.14.1 = Ezekiel, Frg. 15, line 1); also, cf. *οἷς μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων* (9.19.4 = Demetrius, Frg. 1; cf., *FHJA* 1.62-63).

Accordingly, the introductory paragraph would be translated as follows: (Eusebius) After some other remarks, he (Polyhistor) says in connection with these things: "And concerning these matters Ezekiel in his tragedy (speaks), introducing Moses saying: ..."

If, however, Mras is correct in attributing the introductory paragraph to Polyhistor and making Ezekiel the subject of *ἐπιλέγει*, the phrase "some other remarks" (*ἕτερα*) suggests that there was intervening poetic material between Frg. 1B, line 39 (v 31) and Frg. 2B, line 4 (v 32). And yet the biblical account does not relate any intervening events. Also, in the excerpt quoted by Clement, v 32 follows v 31 without any intervening material. The omission of the introductory summary by B (cf. app. crit.) may be an acknowledgement of the problem, although this is difficult to judge because of the frequent omission, often of large sections, in B (cf. Kuiper, 244, citing Heikel). Possibly Ezekiel has omitted portions of the poem relating legends about Moses' childhood (cf., e.g., Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.6-7 ¶¶ 230-37; [CRH: also check midrash on Exod 2:10 - LCL refers to this]). So, Robertson, 809, n. n. In particular, Exod 2:9 *ἔλαβεν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἐθήλαζεν αὐτό* may have provided the occasion for Ezekiel to expand

the image of Jochebed as loving mother; so, Kuiper, 244; cf. Jacobson, 77.

33. ἐπεὶ δὲ καιρὸς νηπίων παρῆλθέ μοι (v 32).

LXX Exod 2:9b-10 ἔλαβεν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἐθήλαζεν αὐτό. 10a ἀδρυνθέντος δὲ τοῦ παιδίου.

34. ἦγαγέ με μήτηρ βασιλίδος πρὸς δώματα (v 33).

LXX Exod 2:10 εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸ πρὸς τὴν θυγατέρα Φαραω, καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτῇ εἰς υἱόν.

Philo *V. Mos.* 1.19 σπάσασα εὐνοίας υἱὸν ποιεῖται. Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.7 ¶ 232 ὄντα δ' αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ Θέρμουθις παῖδα ποιεῖται γονῆς γνησίας οὐ μεμοιραμένη.

35. ἅπαντα μυθεύσασα καὶ λέξασά μοι | γένος πατρῷον καὶ θεοῦ δωρήματα (vv 34-35).

Receiving instruction from his mother about his ancestral heritage is an unbiblical detail, as are the few lines that follow.

γένος πατρῷον. Cf. Acts 7:19 τὸ γένος ἡμῶν ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν τοῦ ποιεῖν ...; also Gal 1:14 ἐν τῷ γένει μου. On the frequency of πατρῷον among tragedians, cf. Wieneke, 51, with examples.

δωρήματα. Cf. Frg. 9, line 12 (v 106).

36. ἕως μὲν οὖν τὸν παιδὸς εἶχομεν χρόνον, | τροφαῖσι βασιλικαῖσι καὶ παιδεύμασιν (vv 36-37).

Cf. Plato *Alc.* 1.122B τροφήν τε καὶ παιδείαν; also *Lg.* 11.926E; Wieneke, 52.

On the formula γεγεννημένος ... ἀνατεθραμμένος ... πεπαιδευμένος (Acts 22:3), cf. W. C. van Unnik, "Tarsus or Jerusalem: the City of Paul's Youth," in *Sparsa Collecta I* (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 259-320, esp. 274ff.

The biblical account does not discuss Moses' education and manner of upbringing in Pharaoh's house, except to note that he "grew up" (LXX Exod 2:11 μέγας γενόμενος; = Heb 11:24).

Philo's description of Moses' education echoes Ezekiel; cf. *V. Mos.* 1.8 *τροφῆς δ' ἠξιώθη βασιλικῆς* (as noted by Wieneke, 78); 1.20 *τροφῆς οὖν ἤδη βασιλικῆς καὶ θεραπείας ἀξιούμενος*; cf. 1.20-31 for Philo's elaborate description of the precocious Moses' education and development, especially his emphasis on its *Egyptian* character. (On Philo's description of Moses' curriculum and its Platonic roots, cf. Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*, 111-12.) Similarly, Acts 7:22 *καὶ ἐπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων*. Contrast Artapanus' portrait of Moses as teacher and cultural benefactor of the Egyptians (Frg. 3.3-6 [*FHJA* 1.208-211]); similarly, Artapanus' portrait of Abraham (Frg. 1 [*FHJA* 1.204-205]); on which, cf. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 80-81, and generally 71-96.

Josephus is less explicit about the Egyptian origin of Moses' education; cf. *Ant.* 2.9.7 ¶ 236 *ἐτρέφετο οὖν πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας τυγχάνων*; 2.10.1 ¶ 238 *γεννηθείς τε καὶ τραφεὶς καὶ παρελθὼν εἰς ἡλικίαν*.

In *Jub.* 47:9, after being brought to Pharaoh's daughter, Moses is taught to write by his father. On whether this may be a corrective attempt intended to stress the Hebrew, as opposed to the Egyptian, character of Moses' education, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 78.

37. *ἅπανθ' ὑπισχνεῖθ', ὡς ἀπὸ σπλάγχνων ἐῶν· | ἐπεὶ δὲ πλήρης κόλπος ἡμερῶν παρῆν* (vv 38-39).

LXX Exod 2:11a *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταῖς πολλαῖς ἐκείναις μέγας γενόμενος Μωυσῆς* ...

On the problematic *κόλπος*, literally "womb" (*LSJ*, 974), cf. Wieneke, 52-53. Perhaps "full *space* of days" retains the basic metaphor. Kuiper, 245, *κύκλος*, citing Euripides *Or.* 1645; *Hel.* 112; followed by Robertson, 809, n. q, hence "circle of days ... being full." Cf. app. crit.

On whether *ἐπεὶ ... παρῆν* reflects an

underlying Hebraism (Wieneke), cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 85, who is unconvinced.

38. ἐξῆλθον οἴκων βασιλικῶν (v 40).

LXX Exod 2:11 ἐξήλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ισραηλ.

ἐξῆλθον - in the ordinary sense of going out of the palace to go about his princely activities or as a more emphatic departure symbolizing the cutting of his ties with the king's house? Probably the latter, in light of the previous line, which seems to mean, "When I came of age"; "when I became an adult" (Jacobson). Similarly, Heb. 11:24 ἠρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ. Cf. *Jub.* 47:10.

Rather than reporting a formal "departure" from Pharaoh's house, Josephus relates the story of Moses' defeat of the Ethiopians (*Ant.* 2.10.1-2 ¶¶ 238-53). Nevertheless, the episode appears to have the same function: to signal Moses' transition from Egyptian prince to Jewish hero.

39. (πρὸς ἔργα γὰρ | θυμός μ' ἄνωγε καὶ τέχνασμα βασιλέως) (vv 40-41).

θυμός μ' ἄνωγε. Frequent in Homer, usually in present sense, "my spirit bids, prompts me." Cf. *Il.* 18.90; 19.102; 24.198; *Od.* 16.466; 21.194; past sense in *Il.* 5.805; *Od.* 3.35. *LSJ*, 169; Wieneke, 53.

40. (πρὸς ἔργα γὰρ | ... καὶ τέχνασμα βασιλέως) (vv 40-41).

The sense seems to be that in his coming of age, he began to realize the true nature and extent of the king's oppressive measures against the Israelities (Robertson, 809, n. r); so, Philo *V. Mos.* 1.33-40. Or, if τέχνασμα, "artifice," "trick" (*LSJ*, 1785, citing this passage et al.), hence rendered here as "wiles" (perhaps "king's trick")

recalls Pharaoh's "sinister strategy" mentioned earlier (Frg. 1, lines 16-17 = vv 8-9), it would mean that he finally became aware of the circumstances of his birth.

The less dramatic interpretation is mentioned (and rejected) by Robertson: "I left the royal house (impelled by my heart to acts and deeds befitting a king)." Cf. his full discussion, 809-810, n. r.

41. Lines 16-30 (vv 42-58) amplify Exod 2:11-15.

ὁρῶ δὲ πρῶτον ἄνδρας ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ, | τὸν μέν γ' Ἑβραῖον, τὸν δὲ γένος Αἰγύπτιον (vv 42-43).

LXX Exod 2:11b καταναοήσας δὲ τὸν πόνον αὐτῶν ὁρᾷ ἄνθρωπον Αἰγύπτιον τύπτοντά τινα Εβραῖον τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ.

ὁρῶ ... ἄνδρας. Cf. LXX Exod 2:13 ὁρᾷ δύο ἄνδρας. πρῶτον. cf. LXX Exod 2:13 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ.

ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ. In emending the MSS reading νομαῖς to νόμῳ, Stephanus brings the text into closer conformity with established usage, e.g., Herodotus 8.89 μὴ ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ (νομῷ ? *LSJ*, 1983, II.6.d) ἀπολλύμενοι, "not dying *in action*" (*LSJ*); Polybius 1.57.8 τοὺς ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ περιπεσόντας, "those who fell *in hand-to-hand fighting*" (LCL); also Polybius 1.34.5; 82.2; 3.63.5; 3.116.9; 5.111.6; 11.2.1; Aeschines 1.5; also *SIG*^{3} 167.37 (Mylasa, 4th cent. B.C.E.); cf. Herodotus 9.48; Aristotle *Pol*. 1285^{a}10; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 6.26.2 (*LSJ*, 1180, νόμος, I.1e; 1983-84, χείρ, II.6.d; Wieneke, 53). Even so, ὁρῶ ... ἄνδρας ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ is unusual without a defining verb; so, Kuiper, 245. Thus, "I saw men (going at it) hand-to-hand"; perhaps "taking the law into their own hands"? Robertson, 810, "locked in strife, at odds"; Jacobson, 53, "fighting"; Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 123, "in einem Händel."

The MSS reading, however, is supported by *SIG*^{3}

700.29, 2nd cent. B.C.E. inscription from Lete in Macedonia: *καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς ἀπέκτεινεν*; also, 2 Macc 5:14 *ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς* (*v.l. νόμοις*); cf. 3 Macc 1:5 *τοὺς ἀντιπάλους ἐν χειρονομίαις διαφθαρῆναι*. According to *LSJ*, 1179, *νομή*, IV, *ἐν χειρῶν νομαῖς* = *ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ*, citing *SIG*^{3} 700.29. Cf. Snell, *TrGF* 1.290, app. crit. on v 42; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 196, n. 39

As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 79, observes, Ezekiel's depiction of "two men fighting, one a Hebrew, the other an Egyptian" neutralizes the blame. By contrast, other traditions either confirm or expand the biblical account which places the blame squarely on the Egyptian who is "beating the Hebrew" (Exod 2:11). *Jub.* 47:10-12 follows the biblical account. Expansions include Philo *V. Mos.* 1.43-44, which vilifies the Egyptian (the episode is freely allegorized in *Leg. All.* 3.37-39; *Fuga* 147-48); also Acts 7:24, which especially exonerates Moses; similarly, midrashic accounts of Exod 2:11; on which cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 196, n. 42; Ginzberg, *Legends* 2.278-82. Josephus, *Ant.* 2.11.1 ¶ 255, notes Pharaoh's intention to murder Moses, but omits the latter's murder of the Egyptian altogether, substituting instead his defeat of the Ethiopians (¶¶ 238-53); also omitted in Heb 11:23-28, although v 27 mentions the king's anger. In Artapanus, Frg. 3.7-18, Moses kills Chanethothes in self-defense. The story is probably a reinterpreted version of Exod 2:11-15; cf. *FHJA* 1.238, n. 75; Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*, 219, n. 116; also Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 196, n. 41.

On the text-critical problem of line 15 (v 43), cf. Wieneke, 53.

42. *ἰδὼν δ' ἐρήμους καὶ παρόντα* <u>μηδένα</u> | *ἐρρυσάμην ἀδελφόν* (vv 44-45).

LXX Exod 2:12 *περιβλεψάμενος δὲ ὧδε καὶ ὧδε οὐχ ὁρᾷ* <u>*οὐδένα*</u>.

Cf. Acts 7:24 *καὶ ἰδών τινα ἀδικούμενον ἠμύνατο καὶ ἐποίσεν ἐκδίκησιν τῷ καταπονουμένῳ.*

ἰδὼν ἐρήμους. cf. Euripides *Med.* 604. Wieneke, 54. On *μηδένα* instead of *οὐδένα*, cf. Wieneke, 54, n. 46; Jacobson, 196, n. 38. *ἐρρυσάμην*. cf. LXX Exod 2:17, 19. Wieneke, 54.

43. *ὃν δ' ἔκτειν' ἐγώ, | ἔκρυψα δ' ἄμμῳ τοῦτον, ὥστε μὴ εἰσιδεῖν | ἕτερόν τιν' ἡμᾶς κἀπογυμνῶσαι φόνον* (vv 45-47).

LXX Exod 2:12b *καὶ πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἄμμῳ*.

Philo *V. Mos.* 1.44 *τούτων ἕνα τὸν βιαιότατον ...ἀναιρεῖ δικαιώσας εὐαγὲς εἶναι τὸ ἔργον*. Cf. Acts 7:24 *πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον*.

On Clement's use in his summary (cf. Frg. 2A, line 5) of the more poetic form *φάμμος*, cf. Robertson, 810, n. t. Note, however, that it is a corrected form (cf. app. crit. on Frg. 2A).

On Jacobson's observation that Ezekiel's portrayal of this event reverses the usual pattern of interpretation which vilifies the Egyptian and exonerates Moses, note *φόνος*, which seems to imply an even harsher judgment against Moses. If so, it intensifies the image of him as tragic hero; cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 196, n. 43; also Robertson, 810, n. t, noting its conforming to Aristotle *Po.* 13.5.

44. *τῇ 'παύριον δὲ πάλιν ἰδὼν ἄνδρας δύο, | μάλιστα δ' αὐτοὺς συγγενεῖς, πατουμένους* (vv 48-49).

LXX Exod 2:13 *ἐξελθὼν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δευτέρᾳ ὁρᾷ δύο ἄνδρας Εβραίους διαπληκτιζομένους. τῇ 'παύριον*. Cf. LXX Gen 30:33; Exod 9:6; 18:13. Wieneke, 55.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 79-80, contrasts Ezekiel's *ἄνδρας δύο ... συγγενεῖς* with the more explict LXX *δύο ἄνδρας Εβραίους*, observing that nothing in these or the subsequent lines requires them to be

identified as Hebrews. For example, the explicit question in LXX Exod 2:14b becomes rephrased by Ezekiel (lines 23-25 = vv 51-53) so that the identity of the questioner is veiled. Thus a Jewish audience, knowing the biblical storyline, could see the pair as Jews, whereas an Egyptian audience could as easily regard them as Egyptians. Accordingly, Ezekiel's version would not only have wider appeal but also resolve certain difficulties in the text, e.g., why a fellow Jew would tell on Moses.

Contrast Acts 7:25-28, which identifes the quarrelers as not only themselves "brothers" (ἀδελφούς), but as Moses' "brothers"; also v 28 retains the explicit form of the question in Exod 2:14b.

On the text-critical problem of πατουμένους, cf. Kuiper, 245-46; Wieneke, 55.

45. λέγω· Τί **τύπτεις** ἀσθενέστερον σέθεν; (v 50).

LXX Exod 2:13b καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀδικοῦντι Διὰ τί σὺ **τύπτεις** τὸν πλησίον;

Acts 7:26 ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε· ἱνατί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους;

46. ὁ δ' **εἶπεν**· Ἡμῖν **τίς σ'** ἀπέστειλε κριτὴν | ἢ ἐπιστάτην ἐνταῦθα; **μὴ** κτενεῖς **σύ με**, | ὥσπερ τὸν **ἐχθὲς** ἄνδρα; (vv 51-53).

LXX Exod 2:14 ὁ δὲ **εἶπεν** **Τίς σε** κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν; **μὴ** ἀνελεῖν **με** σὺ θέλεις, ὃν τρόπον ἀνεῖλες **ἐχθὲς** τὸν Αἰγύπτιον;

ἐπιστάτην. Cf. LXX Exod 1:11 καὶ ἐπέστησεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστάτας τῶν ἔργων. Wieneke, 55 (also discusses difference between Ezekiel's κριτήν and LXX δικαστήν). As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 80, notes, Ezekiel's ἄνδρα veils the identity of LXX τὸν Αἰγύπτιον.

Acts 7:27-28 ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπών· Then follows LXX Exod 2:14 verbatim.

47. καὶ δείσας ἐγὼ | ἔλεξα· Πῶς ἐγένετο συμφανὲς τόδε; (vv 53-54).

LXX Exod 2:14b ἐφοβήθη δὲ Μωυσῆς καὶ εἶπεν Εἰ οὕτως ἐμφανὲς γέγονεν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο;

48. καὶ πάντα βασιλεῖ ταῦτ' ἀπήγγειλεν ταχύ· | ζητεῖ δὲ Φαραὼ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν λαβεῖν (vv 55-56).

LXX Exod 2:15 ἤκουσεν δὲ Φαραω τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο καὶ ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν Μωυσῆν.

Robertson, 810, n. v, adopts Kuiper's reading ἀπηγγέλη, hence "all this *was* soon *reported*," as preferable to Stephanus' solution: emending καὶ to τίς, thus supplying a subject for ἀπήγγειλεν (cf. app. crit.). Cf. Wieneke, 56.

Stephanus' proposal has the effect of obscuring even further the identity of the person who squealed on Moses. As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 80, notes, the biblical text implies that it must have been a fellow Hebrew, which posed a problem for later interpreters.

ζητεῖ ... τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν λαβεῖν. cf. LXX Exod 4:19 τεθνήκασι γὰρ πάντες οἱ ζητοῦντές σου τὴν ψυχήν. Wieneke, 56.

49. ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας ἐκποδὼν μεθίσταμαι | καὶ νῦν πλανῶμαι γῆν ἐπ' ἀλλοτέρμονα (vv 57-58).

LXX Exod 2:15b ἀνεχώρησεν δὲ Μωυσῆς ἀπὸ προσώπου Φαραω καὶ ᾤκησεν ἐν γῇ Μαδιαμ.

ἐκποδὼν μεθίσταμαι. Cf. Euripides *Ph.* 40. Kuiper, 246; Wieneke, 57. ἀλλοτέρμων hapax Ezekiel (*LSJ*, 70); on its similarity to ἀγχιτέρμων, cf. Kuiper, 246; Wieneke, 57. γῆν ἐπ' ἀλλοτέρμονα. cf. LXX Exod 2:22; 18:3 ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ (= Acts 7:6; also cf. Gen 15:13 ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ).

Acts 7:29 ἔφυγεν δὲ Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ καὶ ἐγένετο πάροικος ἐν γῇ Μαδιάμ, οὗ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς δύο.

50. This fragment follows Frg. 2 without any intervening material in Eusebius. It continues as a direct quotation from Polyhistor. Thus the introductory formula is Polyhistor's while the line of poetry quoted comes from Ezekiel himself. There appears to be some poetic material omitted between the single line quoted here (v 59) and the concluding verse of the previous fragment (v 58), but it is not clear how much. Perhaps the omitted material included a description of the well (Exod 2:15), which is otherwise unmentioned in connection with the watering of the animals (cf. Frg. 5). For the general literary context of the fragment, cf. above, n. 2.

51. I.e., "Reuel" (Exod 2:18 MT רעוּאל LXX Ραγουηλ). Since the name does not occur in the poetic lines attributed to Ezekiel, this appears to be Polyhistor's own identification, although in his summary of Demetrius (which follows shortly after this in *P.E.* 9.29.1-3) Raguel is identified as the grandfather of Zipporah. Cf. Demetrius, Frg. 3.1 (*FHJA* 1.74-75, 88, nn. 69 & 73 for a discussion of Raguel's various names and their attendant problems); also Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 527, n. in app. crit.; Robertson, 810, n. w.

In Artapanus, Frg. 3.19, however, Moses is said to have married Raguel's daughter (cf. *FHJA* 1.214-217, 238, n. 76).

52. I.e., Ezekiel.

53. ὁρῶ δὲ ταύτας ἑπτὰ παρθένους τινάς (v 59).

LXX Exod 2:16 τῷ δὲ ἱερεῖ Μαδιαμ ἦσαν ἑπτὰ θυγατέρες ποιμαίνουσαι τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν Ιοθορ.

Philo *V. Mos.* 1.52 ἑπτὰ κόραι. Josephus *Ant.* 2.10.2 ¶ 258 ἑπτὰ παρθένοι ἀδελφαί.

54. This fragment follows the preceding fragment in Eusebius without interruption. Eusebius continues to quote Polyhistor directly. The introductory line is Polyhistor's summarizing statement. For the general literary context of this fragment, cf. above, n. 2.

55. The following reply by Zipporah represents Ezekiel's expansion of the biblical account. In Exod 2:16-22, the only dialogue that occurs is between Reuel and his daughters (cf. vv 18-20), but it is not incorporated into Ezekiel's poem. Zipporah, as a separate character, does not speak in the biblical account. For parallels to this encounter between Moses and Zipporah, and the speech by Zipporah, in Homer and the Greek tragedians, cf. Wieneke, 57; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 85.

56. Λιβύη μὲν ἡ γῆ πᾶσα κλήζεται, ξένε (v 60).

LXX Exod 2:15b ἀνεχώρησεν δὲ Μωυσῆς ἀπὸ προσώπου Φαραω καὶ ᾤκησεν ἐν γῇ Μαδιαμ· ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς γῆν Μαδιαμ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ φρέατος.

Philo *V. Mos.* 1.47 ὑπανεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν ὅμορον Ἀραβίαν. Josephus *Ant.* 1.11.1 ¶ 257 εἴς τε πόλιν Μαδιανὴν ἀφικόμενος πρὸς μὲν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ κειμένην.

Acts 7:29 καὶ ἐγένετο πάροικος ἐν γῇ Μαδιάμ. Cf. Heb 11:27.

Cf. Sophocles *Mys.*, Frg. 360.1 Ἀσία μὲν ἡ συμπᾶσα κλήζεται, ξένε. [Jacobson cites frg. 377.1 N^2 = 411.1 Radt] Wieneke, 57.

Strikingly, nowhere does Ezekiel identify the land to which Moses fled from Egypt as Midian, as does the biblical account and the above mentioned traditions (On Josephus' "town of Midian," cf. Thackeray's note in *LCL* 4.276, n. c). Philo is an exception in naming the country Arabia, and he remains consistent in describing its inhabitants, specifically the "seven maidens, daughters of the

priest," as Arabs (*V. Mos.* 1.51; similarly, Artapanus, Frg. 3.17-19). Thus, without reading the biblical account into Ezekiel's account, the reader (or hearer) would doubtless conclude that the "foreign land" (Frg. 2, line 30 = v 58) to which Moses had fled was Libya, the land inhabited by Ethiopians (v 62), hence somewhere (doubtless south) on the African continent away from Egypt. As Robertson, 811, n. x, observes, since Libya in antiquity was used to designate all of Africa, Ezekiel's phrase "the whole area is called Libya" would be an appropriate, and accurate, description of Africa. Cf. Herodotus 4.42. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 198, n. 2.

Zipporah's identification of her homeland as Libya, which comprised, among others, Ethiopians (cf. Herodotus 3.115; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 198, n. 2), allows for the possibility that Moses married an Ethiopian wife. This places Ezekiel within the exegetical tradition that identified Moses' Ethiopian wife (Num 12:1) and Zipporah, the daughter of Reuel (Jethro) the Midianite priest, as the same woman. Similarly, Demetrius, Frg. 1.3, which identifies Zipporah as an Ethiopian (cf. *FHJA* 1.76-77, 89, n. 81). Josephus, by contrast, represents the tradition that Moses married two wives, the Ethiopian princess Tharbis, who fell madly in love with him on his expedition against the Ethiopians (*Ant.* 2.10.2 ¶¶ 252-53), and (later) the daughter of Raguel (*Ant.* 2.11.2 ¶¶ 258-63). Cf. Robertson, 811, n. x. Also, cf. *FHJA* 1.235, n. 56. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 86-87, and his discussion of the four exegetical solutions that developed in response to the problem of Moses' wives.

It is not clear precisely how, if at all, Ezekiel's identification of Zipporah as a Libyan relates to the tradition, preserved in Cleodemus Malchus, Frg. 1 (cf. *FHJA* 1.252-55, 256, nn. 3, 4, 6), concerning the conquest of Libya (i.e., Africa)

by Abraham's grandson Heophre. One possibility is that Ezekiel's version of the tradition has the effect of underscoring the endogamous nature of Moses' marriage. This is an element noted by Demetrius, Frg. 3.1, who stresses that Zipporah was in the lineage of Abraham. The net effect of the tradition preserved in Cleodemus is that Libya (and Africa) come to be included among Abraham's descendants. Thus, anyone of Libyan descent would belong to the same lineage. Cf. van der Horst, *JHP*, 24; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 86.

On the possibility that Ezekiel was inspired by the reference in Cleodemus, cf. Kuiper, 277-80; also, Denis, *Introduction*, 260, 276. Because of the presumed ignorance of geographical matters reflected in Ezekiel's remarks (either his confusion of Libya with Midian or his assumption that Ethiopians live in Libya), Kuiper, 277-80, thinks it unlikely that he was an Egyptian and suggests instead that he might have been a Samaritan, perhaps inspired by his fellow Samaritan Cleodemus Malchus (cf. Denis, *Introduction*, 276). This is doubted, however, by Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 1.608; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 55; Robertson, 811, n. x. Also, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 86, on what could be reasonably expected in terms of accurate geographical knowledge in antiquity.

Generally, on the association of Libya with Ethiopia, esp. in *P.E.*, cf. *P.E.* 2.1.9 (citing Diodorus Siculus: Osiris sets up Antaeus in Libya and Ethiopia); 2.1.43; 10.8.12 (Diodorus). On Ethiopians as inhabitants of Libya, cf. Herodotus 3.115. So, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 198, n. 2. Also, is it possible that the association of Midian and Ethiopia might have arisen from Isa 60:6, which mentions Midian with Ephah? Also, Dan 11:43; 2 Chr 12:3.

On Libya, cf. Honigmann, "Libya," *PW* 13.1 (1926) 149-202, esp. 149; also 167-68.

On ξένε, cf. below, n. 84.

57. *οἰκοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν φῦλα παντοίων γενῶν, | Αἰθίοπες ἄνδρες μέλανες* (vv 61-62).

Cf. Euripides *Fr.* 228.3 *ὃς ἐκ μελαμβρότοιο πληροῦται ῥοὰς Αἰθιοπίδος γῆς*; 771.4 *γείτονες μελάμβροτοι*. Also, cf. Aeschylus, Frg. 300 (*LCL* 161);. *μέλας*, of men, Plato *R.* 474E.

Cf. Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.9, where the Ethiopians are traced to Cush, i.e., Asbolus, son of Belus (cf. *FHJA* 1.174-75, 186, nn. 36-37); also Artapanus, Frg. 3.7-11 (*FHJA* 1.210-13), on Moses' battle with the Ethiopians and their learning the practice of circumcision from him.

Cf. Herodotus 4.168-199, where various races are enumerated; 3.17, Ethiopians are said to inhabit Libya. Wieneke, 58.

On Ethiopia, cf. E. Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible* (Schweich Lectures, 1967; London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1968); *The Ethiopians: An Introduction to Country and People* (3rd ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1973); F. M. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970); J. W. Gardner, "Blameless Ethiopians and Others," *Greece and Rome* [Second Series] 24 (1977) 185-93; T. Rajak, "Moses in Ethiopia: Legend and Literature," *JJS* 29 (1978) 111-22. Also cf. references to Ethiopia collected by Seguier in *PG* (21) 1575-77; also R. Pietschmann, "Aithiopia," *PW* 1 (1894) 1095-1102.

58. *ἄρχων δ' ἐστὶ γῆς | εἷς καὶ τύραννος καὶ στρατηλάτης μόνος* (vv 62-63).

Cf. Artapanus, Frg. 3.19, where Raguel is "chieftain of the region" (*τῶν τόπων ἄρχων*). Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 89, 199, n. 24, for rabbinic references that similarly enhance the status of Raguel.

59. ἄρχει δὲ πόλεως τῆσδε καὶ κρίνει βροτοὺς | ἱερεύς, ὅς ἐστ' ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τούτων πατήρ (vv 64-65).

In the biblical account, Raguel is designated ὁ ἱερεὺς Μαδιαμ (Exod 2:16; 3:1; 18:1). Similarly, Philo *V. Mos.* 1.52; Josephus *Ant.* 2.11.2 ¶ 258. These other titles, which embellish his status, are further elaborations on the biblical account. On the classical parallels for the various terms and roles, cf. Wieneke, 58-59.

60. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 2.11.1 ¶ 257, which mentions Moses' arrival in "the town of Madian(e)" (εἰς πόλιν Μαδιανήν); also Demetrius, Frg. 1.3 Μαδιὰμ πόλιν.

61. His role as judge appears based on his advice given to Moses in Exod 18:13-27. Also, cf. Philo *Mut.* 110, where Raguel is designated ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆς κρίσεως καὶ τῆς δίκης. In contrast to Ezekiel, where the portrait of Raguel is uniformly positive, Philo contrasts "Jethro," which signifies vanity, with "Raguel," which means "the shepherding of God" and symbolizes his positive behavior to which he eventually turned as the result of his association with Moses. Cf. *Mut.* 103-14; *Ebr.* 36-45. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 88-89.

62. In this fragment, which follows the preceding fragment without interruption, Eusebius continues to quote directly from Polyhistor, whose introductory summary (lines 1-4) indicates that some intervening poetic material has been omitted. On whether Ezekiel has depicted Moses' marriage to Zipporah in a previous scene, cf. Wieneke, 59-61; Robertson, 811, n. y.

63. περὶ τοῦ <u>ποτισμοῦ</u> τῶν θρεμμάτων. LXX Exod 2:16 τῷ δὲ ἱερεῖ Μαδιαμ ἦσαν ἑπτὰ θυγατέρες ποιμαίνουσαι τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν Ιοθορ· παραγενόμεναι δὲ ἤντλουν, ἕως ἔπλησαν τὰς δεξαμενὰς <u>ποτίσαι</u> τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν Ιοθορ. Also, cf. 2:17 (Moses) <u>ἐπότισεν</u> τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῶν; similarly, 2:19.

Whether Polyhistor is drawing directly on LXX for his summary, or simply paraphrasing Ezekiel, whose language had been informed, at least partially, by LXX, is not certain; probably, the latter. θρέμμα does not occur in LXX, although it is employed by both Philo *V. Mos.* 1.51 & 53 and Josephus *Ant.* 2.11.2 ¶¶ 258, 263 in describing this episode; cf. John 4:12.

64. I.e., Ezekiel.

65. περὶ τοῦ **Σεπφώρας** ἐπιβάλλει γάμου. LXX Exod 2:21b (Raguel) καὶ ἐξέδοτο **Σεπφωραν** τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ Μωυσῇ γυναῖκα.

On Moses' marriage to Zipporah, cf. Demetrius, Frg. 3.1-3 = *P.E.* 9.29.1-3 (*FHJA* 1.74-77); Artapanus, Frg. 3.19 = *P.E.* 9.27.19 (*FHJA* 1.214-17); Philo *V. Mos.* 1.59; Josephus *Ant.* 2.11.2 ¶ 263; on the various traditions relating to Moses' marriage to Zipporah, cf. above, n. 56.

Whether Polyhistor's remarks imply that Ezekiel has already related Moses' marriage to Zipporah in a previous scene, or whether he is now turning to that subject is not clear. On the debate, cf. references above in n. 62.

66. The identity of Chum (Χούμ) is problematic. No such person is mentioned in connection with Moses in the biblical account. The spelling is similar to "Cush" (Χους), the son of Ham and father of Nimrod, mentioned in LXX Gen 10:6-8; 1 Chr 1:8-10. Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.9 = *P.E.* 9.17.9 (*FHJA* 1.174-75), mentions "Cush" (Χούμ), the son of Canaan and "father of the Ethiopians" (cf. *FHJA* 1.186, nn. 35-

36). A similar tradition is preserved in Josephus *Ant.* 1.6.2 ¶ 131, where *Χουσαῖος* is said to rule over the Ethiopians. It is probably because of this association of a figure named *Χούμ* with Ethiopia that he appears as a dialogue partner for Zipporah in Ezekiel's play. He has been variously understood as Zipporah's brother (Kuiper, 247; cf. Wieneke, 64) or former suitor (Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 88). Cf. Robertson, 811, n. y; for a more detailed treatment, cf. Jacobson, "The Identity and Role of Chum in Ezekiel's *Exagoge*," *Hebrew University Studies in Literature* 9 (1981) 139-46.

67. The reading in I (*λέγοντας*), adopted by Mras, would appear to suggest that both Chum and Zipporah are speaking "in dialogue," whereas *λέγουσαν*, which is read by BON, suggests that Zipporah speaks in the following lines. In either case, there seems little justification for assuming that Chum should be regarded as the speaker in both lines, as earlier editors supposed. Cf. Philippson, 44; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 199, n. 20.

68. *δι' ἀμοιβαίων* is used to introduce dramatic dialogue, e.g., Theocritus 8.61. Cf. Wieneke, 63-64; Robertson, 811, n. y. Assigning v 66 to Chum and v 67 to Zipporah is derived from Polyhistor's introductory comments.

69. *ὅμως κατειπεῖν χρή σε, Σεπφώρα, τάδε.* | *ξένῳ πατήρ με τῷδ' ἔδωκεν εὐνέτιν* (vv 66-67).

Ezekiel has Zipporah state in the form of direct speech what is clearly stated in Exod 2:21b; cf. above, n. 65. Since it is crafted as a response to Chum's inquiry, the line may be intended to respond to the charge that Moses married a foreigner.

On *εὐνέτις*, cf. Wieneke, 64.

70. Between this and the previous fragment occurs Polyhistor's summary of Demetrius' remarks concerning Moses (*P.E.* 9.29.1-3 = Frg. 3, *FHJA* 1.74-77), with particular emphasis given to his marriage to Zipporah.
Eusebius continues to quote directly from Polyhistor.

The dream of Moses depicted in this fragment, and Raguel's interpretation given in Frg. 7, are without biblical basis, although God's appearance to Moses at Sinai (Exod 19:1-25) may have informed his construction of this scene. Other biblical passages that possibly influenced the content of the dream include Gen 28, 37; Exod 24; Isa 6; Ezek 1; Dan 7; Gen 37; Ps 147. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 95, notes numerous extra-canonical passages where biblical figures experience dreams not recorded in the biblical account, e.g., *T. Levi* 2:5-5:7; *T. Napht.* 5:1-7:1; 2 Esdr 3:1-5:15; 1QApGen 19 (Abraham); et al.

Frequently noted is the use of dreams in classical drama, e.g., in Aeschylus *Persae*, Sophocles *Electra*, and Euripides *Hecuba*, especially as a device for predicting the future. Especially noteworthy is Accius *Brutus* (cited in Cicero *De Divinatione* 1.22.44-45), in which the dream of one of the main actors is interpreted by someone else, as here. Cf. Kappelmacher, 78-80; Starobinski-Safran, 220; van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 24. I. Heinemann, "Moses," *PW* 16.1 (1933) 365, acknowledges Ezekiel's dependence on Greek dramatists for the *technique* of including a dream, but sees no trace of Greek influence in his heroic depiction of Moses. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 95-96, adduces several parallels between Ezekiel and Aeschylus *Persae*, but also proposes Herodotean influence, citing numerous parallels.

This scene has received extensive attention. Cf. Cerfaux, "Influence des Mystères" (1924), 85-

88; Goodenough, *By Light, Light* (1935), 289-91; *Jewish Symbols* (1964) 9.101; W. Meeks, "Moses as God and King," in *Religions in Antiquity* (Essays in Memory of E. R. Goodenough; ed., J. Neusner; Studies in the History of Religion, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968) 354-71; Starobinski-Safran (1974), 216-24; Holladay, "Portrait of Moses" (1976), 447-52; Jacobson, "Mysticism and Apocalyptic" (1981), 272-93; *Exagoge* (1983) 89-97; van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision" (1983), 21-29.

The interpretations of the dream scene by Jacobson and van der Horst are polar opposites. In Jacobson's view, the passage is devoid of mystical influence and Ezekiel does not elevate Moses to divine status; in fact, it should be seen as a polemic against mystical interpretations that tended to elevate Moses to suprahuman status. By contrast, van der Horst stresses the striking similarities with merkavah mysticism, especially *3 Enoch*, and sees the passage as a clear instance where Moses is presented as God's viceregent and plenipotentiary, thus similar to other Jewish traditions of interpretation in which Moses becomes deified. In the annotations that follow, I have attempted to cite at the appropriate places relevant parallels adduced by both Jacobson and van der Horst.

If this scene is interpreted as an elevation of Moses to divine status, it should be balanced with God's reminder to Moses later in the poem that he is *θνητός* (Frg. 9, line 8 = v 102).

For an analysis of the formal features of visions involving a divine call, especially as it relates to Hesiod's vision in *Theogony* 22-34, cf. West, *Hesiod Theogony*, 158-67; noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 200, n. 3.

71. Moses' dream with accompanying interpretation by Raguel is the first of two major non-biblical

scenes in the drama. The other is the account of the phoenix in Frg. 17 (vv 254-69). ὄνειρος is rare in LXX; cf. Wisd 18:17, 19; 2 Macc 15:11; 4 Macc 6:5.

72. ἔδοξ' ὄρους κατ' ἄκρα Σιναίου θρόνον | μέγαν τιν' εἶναι μέχρις οὐρανοῦ πτυχός (vv 68-69).

The MSS reading ἐξ ὄρους κατ' ἄκρας ἴνου (and its variations; cf. app. crit.) is recognized as problematic as early as Stephanus who reads ἐδόκουν ὁρᾶν κατ' ἄκρας που θρόνον μέγαν | τίν' εἶναι, μέχρις οὐρανοῦ βεβηκότα, rendered by Viger "Objicitur ingens vertice in summo thronus, Radiantis altum fornicem attingens poli." Ever since Dübner emended κατ' ἄκρας ἴνου to κατ' ἄκρα Σιναίου, the mountain has been identified as Sinai (though with some variation, e.g., Wieneke, 64, who prefers Σιναϊκοῦ for metrical reasons). Noting the usually overlooked Hebrew (possibly medieval) translation of this scene preserved in Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrasch*, 5.159, which reads "on top of a high mountain," Jacobson, 199-200, n. 2, is reluctant to see it as a reference to Sinai, proposing as a possible alternative ὄρους κατ' ἄκρου αἰπεινοῦ.

Dübner's reading, however, is supported by van der Horst, "Notes," 367-68, who observes that throne-visions were linked with Sinai, especially in merkavah mysticism, as well as in other traditions, e.g., those cited in Ginzberg, *Legends*, 2.304-309; 5.416-418 n. 117; van der Horst also refers to D. J. Halperin, *The Merkabah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven, 1980) 128-33; also H. P. l'Orange, *Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World* (Oslo: H. Aschehoug/Cambridge: Harvard, 1953). Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 90, notes that *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Exod 24:10 connect Moses' ascent of Sinai with God's heavenly throne, but the reference to God's

throne is incidental to the overall description of Moses' receiving the law.

θρόνον μέγαν. Cf. LXX 1 Kgs 10:18 *θρόνον ἐλεφάντινον μέγαν* (= 2 Chr 9:17); also the description of the "great throne" in *1 Enoch* 14:18-25. Also, cf. the so-called "Testament of Orpheus" 32-33 (Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.5 = Aristobulus, Frg. 4; "Orphica," both long and short recensions in M. LaFargue, *OTP*, 2.795-801; also A. Yarbro Collins, *OTP*, 2.840-41), which mentions the golden throne in the "great heaven" on which sits either Zeus or an unidentified Chaldean, perhaps Abraham; so Starobinski-Safran, 220. On the great size of persons and images in ancient dreams, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 200, n. 4.

On the location of God's throne on the summit of a mountain, cf. *1 Enoch* 18:8; 24:3; 25:3. In *T. Levi* 2:5, Levi in a dream envisions himself on a mountain from which he is summoned to begin his journey through the heavens; in 5:1 he finally sees God sitting enthroned, but the throne itself is not located on a mountain summit. On the throne of deities located on mountain peaks, cf. A. Hug, "*θρόνος*," *PW* 2nd series, 6.1 (1936) 616; also G. Widengren, "Psalm 110 und das sakrale Königtum in Israel," in P. A. H. Neumann (ed.), *Zur neueren Psalmenforschung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976) 191; generally, O. Schmitz, "*θρόνος*," *TDNT* (1965) 3.160-64; also Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 90.

Conceivably, this scene is informed by biblical heavenly throne visions. Cf. LXX Ezek 1:26 (also 10:1) *ὁμοίωμα θρόνου ἐπ' αὐτοῦ* (*στερεώματος*), *καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁμοιώματος τοῦ θρόνου ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου ἄνωθεν*; Isa 6:1 *εἶδον τὸν κύριον καθήμενον ἐπὶ θρόνου ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐπηρμένου*; Dan 7:9 *ἐθεώρουν ἕως ὅτε θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν ... ὁ θρόνος ὡσεὶ φλὸξ πυρός* [Theodotion *οἱ τροχοὶ αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον*]. None of these, however, locates God's throne on a

mountain peak. Also, cf. Rev 4:2 *καὶ ἰδοὺ θρόνος ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*; 4:3 *al.*

On the use of the throne motif in connection with mantic activity, cf. Euripides *IT* 1249-58; Aeschylus *Eum*. 616; also 29; on which, cf. Holladay, "Portrait," 451, and critique by Jacobson, "Mysticism," 287-89; van der Horst, "joodse," 109; "Throne Vision," 28; L. W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 58-59.

Also worth noting in this regard is that the place in the synagogue where the elders sat, the "seat of Moses," could be referred to as the throne of Torah; so W. G. Braude and I. J. Kapstein, *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975) 17, n. 59.

οὐρανοῦ πτυχός. Euripides *Ph*. 84 *ἀλλ' ὦ φαεννὰς οὐρανοῦ ναίων πτυχὰς Ζεῦ*; *πτυχαὶ αἰθέρος* in *Hel*. 44, 605; *Or*. 1631, 1636. Wieneke, 64-65. *LSJ*, 1549 *s.v.* II. The plural form, *πτύχας*, which is read by BON, is more common. Stephanus' emendation *βεβηκότα* probably acknowledges the same difficulty. Also, cf. Gen 28:12 *κλίμαξ ... ἧς ἡ κεφαλὴ ἀφικνεῖτο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*; so, Renehan, 68.

On the location of God's throne in heaven, cf. LXX Ps 10:4; 102:19; thus providing a vantage point for God's universal vision (LXX Ps 32:13-14) and the exercise of universal dominion and judgment (LXX Ps 9:9; 32:8; 95:10; also 49:4-6; 71:8, 11; 88:12; 96:5).

73. *ἐν τῷ καθῆσθαι φῶτα γενναῖόν τινα* (v 70).

Cf. LXX Ezek 1:26 *ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου*; Dan 7:22 *τὸν παλαιὸν ἡμερῶν*; Isa 6:1 *τὸν κύριον καθήμενον ἐπὶ θρόνου ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐπηρμένου*.

On *φώς*, cf. Theodotus, Frg. 2, line 6, annotations, note 41; also Robertson, 812, n. b2, "its significance lies in the fact that Ezekiel

would represent God as a man, an image which is surely rooted in the figures of 'the son of man' and 'the Ancient of Days' in Daniel's vision (Dan 7)."

It is a crucial interpretive question whether φὼς γεννα῀ος is understood here as God (e.g., Snell, Meeks) or as a human figure (e.g., Gutman; cf. Jacobson, "Mysticism," 278-79). If the former, the dream unfolds in a strikingly distinctive, perhaps even unique, manner God's sitting on the throne, then vacating it and turning it over to his vicegerent Moses -- a highly unusual scene in light of the apparently widespread notion that God alone could occupy the heavenly throne. (The symbolism of the scene, however, may not be all that different from the risen Lord's claim to God's universal dominion envisioned in Matt 28:18; so, van der Horst, in a private communication). If the latter, the dream unfolds a kingly figure, probably Pharaoh (perhaps Enoch; so Gutman), relinquishing his throne to a successor, in this case Moses. Thus the dream and its interpretation sketch the eventual fall of Pharaoh and consequent rise of Moses.

74. διάδημ' ἔχοντα καὶ μέγα σκῆπτρον χερὶ | εὐωνύμῳ μάλιστα (vv 71-72).

διάδημα. Cf. Wieneke, 65.

σκῆπτρον. It is natural, and therefore usual, for the scepter to be mentioned in connection with the divine throne, as e.g., Ps 45:6 (ῥάβδος), or a human throne, as e.g., Esth 5:1-2 (ῥάβδος); so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 91, 200, nn. 7-8, who also refers to Sophocles *El.* 419-21. Cf. *Exod. Rab.* 8:1, in which God assigns glory to those who fear him: Solomon sits on his throne, Elijah rides on his horse, Moses holds his scepter, Messiah wears his crown, Israel wears his mantle, and Moses is called by his own name (i.e., god); also *Midr. Ps.* 21:2; as noted by Trencsényi-Waldapfel, 159; also, cf.

Strack-Billerbeck 1.979. On holding the scepter in the left hand, cf. l'Orange, *Iconography*, 154; also J. W. Salomonson, *Chair, Sceptre and Wreath. Historical Aspects of Their Representation on Some Roman Sepulchral Monuments* (Amsterdam, 1956), both cited by van der Horst, "Notes," 368. On the scepter as part of the king's regalia and symbol of authority, cf. Widengren, "Psalm 110," 191-93 (cf. above, n. 72).

On μάλιστα here (and in v 49), cf. van der Horst, "Notes," 368.

75. δεξιᾷ δέ μοι | ἔνευσε, κἀγὼ πρόσθεν ἐστάθην θρόνου (vv 72-73).

Cf. Kuiper, 248.

76. σκῆπτρον δέ μοι παρέδωκε καὶ εἰς θρόνον μέγαν | εἶπεν καθῆσθαι (vv 74-75). On receiving the scepter from God and thereby gaining universal power, cf. *Sib. Or.* 5.414-15; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 91, 200, n. 11.

εἰς θρόνον μέγαν εἶπεν καθῆσθαι. Cf. *1 Enoch* 45:3; 51:3 (*v. l.*); 55:4; 61:8; 62:1 (?); 69:29; also *3 Enoch* 10:1, where God makes for Enoch a throne similar to the throne of glory.

Whether this instruction for Moses to sit on God's throne represents a radical departure from usual expectations is difficult to say. Certain traditions underscore the king's exclusive access to his throne, e.g., *m. Sanh.* 2.5; *b. Sanh.* 22a; *Num. Rab.* 14:3; *Ps. Rab.* 21:2; *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 26:2; also Homer *Il.* 8.432-43; even moreso, God's exclusive access to the heavenly throne, e.g., *b. Hag.* 14a; *b. Sanh.* 38b. And yet, certain biblical passages implied some sharing; thus *Num. Rab.* 14:3; *Ps. Rab.* 21:2, report that God allowed Solomon to sit "on the throne of the Lord" (1 Chr 29:23) and gave Moses his scepter (Num 20:9). On the general proscription against anyone besides God being

seated in heaven, cf. P. Alexander, "3 Enoch," *OTP* 1.263, n. 10b.

Cf. also 1 Chr 28:5; 2 Chr 9:8; Wis 9:4, 10.

77. *βασιλικὸν δ' ἔδωκέ μοι | διάδημα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ θρόνων χωρίζεται* (vv 75-76).

In *3 Enoch* 12:1-5, God gives Enoch a royal robe and crowns him with a "kingly crown" (v 3), then gives him the name "the lesser YHWH" (v 5); also 14:1, 5. Perhaps, though not as directly, related is the story of the infant Moses who seizes Pharaoh's crown and smashes it to the ground (Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.7 ¶¶ 233-34) or crowns himself "as he was destined to do when he became great" (*Exod. Rab.* 1:26); so noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 91, 201, n. 13.

The motif of God's actually vacating the throne and transferring occupancy to someone else appears to be unique; so van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 25.

ἐκ θρόνων. On the use of the plural here, as opposed to the singular in vv 74-75, cf. LXX Wis 9:4, 10; also Aeschylus *Eum.* 18, 29; Euripides *IT* 1254-55 (as noted by van der Horst, "Notes," 368, who also adduces this as an instance of *amplificatio*, in which the plural is substituted for the singular, especially in poetic use, with additional bibliography). Accordingly, the emendations by Stephanus and Phillipson (cf. app. crit.) appear unnecessary. Cf. Kuiper, 248; Wieneke, 65-66.

78. *ἐγὼ δ' ἐσεῖδον γῆν ἅπασαν ἔγκυκλον | καὶ ἔνερθε γαίας καὶ ἐξύπερθεν οὐρανοῦ* (vv 77-78).

Cf. LXX Ps 32:13-14; also *1 Enoch* 17-18, which depicts Enoch's universal vision of things "beneath the earth and above the heaven."

On *γῆν ἔγκυκλον*, cf. Kuiper, 248; Wieneke, 66; also, cf. Isa 40:22.

79. *καί μοί τι πλῆθος ἀστέρων πρὸς γούνατα | ἔπιπτ'* (vv 79-80).

Cf. Gen 37:9 *ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη καὶ ἕνδενα ἀστέρες προσεκύνουν*. Kuiper, 267; Wieneke, 66-67, also noting Exod 32:13 (= Gen 26:4; so Vogt, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 124, n. a on 79). Also LXX Ps 146:4 *ὁ ἀριθμῶν πλήθη ἄστρων καὶ πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα καλῶν*. Also, cf. *3 Enoch* 14:3-5.

According to Cerfaux, 87-88, the astral motif reflects the language of Alexandrian mystery liturgies.

80. *ἐγὼ δὲ πάντας ἠριθμησάμην, | κἀμοῦ παρῆγεν ὡς παρεμβολὴ βροτῶν* (vv 80-81).

Here Moses numbers the heavenly hosts, an activity normally reserved for God, e.g., LXX Ps 146:4 (cf. above, n. 79); also Isa 40:26. Enoch does so in *1 Enoch* 33:2-4; similarly Enoch/Metatron in *3 Enoch* 46:1-2, specifically citing LXX Ps 146:4. Cf. van der Horst, "Notes," 368; also Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 92.

On Moses' "numbering" activity, cf. Num 3, 26; so, Wieneke, 67; Starobinski-Safran, 220.

κἀμοῦ. On the text-critical problem, cf. Renehan, 68-69, who proposes *καὶ ἰδοὺ* (= *κἰδού*), as especially in dream narratives, e.g., Gen 28:12; 31:10; 41:1-2, 5; also 37:9 (cf. above, n. 79); also *ἰδού* in Frg. 12, line 8 (= v 124) and line 14 (= v 130); thus bringing Ezekiel into even closer conformity to LXX. Renehan's proposal is noted by Snell, *TrGF*, 1.357. Also cf. van der Horst, "Notes," 368-69, who finally prefers Stephanus' emendation.

παρεμβολὴ βροτῶν. Cf. Job 25:3; *Num. Rab.* 11:7; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 92, 201, n. 21. Renehan, 68, also notes the frequency of *παρεμβολή* (19x) in Exod; also the use of intransitive *παράγω*.

81. *εἶτ' ἐμφοβηθεὶς ἐξανίσταμ' ἐξ ὕπνου* (v 82).

The motif of awaking from a dream in fear is common. Cf. Gen 28:16-17; 41:7-8; cf. Wieneke, 67; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 92. For its use in Jewish apocalyptic, cf. *1 Enoch* 83:6-7; 90:41-42; *2 Enoch* (J) 1:6-7; 4 Ezra 12:3-5; 13:14; on dreams accompanied by fear, cf. Dan 2:1; 4:5; 7:28; also, Apuleius *Metam.* 4.27

82. This fragment follows the previous fragment in Eusebius without interruption. The material is quoted directly from Alexander Polyhistor, whose introductory words identify Raguel as the speaker of the poetic lines that follow. For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

83. It does not look as if Ezekiel has omitted any poetic material between the dream and Raguel's interpretation given here.

84. *ὦ ξένε* (v 83).

If *ξένος* is understood as "stranger," as appears to be the case previously (Frg. 4, line 3 = v 60; so also, e.g., Euripides *Ion* 247; cf. Plato *Smp.* 204 C), it is an odd way for Moses to be addressed by his own father-in-law, especially if Ezekiel has already depicted his marriage to Zipporah, as Frg 5 seems to imply (= vv 66-67). Accordingly, Kappelmacher, 77, 80, thinks Moses' dream and Raguel's interpretation must have preceded the earlier conversation between Chum and Zipporah. It thus functioned to render Moses fit in the eyes of Raguel. Kappelmacher's suggested rearrangement is accepted by Wieneke, 59-63, and Trencsényi-Waldapfel, 148. But *ξένος* can also mean "guest-friend" (frequently used with *φίλος*) or one who receives hospitality (*LSJ*, 1189). Understood in this softer sense, it would thus be a fitting designation for Moses, the guest who had been

hospitably received by Raguel. So, Lesky, "Review," 2219-20; Robertson, 812, n. d2; Jacobson, *Exagoge*. 89, 199, n. 27.

85. *καλόν σοι τοῦτ' ἐσήμηνεν θεός* (v 83).

Wieneke, 67-68, compares classical, especially tragic, use of *μηνύω*, "disclose what is secret," "reveal" (*LSJ*, 1128), which is read in BON (according to Mras), with *σημαίνω*, and opts for the former, which certainly gives a sensible meaning here; thus, "what God has disclosed to you." Cf. app. crit.

86. *ζώην δ', ὅταν σοι ταῦτα συμβαί<ν>ῃ ποτέ* (v 84).

Stephanus' emendation provides the needed subjunctive form. Cf. Wieneke, 67. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 55, renders the line well: "May I live to see the day when these things are fulfilled."

ζώην δ'. Cf. Aristophanes *Eq*. 833.

87. *ἆρά γε μέγαν τιν' ἐξαναστήσεις θρόνον | καὶ αὐτὸς βραβεύσεις καὶ καθηγήσῃ βροτῶν;* (vv 85-86).

ἆρά γε. Even though Mras and Snell take vv 85-86 as interrogative, *ἆρά γε* is to be understood here as the equivalent of *ἄρά γε*. Thus the lines are rendered here as declarative. So, Kuiper, 249; Wieneke, 68 (both retaining *ἆρα*, but punctuating with a period); discussion in van der Horst, "Notes," 369. Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 125 and Robertson, 812, render as declarative. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 54-55, prints Snell's text, but translates as declarative. Cf. Aristophanes *Pl*. 546; Euripides *IA* 311; Sophoches *OC* 858.

ἐξαναστήσεις. *ἐξανίστημι* can be understood either as "raise up," "erect" (cf. Euripides *Andr*. 263, 267; *Hec*. 1165; *Med*. 1212) or "remove," "expel" (cf. Sophocles *Ant*. 297; *LSJ*, 585), even "overthrow" (Euripides *Suppl*. 1198). The former is

preferred by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 55; Robertson, 812; van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 23. The latter is preferred by Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 125. For summary of earlier interpreters on each side and exegetical discussion, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 93, 201, nn. 24-25; also Starobinski-Safran, 222.

Stählin, *Gnomon* 9 (1933) 57, emends *θρόνον* to *θρόνου*, which might then yield "you will cause a great one to depart (from) the throne" (cf. Sophocles *OC* 47 *ἐξαν.* + gen.). van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 23, n. 19; also "joodse," 108, opposes this interpretation because it implies that *φὼς γενναῖος* in Frg. 6, line 10 = v 70 must refer to Pharaoh. But does it necessarily?

βραβεύσεις. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 302; Euripides *Med.* 274 (of Creon, king of Corinth); cited by Jacobson, "Mysticism," 287, against Holladay, "Portrait." Oddly, *βραβεύω* and cognates are noticeably absent in the additional passages cited by Jacobson, e.g., the description of Raguel in vv 62-64; Ps 2:10; Sir 10:1; 2 Sam 15:2-6. No one doubts that kings functioned as judges (e.g., Solomon, 1 Kgs 3:16-28) nor that Moses plays this role (Exod 2:14; 18:13-27), but the fact remains that *βραβεύω* here is a somewhat surprising formulation.

καθηγήσῃ βροτῶν. Jacobson, "Mysticism," 287, regards *καθηγέομαι* as a "perfectly suitable word for a ruler," but provides no examples. While it is true that the term may mean "lead," "command," "exercise authority over" (Plutarch *Cam.* 15; *Thes.* 35 *ἄρχειν καὶ καθηγεῖσθαι*; *LSJ*, 852), it can also mean "lead," "guide," "show the way" (Plato *Ep.* 312 C) in the sense of "explain" (Herodotus 7.183; Xenophon *An.* 7.8.9) thus "teach," "instruct" (Plutarch *Moral.* 2.120A; Strabo 14.5.14; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Is.* 1; *Amm.* 5). Thus "leader of mortals" may as easily signify his role as preeminent prophet who provides inspired guidance

for the people as it does kingly leadership.

88. τὸ δ' εἰσθεᾶσθαι γῆν ὅλην τ' οἰκουμένην (v 87).

εἰσθεᾶσθαι. hapax Ezekiel. Wieneke, 68.

γῆν ὅλην τ' οἰκουμένην. This phrase, along with others that employ universal language, e.g., γῆν ἅπασαν ἔγκυκλον (Frg. 6, line 17 = v 77), πάντας (Frg. 6, line 20 = v 80), leads Trencsényi-Waldapfel, 147, 156, to stress especially the ecumenical tendency of the drama: "La domination oecuménique de Moïse ne peut signifier autre chose que l'acceptation par le monde entier de la loi divine, révélée par lui."

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.155, where Moses is made a partner of God's own possessions, i.e., "the whole earth and sea and rivers"; so Starobinski-Safran, 221; also *3 Enoch* 10:3, where Enoch is given universal reign.

89. καὶ τὰ ὑπένερθε καὶ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν θεοῦ (v 88).

τὰ ὑπένερθε. Cf. Pindar *N.* 10.87-88; Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 2.259; so Wieneke, 68.

Cf. *3 Enoch* 11:3; also 10:5; Phil. 2:10.

Also, cf. above, n. 78 on Frg. 6, line 18 = v 78. On ὑπέρ with the accusative, cf. Kuiper, 249; Wieneke, 69.

Also, cf. *m. Hag.* 2:1; *Sifre Zutta* 84; apud van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 28; citing Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 208.

90. ὄψει τά τ' ὄντα τά τε προτοῦ τά θ' ὕστερον (v 89).

Cf. Homer *Il.* 1.69-70 (of Calchas) οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ' ἄριστος, ὃς ἤδη τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα; Hesiod *Theog.* 38 εἰρεῦσαι τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα; also cf. 32; Vergil *Georg.* 4.392 (of Proteus) "novit namque omnia vates, quae sint, quae fuerint, quae mox ventura

trahantur"; also cf. Ovid *Metam.* 1.517-18; Euripides *Hel.* 922. Cf. *Memar Marqah* 1. ¶ 1 (God) "knows what has been, what is now, what is yet to be"; also ¶ 1 mentions the angel who appeared to Moses at the bush and "discoursed with him about what had been and what was yet to be" (MacDonald, *BZAW*, 84, 2.3).

In *3 Enoch* 10:5 Enoch's omniscience includes knowledge of "this world and the world to come"; also cf. 11:2-3; also 45:1; 48 (D):7.

Moses is promised similarly extended hindsight and foresight in *Exod. Rab.* 6:3; 45:6; *Num. Rab.* 23:4; so Starobinski-Safran, 222-23.

On the formula generally, cf. W. C. van Unnik, "A Formula Describing Prophecy," *Sparsa Collecta II* (Leiden, 1980) 183-93; West, *Hesiod Theogony*, 166, comments on v 32.

On the possible influence of mantic imagery in the dream and its interpretation, cf. Holladay, "Portrait," 451-52. Cf. Ziehen, "Mantis," *PW* 14 (1930) 1346-47. On the ability of the μάντις to know the unknown, cf. Euripides *Suppl.* 211; also *Hipp.* 346; Xenophon *Cyr.* 1.6.23 (corresponding to Socratic prophecy, *Mem.* 1.1.6-7); the future, cf. Plato *Chrm.* 174 A; also *Tht.* 179 A; *La.* 195; the present and past, cf. Homer *Il.* 1.70; 18.250; *Od.* 24.452; Aristotle *Rh.* 3.17.10, p. 1418^{a}. References cited by Ziehen. On the ability to see and interpret the hidden things of the present, cf. Euripides *Hec.* 1267; *Ores.* 363; *Hipp.* 346; *Rh.* 66; *Ion* 346.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 94, notes the biblical emphasis on Moses' prophetic abilities to discern the future; cf. Deut 28-33. On Hebrew prophecy as characterized by its special concern with the future, cf. E. Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. *Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Giessen, 1927) 148; H. H. Rowley, "The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study,"

in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament* (2nd rev. ed.; Oxford, 1965) 131-32, and literature cited therein; contra R. H. Charles *Daniel* (ICC), "Prophecy is ... a forthtelling of the will of God -- not a foretelling." It is occasionally concerned with τὰ ὄντα, e.g., 2 Sam 12:1-14, but not with τὰ προτοῦ as a rule. Also, West, *Hesiod Theogony*, 166.

Starobinski-Safran, 223, sees this final element in Raguel's interpretation as the climax to his portrait of Moses as a prophet, which complements the primary image of king in the dream itself; similarly, van der Horst, "Throne Vision," 28; hence anticipating similar blending of the two (and more) images in Philo, *V. Mos.*

91. This fragment follows the previous fragment without interruption. Eusebius continues to quote directly from Alexander Polyhistor, who provides the introductory comments in lines 1-4. It is difficult to tell how much poetic material has been omitted between this and the previous fragment. In the biblical account, only a brief summary (Exod 2:23-25) separates Moses' arrival in Midian and marriage to Zipporah (Exod 2:15-22) and the burning bush episode (Exod 3:1-4:17), the latter of which serves as the subject and setting of Frgs. 8-14 (vv 90-192). If Ezekiel followed the sequence of the biblical account, it is unlikely that very much has been omitted. On the other hand, as Frgs. 6-7 illustrate, Ezekiel can readily create scenes not in the biblical account, and it is possible that some such scene has been omitted. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 97; Robertson, 812, n. f^2.

This fragment is based essentially on LXX Exod 3:1-3.

For a summary of the content and analysis of the structure of the next major section (vv 90-192), which is generally thought to have

constituted Act III of the drama, cf. Wieneke, 69-74. He also provides detailed comparisons between Ezekiel and LXX.

Parallel accounts of the burning bush episode occur in Philo *V. Mos.* 1.65-84; Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.1-4 ¶¶ 264-76.

92. τῆς καιομένης βάτου. Cf. below, n. 97. τῆς ἀποστολῆς αὐτοῦ τῆς **πρὸς Φαραώ**. Cf. LXX Exod 3:10 καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε **πρὸς Φαραω**...

Ezekiel does not mention that the episode took place on Mount Horeb, nor that it was an angel of the Lord who appeared to Moses (Exod 3:1-2). Philo *V. Mos.* 1.66 mentions the angel, but Josephus does not.

93. I.e., Ezekiel.

94. Cf. above, Frg. 5, line 3, n. 68; also Frg. 6, line 6.

95. ἔα· τί μοι σημεῖον ἐκ **βάτου** τόδε (v 90).

LXX Exod 3:1-2 καὶ Μωυσῆς ἦν ποιμαίνων τὰ πρόβατα Ιοθορ τοῦ γαμβροῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱερέως Μαδιαμ καὶ ἤγαγεν τὰ πρόβατα ὑπὸ τὴν ἔρημον καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος Χωρηβ. 2 ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς ἐκ τοῦ **βάτου**.

ἔα. Euripides *Ba.* 644; *Med.* 1004; *Or.* 1573; etc. Cf. Kuiper, 250; Wieneke, 74; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 97-98, 203, n. 1. Cf. LXX Job 4:19 (A); 15:16; 25:6 (= אף); 19:5 (= אם־אמנם).

σημεῖον. Cf. LXX Exod 3:12.

96. τεράστιόν τε καὶ βροτοῖς ἀπιστία (v 91).

On Ezekiel's use of the abstract ἀπιστία, and Stephanus' emendation, cf. Kuiper, 250; Wieneke, 74-75.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.71 τὸ τεράστιον τοῦτο.

97. ἄφνω **βάτος** μὲν **καίεται** πολλῷ **πυρί**, | αὐτοῦ δὲ χλωρὸν πᾶν μένει τὸ βλαστάνον (vv 92-93).

LXX Exod 3:2b καὶ ὁρᾷ ὅτι ὁ **βάτος καίεται πυρί**, ὁ δὲ βάτος οὐ κατεκαίετο.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.65, esp. πολλῇ φλογί. Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.1 ¶ 266, esp. τῆς φλογὸς πολλῆς.

ἄφνω. Cf. Frg. 15, line 46 (= v 232). Euripides *Med.* 1205 *al.* Cf. Wieneke, 75. Also, LXX Josh 10:9 *al.* (= פתאם); Acts 2:2.

98. τί δή; προελθὼν **ὄφομαι** τεράστιον | μέγιστον (vv 94-95).

LXX Exod 3:3 εἶπεν δὲ Μωυσῆς παρελθὼν ὄφομαι τὸ ὅραμα τὸ μέγα τοῦτο, τί ὅτι οὐ κατακαίεται ὁ βάτος.

On the text-critical problem, cf. Kuiper, 250, whose emendations Wieneke, 75, finds unnecessary.

99. οὐ γὰρ πίστιν ἀνθρώποις φέρει (v 95).

Cf. Sophocles *OT* 1445 καὶ γὰρ σὺ νῦν τἂν τῷ θεῷ πίστιν φέροις. Wieneke, 75.

100. This fragment follows the preceding fragment without interruption. Eusebius continues to quote directly from Polyhistor. The fragment is based on LXX Exod 3:5-10. For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above n. 1.

101. εἶτα ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ προσομιλεῖ.

LXX Exod 3:4 ὡς δὲ εἶδεν κύριος ὅτι προσάγει ἰδεῖν, ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν κύριος ἐκ τοῦ βάτου λέγων Μωυσῆ, Μωυσῆ. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν τί ἐστιν;

Polyhistor's introductory formula suggests that no poetic material has been omitted between the preceding lines and the lines that follow.

102. Ἐπίσχες, ὦ φέριστε, μὴ προσεγγίσῃς, | Μωσῆ, πρὶν ἢ τῶν σῶν **ποδῶν λῦσαι** δέσιν (vv 96-97).

LXX Exod 3:4-5a 4 Μωυσῆ, Μωυσῆ ... 5a καὶ

εἶπεν μὴ ἐγγισῃς ὧδε· **λῦσαι** τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ **τῶν ποδῶν** σου.

ἐπίσχες recalls προελθών in Frg. 8, line 9 (v 94), suggesting that these lines followed Moses' previous speech without interruption. Cf. Euripides *El.* 758, 962 etc. Cf. Wieneke, 75.

φέριστε. Cf. Homer *Il.* 6.123; 15.247 etc. Cf. Wieneke, 76.

μὴ προσεγγίσῃς. Cf. LXX Josh 3:4 μὴ προσεγγίσητε αὐτῇ. LXX etc.

103. **ἁγία γὰρ** ἧς σὺ γῆς ἐφέστηκας πέλει (v 98).

LXX Exod 3:5b ὁ γὰρ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ σὺ ἕστηκας, γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν.

For a text-critical discussion of Dübner's emendation ἧς σὺ γῆς, cf. Kuiper, 251; Wieneke, 76.

πέλει. Not in LXX; frequent from Homer onward, including tragedy, e.g., Aeschylus *Ch.* 534. Cf. *LSJ*, 1358. Also cf. vv 153, 192, 251.

104. ὁ δ' ἐκ **βάτου** σοι θεῖος ἐκλάμπει λόγος (v 99).

LXX Exod 3:2 ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς **ἐκ** τοῦ **βάτου**, καὶ ὁρᾷ ὅτι ὁ βάτος καίεται πυρί, ὁ δὲ βάτος οὐ κατεκαίετο.

Philo *V. Mos.* 1.66 κατὰ δὲ μέσην τὴν φλόγα μορφή τις ἦν περικαλλεστάτη, τῶν ὁρατῶν ἐμφερὴς οὐδενί, θεοειδέστατον ἄγαλμα, φῶς αὐγοειδέστερον τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπαστράπτουσα, ἣν ἄν τις ὑπετόπησεν εἰκόνα τοῦ ὄντος εἶναι· καλείσθω δὲ ἄγγελος, ὅτι σχεδὸν τὰ μέλλοντα γενήσεσθαι διήγγελλε τρανοτέρᾳ φωνῆς ἡσυχίᾳ διὰ τῆς μεγαλουργηθείσης ὄψεως; 1.85 τὰ θεῖα λόγια; Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.1 ¶¶ 266–69, esp. 267 κατεπλάγη δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον φωνὴν τοῦ πυρὸς ἀφέντος καὶ ὀνόματι καλέσαντος αὐτὸν καὶ ποιησαμένου λόγους ...; Artapanus, Frg. 3.21 = *P.E.* 9.27.21 (*FHJA* 1.216–17) φωνὴν δ' αὐτῷ θείαν εἰπεῖν; Pseudo-Philo *Bib. Ant.* 37.3; Acts 7:30–31 ὤφθη αὐτῷ ... ἄγγελος (D *et al.* κυρίου) ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάτου ... ἐγένετο φωνὴ κυρίου; Justin *Apol.* 1.63; *Dial.*

Trypho 59.60. Cf. Orphica E & T 6; J & C[1] 6 (Aristobulus, Frg. 4.5) = *P.E.* 13.12.5 (λόγου θεῖου).

θεῖος ἐκλάμπει λόγος. The phrase θεῖος λόγος has been variously understood, ranging from a rather straightforward, non-technical sense, "divine speech" (Girardi), "divine voice" (Wieneke, Vogt), "God's word" (Robertson, van der Horst), or "word of God" (Jacobson) to a more technical, philosophically laden sense (Kuiper, Schlatter, Gutman), "Divine Logos" (Goodenough, Meeks). How the exegetical question is resolved is significant, among other things, for determining whether Ezekiel is one of the earliest proponents of a Logos theology (van der Horst).

Apart from what significance to attach to the phrase θεῖος λόγος itself, the question partially hinges on how one understands ἐκλάμπει and how usual it was to employ a verb whose essential metaphor was visual to depict the action of a noun whose essential metaphor was audial. Wieneke, 76-77, cites several instances suggesting that mixing sound and sight metaphors was common enough, e.g., Polybius 15.31.1; also Aeschylus *Pr.* 21 ἵν' οὔτε φωνὴν οὔτε του μορφὴν βροτῶν ὄφει; Sir 48:1 καὶ ἀνέστη Ηλιας προφήτης ὡς πῦρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο. Also, cf. W. B. Stanford, *Greek Metaphor* (Oxford, 1936) 47-59 (reference provided by van der Horst privately). Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 100, also notes LXX Exod 20:18 καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνὴν. Robertson, 813, n. g[2], suggests that Ezekiel may have preferred φωνή, but used λόγος because it was more suitable metrically -- hence a technical rather than philosophical decision.

Cf. ἐξέλαμψει in Frg. 16, line 16 (= v 246). For ἐκλάμπω in Aeschylus, frg. *Memnon*, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 185, n. 7.

Cf. Kuiper (1900), 251; further comments in Kuiper's *RSA* article (1904) 79-87; Girardi,

"Dramma" (1902), 11; Schlatter, *Geschichte* (1925^3), 215; Wieneke (1931), 76-77; Goodenough, "Light" (1935), 290-91; Meeks, *Prophet-King* (1967), 156-57; extensive discussion in Jacobson, "Mysticism" (1981), 279-87; expanded, with attention to rabbinic traditions, in *Exagoge* (1983), 99-101, 203, nn. 10-15; Robertson (1985), 813, n. g^2; van der Horst, *JHP*, 33, n. 99. On θεῖος λόγος in Philo, cf. Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*, 179-80.

105. θάρσησον, ὦ παῖ, καὶ λόγων ἄκου' ἐμῶν (v 100).

Cf. Aeschylus *Suppl.* 600 θαρσεῖτε παῖδες. Cf. Wieneke, 77; Kuiper, 251. Also, cf. LXX Exod 14:13; 20:20; Jdt 7:30; 11:1; also Matt 9:2, 22; 14:27 (= Mk 6:50); Mk 10:49; John 16:33; Acts 23:11.

106. ἰδεῖν γὰρ ὄφιν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀμήχανον | θνητὸν γεγῶτα (vv 101-102).

LXX Exod 3:6b ἀπέστρεψεν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ· εὐλαβεῖτο γὰρ κατεμβλέψαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. 33:20 (Lord to Moses) καὶ εἶπεν· οὐ δυνήσῃ ἰδεῖν μου τὸ πρόσωπον· οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἴδῃ ἄνθρωπος τὸ πρόσωπόν μου καὶ ζήσεται.

θνητὸν γεγῶτα. As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 144, 214, n. 26, observes, Ezekiel tends scrupulously to avoid elevating Moses to divine status here. Cf. Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*, 233-42.

Cf. Philo *Fuga* 141, with reference to Exod 3:6, as noted by Jacobson, "Mysticism," 286-87, who discusses Ezekiel in light of other traditions and suggests that this passage may be the "earliest extant evidence for the Jewish doctrine of the 'invisibility' of God" (p. 287); also *Exagoge*, 98.

107. τῶν λόγων δ' ἔξεστί σοι | ἐμῶν ἀκούειν, τῶν ἔκατ ἐλήλυθα (vv 102-103).

For examples of hearing a speaker's voice without seeing the speaker, cf. Euripides *Hipp.* 86 κλύων μὲν αὐδήν, ὄμμα δ' οὐχ ὁρῶν τὸ σόν; also Acts

9:7 *ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες.* Cf. Kuiper, 251; Wieneke, 77.

108. *ἐγὼ θεὸς σῶν, ὧν λέγεις, γεννητόρων,* | **Ἀβραάμ** *τε καὶ* **Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβου** *τρίτου* (vv 104-105).

LXX Exod 3:6 *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρός σου, θεὸς* **Αβρααμ καὶ** *θεὸς* **Ισαακ** *καὶ θεὸς* **Ιακωβ**.

σῶν γεννητόρων. MT Exod 3:6 אבי׳ה. Samaritan Pentateuch Exod 3:6 אבות׳ה; Acts 7:32 *τῶν πατέρων σου*. Ezekiel's plural form is perhaps influenced by LXX Exod 3:13, 15; 4:5. Cf. Robertson, 813, n. h^2. *γεννήτωρ* not in LXX. Cf. Wieneke, 77; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 14, 205, n. 48.

τρίτου. On adding *τρίτος* after a three-member set, cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 308 *Λίλαιος, Ἀρσάμης τε κ' Ἀργήστης τρίτος*. Wieneke, 77.

On the metrical difficulties caused by the proper names taken from Exod 3:6, cf. Robertson, 813, n. i^2; noting Strugnell, 450, n. 5, 451; Snell, *Glotta*, 28.

109. *μνησθεὶς δ' ἐκείνων καὶ ἔτ' ἐμῶν δωρημάτων* (v 106).

LXX Exod 2:24b *καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ τῆς πρὸς* Αβρααμ *καὶ* Ισαακ *καὶ* Ιακωβ. 6:5 *καὶ ἐμνήσθην τῆς διαθήκης ὑμῶν*.

Even though the language reflects LXX Exod 2:24b; 6:5, this line seems to correspond to LXX Exod 3:7-9.

Cf. also Gen 15:18; 17:2; 26:3-4; 28:13-14.

ἐμῶν δωρημάτων. Literally, "my gifts," as e.g., Euripides *Med*. 636, (so Wieneke, 78), but usually taken as "my promises" (so Kuiper, 252 *et al*., e.g., Vogt), even though this is not the usual sense of *δώρημα*. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 109-11, discusses the possibility of understanding the phrase as "gifts made to me" (i.e., God), in which case God would now be responding to the accumulated

merits of the patriarchs. More convincing, however, is his conjectured emendation *ἐμῶν δὴ ῥημάτων*, hence "my words," in the sense of "my promises." Cf. Matt 26:75 *καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος* ... As van der Horst, "Notes," 369, observes, however, Josephus *Ant.* 2.9.3 ¶ 212 (noted by Kuiper, 252) is perhaps more germane than Jacobson allows: *καὶ τοῖς προγόνοις αὐτῶν* (i.e., Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) *δωρησάμενος* (viz. God) *τὸ γενέσθαι τοσοῦτον πλῆθος αὐτοὺς ἐξ ὀλίγων.*

Horbury, *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986) 37-51, argues for the traditional understanding of *δωρήματα* as God's "gifts," in the sense of "the national privileges given by God through patriarchal covenants," especially "the promises of increase and of the land," e.g., Exod 32:13 (50). Indeed, he sees this as an early instance of a Jewish theological idiom which later became widespread towards the end of the period of the Second Temple in both Greek-speaking (Philo and Josephus) and Hebrew or Aramaic-speaking (various Rabbinic texts) Judaism, and which was also appropriated in Christian traditions, notably Rom 11:29 (cf. 9:4-5), John 4:10, and 1 Clement. Horbury regards it as especially significant as an overlooked, early antecedent to Pauline views of grace.

110. <u>*πάρειμι σῶσαι*</u> <u>*λαὸν*</u> *Ἑβραίων* <u>*ἐμόν*</u> (v 107).

LXX Exod 3:7 *εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ* <u>*λαοῦ μου*</u> *τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ* ... 3:8 *καὶ* <u>*κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι*</u> *αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης καὶ εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς γῆν ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολλήν, εἰς γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι, εἰς τὸν τόπον τῶν Χαναναίων* ...

111. *ἰδὼν* **κάκωσιν** *καὶ πόνον δούλων ἐμῶν* (v 108).

LXX Exod 3:7 *εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν* **ἰδὼν**

εἶδον τὴν **κάκωσιν** τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργοδιωκτῶν. οἶδα γὰρ τὴν ὀδύνην αὐτῶν. 3:9 καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ κραυγὴ τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ ἥκει πρός με, κἀγὼ <u>ἑώρακα</u> τὸν θλιμμόν, ὃν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι θλίβουσιν αὐτούς.

πόνον. Cf. LXX Exod 2:11.

On the unusual reference (by God) to Israel as *δούλων ἐμῶν*, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 107-109. He distinguishes between the Exodus description of the Jews as slaves of Pharaoh/Egypt as opposed to their being called God's slaves; he also treats the pertinent biblical references, esp. LXX Ps 112, but also notes Lev 25:42, 55; Isa 41:8-9; Deut 32:36 etc (p. 205, n. 35).

112. ἀλλ' ἔρπε καὶ σήμαινε τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις (v 109).

In sequence, this line corresponds to LXX Exod 3:10 *καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε*. The phrase *τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις* recalls the words of God spoken in direct discourse in LXX Exod 3:16 *ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς· κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν ὤπταί μοι, θεὸς Αβρααμ* .... Perhaps also 6:6 *βάδιζε εἰπὸν*, indicating dependence on LXX rather than MT לכן אמור; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 203, n. 16.

ἀλλ' ἔρπε. Euripides *IT 699*; *Andr.* 433 *al.* Kuiper, 252.

σήμαινε κ.τ.λ. Euripides *Hec.* 999 *τῷ σῷ τοῦτο σημανεῖς λόγῳ*. Kuiper, 252.

113. *πρῶτον μὲν αὐτοῖς πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ* (v 110).

In the section of biblical text that Ezekiel seems to follow here (LXX Exod 3:7-12), Pharaoh is singled out as the first addressee (3:10). The double addressee form appears to be dependent on the structural arrangement of LXX Exod 3:15-18: first to Israel (v 15), then to Pharaoh (v 18). The description of the first group, the gathered

Hebrews (πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ), derives from Exod 3:14-15 οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ; also cf. v 16 ἐλθὼν οὖν συνάγαγε τὴν γερουσίαν τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 101, notes the slightly confused order of Ezekiel's arrangement.

114. ἔπειτα βασιλεῖ τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ τεταγμένα, | ὅπως σὺ λαὸν τὸν ἐμὸν ἐξάγοις χθονός (vv 111-112).

The wording for this second addressee, the king, appears to be derived from LXX Exod 3:10 καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε πρὸς Φαραω βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐξάξεις τὸν λαόν μου τοὺς υἱοὺς Ισραηλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. Cf. also 3:18.

115. This fragment follows the preceding fragment without interruption. Eusebius continues to quote directly from Alexander Polyhistor, who supplies the introductory line. For the general context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

116. εἶτα ὑποβάς τινα ἀμοιβαῖα αὐτὸς ὁ Μωσῆς λέγει.

The words of Moses that follow are derived from LXX Exod 4:10. Thus between this and the previous fragment the intervening biblical material in Exod 3:11-4:9 has been skipped. Some of this material is incorporated into later fragments, e.g., 3:21-22 into Frg. 13, lines 36-40 (vv 162-66); 4:1-9 into Frg. 12 (vv 120-31). Among the notable omissions, at least from the extant fragments of the poem, is the interchange indentifying God as "I AM WHO I AM" (Exod 3:13-14).

ὑποβάς τινα ἀμοιβαῖα. Polyhistor's wording here suggests that Ezekiel's poem probably included the dialogue between God and Moses in Exod 3:11-14.

On Ezekiel's departure from the biblical sequence, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 101.

The following dialogue between Moses (Frg. 10, lines 3-5 = vv 113-15) and God (Frg. 11, lines 3-6 = vv 116-19) is based essentially on Exod 4:10-17.

Accordingly, the extant poem omits Moses' initial self-deprecating remark (Exod 3:11), as well as the intervening dialogue between Moses and God (Exod 3:13-4:1), which continues to underscore Moses' reluctance (esp. 4:1). Also, certain elements of the biblical section that Ezekiel does treat are omitted, e.g., God's censure of Moses (4:11), yet another refusal by Moses (4:13), and God's understandably angry response (4:14).

A similar tendency to deemphasize the extent of Moses' resistance is seen in Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.2-4 ¶¶ 270-76, less so in Philo *V. Mos.* 1.83-85; completely omitted in Artapanus Frg. 3.21 = *P.E.* 9.27.21 (*FHJA* 1.216-17).

According to Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 102-103, a more dominant element of Ezekiel's reinterpretation of the biblical narrative is his omission of references (e.g., Exod 4:1, 5, 8-9; 14:11-12; though cf. 4:31; 12:28) to the Jews' own disbelief (in contrast to Acts 7:35-43).

117. Οὐκ εὔλογος πέφυκα (v 113).

LXX Exod 4:10a εἶπεν δὲ Μωυσῆς πρὸς κύριον· δέομαι, κύριε, οὐχ ἱκανός εἰμι πρὸ τῆς ἐχθὲς οὐδὲ πρὸ τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας οὐδὲ ἀφ' οὗ ἤρξω λαλεῖν τῷ θεράποντί σου. 6:12 ἐλάλησεν δὲ Μωυσῆς ἔναντι κυρίου λέγων· ἰδοὺ οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ οὐκ εἰσήκουσάν μου, καὶ πῶς εἰσακούσεταί μου Φαραω; ἐγὼ δὲ ἄλογός εἰμι.

Philo *V. Mos.* 1.83 οὐκ εὔλογον; *Her.* 16 ἄλογος. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.2 ¶ 271 ἰδιώτης ἀνήρ.

εὔλογος. Usually "reasonable," "sensible" (Wieneke, 78; *LSJ*, 721), e.g., Philo *Immut.* 127. Not in LXX. Cf. *BAG*^{2}, 323. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 57, "articulate." Perhaps, "I am not a sensible choice."

Ezekiel's use of εὔλογος shows greater affinity with Philo than with LXX. However, as van

der Horst, "Notes," 369-70, reports, "MSS F and M and some minuscules of the LXX read in *Exod.* 4:10 *οὐκ εὔλογος* instead of *οὐχ ἱκανός*." Possibly, then, Ezekiel and Philo drew on a common text; so E. Bickerman, "Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History I* (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 145; also *LSJ*, 721. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 204, n. 32, however, prefers to see this as another possible instance of Ezekiel's influence on Philo. Cf. Wieneke, 78, for other instances where Philo is possibly dependent on Ezekiel.

118. γλῶσσα δ' ἐστί μοι | δύσφραστος, **ἰσχνόφωνος**, ὥστε μὴ λόγους | ἐμοὺς γενέσθαι βασιλέως ἐναντίον (vv 113-115).

LXX Exod 4:10b **ἰσχνόφωνος** καὶ βραδύγλωσσος ἐγώ εἰμι. 6:30 καὶ εἶπεν Μωυσῆς ἐναντίον κυρίου· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ **ἰσχνόφωνός** εἰμι, καὶ πῶς εἰσακούσεταί μου Φαραω; also cf. LXX Exod 3:11.

Philo *V. Mos.* 1.83 *ἰσχνόφωνον καὶ βραδύγλωσσον*; also *Her.* 16.

δύσφραστος. Not in LXX. Cf. Exod 4:11 *δύσκωφον*. Cf. Plato *Tim.* 50 C. Wieneke, 79.

ἰσχνόφωνος. Cf. Herodotus 4.155 *ταῖς ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ τραυλός*; Hippocrates *Epid.* 1.19; Aristotle *Pr.* 11.38 (903^b). Wieneke, 79.

On the text-critical problem, cf. app. crit. and discussion in Kuiper, 252; Wieneke, 79.

119. This fragment follows the previous fragment without interruption. Eusebius continues to quote directly from Alexander Polyhistor, who provides the introductory line. For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

120. *εἶτα πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ ἀποκρίνεται*.

These introductory words by Polyhistor seem to suggest that the poetic lines that follow occurred

in response to Moses' disclaimer (Frg. 10). Thus it is likely that nothing has been omitted.

The speech by God in the following lines is based directly on LXX Exod 4:14-17. As noted earlier, Ezekiel omits the exchange between God and Moses in LXX Exod 4:11-13 and the reference to God's anger (4:14), which prompts the appointment of Aaron (4:14-17). On the changes resulting from Ezekiel's omissions from the biblical narrative, cf. above n. 116.

121. *'Ααρωνα πέμψω σὸν κασίγνητον ταχύ* (v 116).

LXX Exod 4:13-14 *καὶ εἶπεν Μωυσῆς· δέομαι, κύριε, προχείρισαι δυνάμενον ἄλλον, ὃν ἀποστελεῖς.* 14 *καὶ θυμωθεὶς ὀργῇ κύριος ἐπὶ Μωυσῆν εἶπεν· οὐκ ἰδοὺ Ααρων ὁ ἀδελφός σου ὁ Λευίτης; ἐπίσταμαι ὅτι λαλῶν λαλήσει αὐτός σοι· καὶ ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς ἐξελεύσεται εἰς συνάντησίν σοι καὶ ἰδών σε χαρήσεται ἐν ἑαυτῷ.*

On *πέμψω*, as opposed to Stephanus' emendation *πέμψον*, conforming to LXX Exod 4:13 *ἀποστελεῖς*, cf. Kuiper, 253; Wieneke, 79.

κασίγνητος. Not in LXX.

122. *ᾧ πάντα λέξεις τἀξ ἐμοῦ λελεγμένα* (v 117).

LXX Exod 4:15 *καὶ ἐρεις πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ δώσεις τὰ ῥήματά μου εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα σου καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ συμβιβάσω ὑμᾶς ἃ ποιήσετε.*

123. *καὶ αὐτὸς λαλήσει βασιλέως ἐναντίον* (v 118).

LXX Exod 4:16a ***καὶ αὐτός*** *σοι προσλαλήσει πρὸς τὸν λαόν*. Cf. 4:14a ... *λαλῶν λαλήσει* ***αὐτός*** *σοι*.

Why Ezekiel changes Exod 4:16a and singles out Aaron's role as spokesman to the king rather than to the people is not clear. Perhaps it is to conform God's response to the precise point of Moses' objection in the previous speech, namely, his inadequacy in speaking before the king (Frg. 10, line 5 = v 115); or perhaps it reflects LXX

Exod 7:2. To be sure, in the biblical account Aaron serves as spokesman to the people (Exod 4:30), but also, along with Moses, to Pharaoh (Exod 5:1-9, esp. 1, 3-4; 7:7).

124. σὺ μὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὁ δὲ λαβὼν σέθεν πάρα (v 119).

Exod 4:16b καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου στόμα, σὺ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔσῃ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

The difficulty of this line is recognized as early as Stephanus, who emends ἡμᾶς to ἡμῶν, which would yield something like "from us," or "before us," i.e., "in our presence." Ezekiel's own ambiguity may result from his puzzlement over this text (and LXX Exod 7:1), which seems to assign Moses an unusual status; at least, a status unusually worded. He was certainly not the only Jewish exegete to puzzle over the text (cf. discussion in Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*, 108-55).

Robertson, 813, appears to accept Stephanus' emendation in his rendering "you'll take the words *from me*." But, as Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 204, n. 18, correctly observes, "Ezekiel never refers to God ... in the plural"; hence, ἡμᾶς (or ἡμῶν) would seem to require a translation that includes both God and Moses, e.g., "and you (will speak) for us," i.e., Moses has sole responsibility for communicating what God reveals to him in their private conversations.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 204, n. 18, also suggests that something might have been omitted after πάρα. He also proposes λεών (Attic of λαόν) as a possible emendation of λαβών; thus as the object of πρὸς and recalling LXX Exod 4:16 πρὸς τὸν λαόν.

On the problematic character of the line, cf. Kuiper, 253; Wieneke, 79-80.

125. This fragment follows the previous fragment without interruption. Eusebius continues to quote

directly from Alexander Polyhistor, who provides the introductory line to the poetic selection that follows. For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

This fragment is based on LXX Exod 4:1-9 and is thus out of biblical sequence with Frgs. 10 and 11, which are based respectively on Exod 4:10 and 4:14-17.

126. *περὶ δὲ τῆς ῥάβδου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεράτων.*

The rod is first introduced in LXX Exod 4:2 and continues to figure prominently in the succeeding narrative, both in the hands of Moses (LXX Exod 4:4, 17, 20; 7:15-17; 10:13; 14:16; 17:5, 9) and Aaron (LXX Exod 7:9-13, 19-20; 8:1, 12-13). Cf. below, n. 129.

The mention of "other wonders," besides the rod, seems unusual, since Ezekiel depicts only two of the three displays of power mentioned in LXX Exod 4:1-9, turning the rod into a serpent and restoring Moses' hand to its natural color. Conceivably, the scene included a depiction of the third sign, promised but not demonstrated by God (LXX Exod 4:9). So, Wieneke, 72; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 104. Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.3 ¶¶ 272-74 actually describes the performance of the third sign. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.76-81 speaks of "three signs," though admitting that the third "had its birthplace in Egypt" (1.81).

As for Ezekiel's use of the term *τέρατα*, the wonders in LXX Exod 4:8-9 are described as *σημεῖα*; also 4:17. His use may be informed by *τέρατα* in 4:21 (cf. 7:3, 9; 11:9-10). Cf. Frg. 13, line 4, where Polyhistor describes the various plagues depicted in the following scene as *σημεῖα*.

127. *οὕτω δι' ἀμοιβαίων εἴρηκε.*

δι' ἀμοιβαίων. Cf. Frg. 5, line 3 (n. 68); Frg. 6, line 6; Frg. 8, line 3; also Frg. 10, line 1.

As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 105-106, observes, in the biblical text Moses speaks only one word (LXX Exod 4:2), whereas in Ezekiel he becomes a full dialogue partner with God. Cf. also van der Horst, *JHP*, 35, n. on vv 120-131.

128. τί δ' ἐν χεροῖν σοῖν τοῦτ' ἔχεις; λέξον τάχος (v 120).

LXX Exod 4:2a εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ κύριος· τί τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ ἐν τῇ χειρί σου;

τάχος. Often in Euripides, e.g., *Hipp.* 973. Other examples in Wieneke, 80. Cf. LXX Exod 32:7 B βάδιζε τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν κατάβηθι.

129. **ῥάβδον** τετραπόδων καὶ βροτῶν κολάστριαν (v 121).

LXX Exod 4:2b ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· **ῥάβδος**.

τετραπόδων καὶ βροτῶν. Cf. LXX Exod 8:13 ἔν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν. Wieneke, 80.

κολάστριαν. An unusual form. Cf. Kuiper, 253; Wieneke, 80, with related examples.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 106, suggests that this description of the rod as an implement for disciplining animals and humans may be intended to counter the tradition of Moses' "magic rod," on which cf. rabbinic passages cited in Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 204, n.27; also Tiede, *Charismatic Figure*, 171-73; Ginzberg, *Legends*, 2.320-21; Holladay, *FHJA* 1.241, n. 93.

130. ῥῖφον πρὸς οὖδας καὶ ἀποχώρησον ταχύ. | **δράκων** γὰρ **ἔσται** φοβερός, ὥστε θαυμάσαι (vv 122-123).

LXX Exod 4:3 καὶ εἶπεν· **ῥῖφον** αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. καὶ ἔρριψεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐγένετο ὄφις. 7:9 λαβὲ τὴν ῥάβδον καὶ **ῥῖφον** αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐναντίον Φαραω καὶ ἐναντίον τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ, καὶ **ἔσται δράκων**.

πρὸς οὖδας. Cf. Euripides *Ba.* 1112 πίπτει πρὸς

οὖδας; also *Hec.* 405; *Med.* 1195. Kuiper, 253. Wieneke, 80.

ἀποχώρησον. Cf. Aristophanes *Av.* 1647; *Ach.* 456; Wieneke, 80. Cf. LXX Jer 26:5; 2 Macc 4:33; 3 Macc 2:33.

δράκων. Cf. Euripides *Ba.* 1330 δράκων γενήσει μεταβαλών. Also LXX Exod 7:9 (see above), 10, 12.

131. ἰδοὺ βέβληται· δέσποθ', ἵλεως γενοῦ· | ὡς φοβερός, ὡς πέλωρος· οἴκτειρον σύ με· | πέφρικ' ἰδών, μέλη δὲ σώματος τρέμει (vv 124-126).

LXX Exod 4:3b καὶ ἔφυγεν Μωυσῆς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

ἰδοὺ. Often in Euripides, e.g., *Hec.* 563, 1041. Cf. Wieneke, 80. Also cf. LXX Exod 3:9; 4:14 *al.*

δέσποθ', ἵλεως γενοῦ. Cf. Euripides *IT* 271 δέσποτα Παλαῖμον, ἵλεως ἡμῖν γενοῦ. Kuiper, 253; cf. Wieneke, 80. Cf. LXX Exod 32:11-12 κύριε ... ἵλεως γενοῦ; Deut 21:8 etc.; 4 Macc 6:27-8 θεέ ... ἵλεως γενοῦ.

φοβερός. Frequent in LXX, e.g., Gen 28:17; πέλωρος does not occur in LXX. Cf. Homer *Il.* 12.220 δράκοντα ... πέλωρον; Hesiod *Th.* 299 πέλωρον ὄφιν δεινόν τε μέγαν. Wieneke, 81.

οἴκτειρον σύ με. Cf. Sophocles *Ph.* 756; *Tr.* 1070. οἰκτείρειν frequent in LXX, e.g., Ps 4:2 οἰκτ(ε)ίρησόν με. Cf. Kuiper, 253; Wieneke, 81.

πέφρικ' ἰδών. Cf. Aeschylus *Pr.* 695 πέφρικ' εἰσιδοῦσα πρᾶξιν etc. Wieneke, 81. Cf. also Aeschylus *Supp.* 346; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 185, n. 8.

132. μηδὲν φοβηθῇς, χεῖρα δ' ἐκτείνας λαβὲ | οὐράν, πάλιν δὲ ῥάβδος ἔσσεθ' ὥσπερ ἦν (vv 127-128).

LXX Exod 4:4 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν· ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα καὶ ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς κέρκου· ἐκτείνας οὖν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπελάβετο τῆς κέρκου, καὶ ἐγένετο ῥάβδος ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.

μηδὲν φοβηθῇς. Cf. Aeschylus *Pr.* 128 μηδὲν

φοβηθῇς; also in Euripides *Andr.* 994; *Rh.* 661. In LXX μὴ φοβηθῇς, e.g., Num 21:34; Deut 3:2; Josh 1:9; 8:1; 10:8; 11:6; 2 Kgs 19:6; Tob 5:17 (S); Isa 37:6; Jer 1:8, 17; 26:27; Ezek 2:6; 3:9; 2 Macc 7:29.

Kuiper, 254, also cites Ezekiel's substitution of οὐρά for LXX κέρκος as another instance of Ezekiel's improvement of LXX. But cf. Aristotle *PA* 4.10 (689^b1 - 690^a4), esp. 689^b30. Also cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.77 τῆς οὐρᾶς.

133. ἔνθες δὲ χεῖρ' εἰς **κόλπον** ἐξένεγκέ τε (v 129).

LXX Exod 4:6a εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ κύριος πάλιν· εἰσένεγκε **τὴν χεῖρά** σου εἰς τὸν **κόλπον** σου... καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν ... καὶ ἐξήνεγκεν ...

ἔνθες χεῖρ'. Cf. Euripides *Alc.* 854. Wieneke, 81. Kuiper, 254, "Ceterum in his versibus vitavit barbaras Exodi formas: εἰσένεγκον Exod. noster ἐξένεγκε." But Ezekiel's ἐξένεγκε reflects LXX Exod 4:6b ἐξήνεγκεν (also 4:7), and changing the indicative to an imperative appears to be a defensible appropriation of a LXX form. In any case, the relevant comparison would be Ezekiel's use of ἐντίθημι instead of the LXX εἰσφέρω.

134. ἰδοὺ τὸ ταχθέν, γέγονεν ὡσπερεὶ χιών (v 130).

LXX Exod 4:6b καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐξήνεγκεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐγενήθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ **χιών**.

On ἰδού, cf. above n. 131.

ὡσπερεὶ χιών. ὡσπερεί not in LXX, though cf. Sm. Ps 57 (58):9. Cf. however Euripides *Or.* 762; but ὡσεί in Sophocles *El.* 234. For ὡσεὶ χιών, cf. Num 12:10; 2 Kgs 5:27; Dan 7:9.

It should be noted that Ezekiel follows LXX here. Whereas MT Exod 4:6 states that Moses' hand became "leprous, as white as snow" (מצרעת כשלג), LXX reads simply ὡσεὶ χιών. Admittedly the LXX

version of the sign is less spectacular, but another indication of Ezekiel's close dependence on LXX rather than MT. Possibly the reference to leprosy is omitted because of the antisemitic polemic, as e.g., in Manetho (= Josephus *Ag.Ap.* 1.26 ¶ 233; cf. Stern, *GLAJJ*, 1.81-82, 85, n. on ¶ 233); so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 106, with full discussion; also, cf. van der Horst, *JHP*, 35, n. on v 130. The reference to leprosy is similarly omitted in Philo *V. Mos.* 1.79; Josephus *Ant.* 2.12.3 ¶ 273.

Earlier editors (e.g., Viger and Dindorf) attributed this line of dialogue to God, but since Dübner, editors (e.g., Philippson, Kuiper, Wieneke, et al.) have assigned it to Moses. Cf. Snell, *TrGF* 1.295, n. on line 130; Philippson, 45, n. on vv 127-31. Ezekiel's arrangement of the dialogue, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 105.

Viger's emendation *προχθέν* makes it easier to attribute the line to God, thus "Behold. It's been done. It's become like snow."

135. ἔνθες **πάλιν** δ' **εἰς κόλπον**, ἔσται δ' ὥσπερ ἦν (v 131).

LXX Exod 4:7 καὶ εἶπεν· **πάλιν** εἰσένεγκε τὴν χεῖρά σου **εἰς** τὸν **κόλπον** σου. καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν τὴν χεῖρα **εἰς** τὸν **κόλπον** αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ἀπεκατέστη εἰς τὴν χρόαν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.

135a. This fragment directly follows the previous fragment. It is clear, however, from Eusebius' introductory words in lines 1-2 that he has omitted some material from Polyhistor. Whether these "intervening remarks" are sections of Ezekiel's poem, which Eusebius for some reason chose to omit, or non-Ezekiel material pertaining to the exodus that Polyhistor has included from some other source is not clear. Since the following fragment

basically treats the ten plagues (LXX Exod 7:8 - 11:10) and instructions pertaining to the Passover (LXX Exod 12:1-28), it is likely that Ezekiel's play covered at least some portions of the biblical material intervening between this and the previous fragment, viz. LXX Exod 4:18-7:7. On whether the following speech by Moses originally belonged to the earlier burning-bush scene, cf. below, n. 141.

After Eusebius' transitional remarks, as usual, he resumes quoting directly from Polyhistor, whose introductory statement (lines 3-5) identifies the source of the poetic material. This suggests that a considerable portion of material has been omitted.

For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

136. I.e., Polyhistor.

137. Τούτοις ἐπάγει, μετά τινα τὰ μεταξὺ αὐτῷ εἰρημένα, λέγων.

On the "intervening remarks," cf. above n. 135a.

138. Ταῦτα δέ φησιν οὕτως καὶ Ἐζεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ Ἐξαγωγῇ λέγων.

On the title, cf. Frg. 1A, line 4 (also Frg. 1B, line 5); Frg. 2B, line 2; Frg. 15, line 3; and Frg. 16, line 10.

139. περὶ μὲν <u>τῶν σημείων</u>.

LXX Exod 4:17b ἐν ᾗ (ῥάβδῳ) ποιήσεις ἐν αὐτῇ <u>τὰ σημεῖα</u>. Also, cf. 4:8-9, 28, 30; 7:3, 9. Also, cf. LXX Ps 104:27. Also, cf. above, n. 126.

For other accounts of the plagues, cf. LXX Ps 77:43-51; 104:26-36; Philo *V. Mos.* 1.96-146; Josephus *Ant.* 2.14.1-6 ¶¶ 293-314; Artapanus, Frg. 3.27-33 = *P.E.* 9.27.27-33 (cf. *FHJA* 1.220-23, 241-42, nn. 94-112); *Jub.* 48:5-8; also, cf. LXX Wis

16:1, 5-14; 17:1-18:4.

On the order of the plagues, cf. Wieneke, 70-71; also Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 114-16, who also discusses Ezekiel's deviations from the biblical account and their significance.

140. *τὸν θεὸν παρεισάγων λέγοντα οὕτως.*

By treating the plagues and instructions concerning Passover as part of God's prophetic speech, Ezekiel not only compresses a lengthy time period into a single scene, but obviously solves an otherwise challenging staging problem. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 112-13; Robertson, 814, n. m[2].

On the primacy of God's role in initiating and performing the "signs" of the plagues, as compared with other traditions that stress Moses' role, e.g., Artapanus, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 120-21. Also, cf. Tiede, *Charismatic Figure*, 171-73, 226-28.

141. *Ἐν τῇδε* **ῥάβδῳ** *πάντα ποιήσεις κακά* (v 132).

LXX Exod 4:17 *καὶ τὴν* **ῥάβδον** *ταύτην τὴν στραφεῖσαν εἰς ὄφιν λήμψῃ ἐν τῇ χειρί σου, ἐν ᾗ ποιήσεις ἐν αὐτῇ τὰ σημεῖα.* 7:19 *εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν· εἰπὸν Ααρων τῷ ἀδελφῷ· λαβὲ τὴν ῥάβδον σου καὶ ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ποταμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς διώρυγας αὐτῶν ... καὶ ἔσται αἷμα.* Also cf. 7:8-13.

This first line of God's speech is based on the last line of God's response to Moses in LXX Exod 4:14-17, which both mentions the rod and the signs (*σημεῖα*) Moses would perform with it. With these two connecting motifs, Ezekiel is thus able to use it as the beginning line of the speech in which God foretells the "woes" (*κακά*) Moses will inflict on Pharaoh and the Egyptians. Because the speech is linked with Moses' earlier speech in 4:14-17, it is conceivable that his speech here (vv 132-74) originally belonged to the earlier scene

depicting the burning-bush episode (Frgs. 8-12 = vv 90-131). Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 206, n. 1.

For the expression ἐν τῇδε ῥάβδῳ, cf. Lucian *Dial. mort.* 23.3 (*LCL* 28.3 ¶ 428) and 1 Cor 4:21 (references supplied by van der Horst privately).

On the importance of the rod, especially its magical qualities, cf. above, n. 129.

Cf. Frg. 15, lines 39-40 = vv 225-226 κακὰ σημεῖα καὶ τεράατ'.

142. πρῶτον μὲν αἷμα ποτάμιον ῥυήσεται | **πηγαί** τε **πᾶσαι** καὶ **ὑδάτων συστήματα** (vv 133-134).

LXX Exod 7:17-25. αἷμα and ποταμός occur throughout the section. ῥέω and πηγή do not occur here. Cf. Gen 1:10 καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ξηρὰν γῆν καὶ τὰ **συστήματα** τῶν **ὑδάτων** ἐκάλεσεν θαλάσσας; Gen 7:11 **πᾶσαι** αἱ **πηγαί** τῆς ἀβύσσου. Also, cf. LXX Ps 77:44; 104:29.

Also, cf. Pseudo-Aeschylus (= *TrGF* 2.169, Frg. 617.8 = Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 5.14.131 ¶ 3 = Eusebius *P.E.* 13.13.60 = Pseudo-Justin *De Monarchia* 2) καὶ πᾶσα πηγὴ καὶ ὕδατος συστήματα.

πηγαί τε πᾶσαι καὶ ὑδάτων συστήματα. This describes the pollution of all the Egyptian waterways mentioned in LXX Exod 7:19, but in language reminiscent of LXX Gen 1:10; 7:11.

On whether αἷμα is subject (Wieneke, 81-82) or object, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 206, n. 2.

Ezekiel's first plague corresponds to the first biblical plague (LXX Exod 7:17-25).

143. **βατράχων** τε πλῆθος καὶ **σκνίπας** ἐμβαλῶ χθονί (v 135).

The plague of frogs is recorded in LXX Exod 7:27-8:11. The term βάτραχος is repeatedly used. Cf. 7:27 εἰ δὲ μὴ βούλει σὺ ἐξαποστεῖλαι, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ τύπτω πάντα τὰ ὅριά σου τοῖς **βατράχοις**. 28 καὶ ἐξερεύξεται ὁ ποταμὸς **βατράχους** ... Also, cf. LXX Ps 77:45; 104:30.

Snell proposes a lacuna after βατράχων τε πλῆθος. Cf. app. crit.; also "Jamben," 29, n. 1; *TrGF* 1.295. Strugnell, 451, n. 6, proposes βατράχων τε πλῆθος σκνῖπά τ' ἐμβαλῶ χθονί, which is preferred by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 206, n. 5; also van der Horst, "Notes," 370. Cf. *LSJ*, 1612.

The plague of insects is recorded in LXX Exod 8:12-15. The term σκνίψ is repeatedly used. Cf. 8:12 καὶ ἔσονται **σκνῖφες** ἔν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν καὶ ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου. Also, cf. LXX Ps 77:46; 104:31. On the uncertain meaning of σκνίψ (*v.l.* κνίψ), van der Horst, "Notes," 370, mentions the *Suda* definition ζῷον μικρὸν ξυλοφάγον; *LSJ*, 1613, "an insect found under the bark of trees eaten by the woodpecker," citing Aristotle *HA* 9.9 (614^b1); *Sens.* 5 (444^b12); Plutarch *Moral.* 636D.

Ezekiel's second and third plagues correspond to the second and third biblical plagues (LXX Exod 7:27-8:15).

144. ἔπειτα τέφραν οἷς **καμιναίαν** <u>πάσω</u>, | ἀναβρυήσει δ' ἐν βροτοῖς **ἕλκη** πικρά (vv 136-137).

The plague of boils is described in LXX Exod 9:8-12. Cf. 9:8 εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν καὶ Ααρων λέγων· λάβετε ὑμεῖς πλήρεις τὰς χεῖρας αἰθάλης **καμιναίας**, καὶ <u>πασάτω</u> Μωυσῆς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐναντίον Φαραω καὶ ἐναντίον τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ, 9 καὶ γενηθήτω κονιορτὸς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἔσται ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τετράποδα **ἕλκη**, φλυκτίδες ἀναζέουσαι, ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν καὶ ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου.

As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 114, notes, in the biblical account the boils attack both man and beast.

On ἀναβρυήσει, and the related text-critical problems, cf. app. crit. and discussion in Kuiper, 254-55; Wieneke, 83.

Ezekiel's fourth plague corresponds to the

sixth biblical plague (LXX Exod 9:8-12). On the possible reasons for the shift in order, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 115-16.

145. *κυνόμυια δ' ἥξει καὶ βροτοὺς Αἰγυπτίων | πολλοὺς κακώσει* (vv 138-139).

The plague of flies is described in LXX Exod 8:16-28. The term *κυνόμυια* (= *κυνάμυια*) is used throughout. Cf. 8:17 *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς θεράποντάς σου καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς οἴκους ὑμῶν κυνόμυιαν, καὶ πλησθήσονται αἱ οἰκίαι τῶν Αἰγυπτίων τῆς κυνομυίης καὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐφ' ἧς εἰσιν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ... 20 ἐποίησεν δὲ κύριος οὕτως, καὶ παρεγένετο ἡ κυνόμυια πλῆθος εἰς τοὺς οἴκους Φαραω ...*
καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου...

Also, cf. LXX Ps 77:45; 104:31.

Ezekiel's fifth plague corresponds to the fourth biblical plague (LXX Exod 8:16-28).

146. *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ' ἔσται πάλιν | λοιμός, θανοῦνται δ' οἷς ἔνεστι καρδία | σκληρά* (vv 139-141).

This sixth item is perhaps a veiled reference to the fifth biblical plague, the killing of Egyptian livestock, described in LXX Exod 9:3-7. Cf. 9:3 *θάνατος μέγας σφόδρα*. Also cf. LXX Ps 77:48-50.

The chief difference, of course, is that no mention is made of livestock here; rather, it appears to be a plague inflicted against those of "hard hearts," i.e., Pharaoh and the Egyptians. For discussion of the exegetical problem, especially the possible influence of LXX Ps 77:48-50, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 117-18, who sees an intentional connection between this and the final plague.

On the hardness of heart motif, cf. LXX Exod 7:3 *ἐγὼ δὲ σκληρυνῶ τὴν καρδίαν Φαραω ...*; also 4:21; 7:22; 8:15 *al.* Also, cf. A. Hermann, "Das steinharte Herz," *JAC* 4 (1961) 77-107; as noted by

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 208, n. 22.

147. *πικράνω δ' οὐρανόν· χάλαζα νῦν | σὺν πυρὶ πεσεῖται καὶ νεκροὺς θήσει βροτούς* (vv 141-142).

The plague of hail is described in LXX Exod 9:13-35. The motif of making the heaven bitter (*πικράνω* or cognates) does not occur in the biblical account. Cf. 9:18 *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὕω ταύτην τὴν ὥραν αὔριον* **χάλαζαν** *πολλὴν σφόδρα ...* 23 *ἐξέτεινεν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὴν χεῖρα εἰς τὸν* **οὐρανόν**, *καὶ κύριος ἔδωκεν φωνὰς καὶ* **χάλαζαν**, *καὶ διέτρεχεν τὸ* **πῦρ** *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἔβρεξεν κύριος* **χάλαζαν** *ἐπὶ πᾶσαν γῆν Αἰγύπτου...* Cf. LXX Ps 104:32.

On the text-critical difficulty of *πικράνω*, cf. app. crit., and discussion in Kuiper, 255; Wieneke, 84. For *πικραίνω*, cf. Aeschylus *Eum*. 693; so Jacobson *Exagoge*, 185, n. 7.

That the hailstorm was fatal is inferred from LXX Exod 9:19, and probably 9:25. Cf. next note.

This seventh plague of Ezekiel corresponds to the seventh biblical plague (LXX Exod 9:13-35).

148. *καρποί τ' ὀλοῦνται τετραπόδων τε σώματα* (v 143).

LXX Exod 9:25 *ἐπάταξεν δὲ ἡ χάλαζα ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους, καὶ πᾶσαν βοτάνην τὴν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ ἐπάταξεν ἡ χάλαζα, καὶ πάντα τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις συνέτριψεν ἡ χάλαζα.* Cf. 9:31-32. Also, cf. LXX Ps 104:32-33; note v 35 *τὸν καρπόν*.

149. *σκότος τε θήσω τρεῖς ἐφ' ἡμέρας ὅλας* (v 144).

The plague of darkness is described in LXX Exod 10:21-29. Cf. 10:22 *ἐξέτεινεν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὴν χεῖρα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἐγένετο* **σκότος** *γνόφος θύελλα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν γῆν Αἰγύπτου* **τρεῖς ἡμέρας** (also v 23). Cf. LXX Ps 104:28; also LXX Wis 17:1-18:4.

This eighth plague of Ezekiel corresponds to the ninth biblical plague (LXX Exod 10:21-29).

On Ezekiel's order of arrangement and the close connection between this and both the preceding and following plagues, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 115.

150. ἀκρίδας τε πέμψω, καὶ περισσὰ βρώματα | ἅπαντ' ἀναλώσουσι καὶ καρποῦ χλόην (vv 145-146).

The plague of locusts is described in LXX Exod 10:3-20. Cf. 10:4 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ταύτην τὴν ὥραν αὔριον **ἀκρίδα** πολλὴν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ὅριά σου, 5 καὶ καλύψει τὴν ὄψιν τῆς γῆς, καὶ οὐ δυνήσῃ κατιδεῖν τὴν γῆν, καὶ κατέδεται πᾶν τὸ περισσὸν τῆς γῆς τὸ καταλειφθέν, ὃ κατέλιπεν ὑμῖν ἡ χάλαζα, καὶ κατέδεται πᾶν ξύλον τὸ φυόμενον ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ... 15 καὶ κατέφαγεν πᾶσαν βοτάνην τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντα τὸν **καρπὸν** τῶν ξύλων, ὃς ὑπελείφθη ἀπὸ τῆς χαλάζης· οὐχ ὑπελείφθη χλωρὸν οὐδὲν ἐν τοῖς ξύλοις καὶ ἐν πάσῃ βοτάνῃ τοῦ πεδίου ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου. Also, cf. LXX Ps 104:34-35, esp. τὸν καρπὸν.

Kuiper, 255, accepts Dübner's emendation περισσαί, which Wieneke, 85, finds unnecessary, thus retaining the MSS reading περισσά.

This ninth plague of Ezekiel corresponds to the eighth biblical plague (LXX Exod 10:3-20).

151. ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις τέκν' ἀποκτενῶ βροτῶν | πρωτόγονα (vv 147-148).

The death of the first-born is announced in LXX Exod 11:1-9. Cf. 11:5 καὶ τελευτήσει πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ ἀπὸ πρωτοτόκου Φαραω, ὃς κάθηται ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ ἕως πρωτοτόκου τῆς θεραπαίνης τῆς παρὰ τὸν μύλον καὶ ἕως πρωτοτόκου παντὸς κτήνους.

ἀποκτενῶ. On the force of this verb, as compared with verbs used to describe the previous plagues, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 116. Also, cf. Euripides *Or.* 15 τέκν' ἀποκτείνας. Wieneke, 85.

On the use of πρωτόγονος by the Greek tragedians, e.g., Euripides *Hec.* 458, cf. Wieneke, 85-86.

Ezekiel's tenth plague corresponds to the tenth biblical plague (LXX Exod 11:1-9).

152. *παύσω δ' ὕβριν ἀνθρώπων κακῶν* (v 148).

On the significance of Ezekiel's use of *ὕβρις*, especially in light of its crucial significance in Greek drama, cf. Robertson, 814, n. p^2, who also refers to R. Lattimore, *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969) 23. He also suggests a parallel between Ezekiel's portrait of Pharaoh and that of Xerxes in Aeschylus *Per.*, esp. vv 749-50, 808.

153. *Φαραὼ δὲ βασιλεὺς πείσετ' οὐδὲν ὧν λέγω* (v 149).

LXX Exod 11:9 *εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν· οὐκ εἰσακούσεταί ὑμῶν Φαραω, ἵνα πληθύνων πληθύνω μου τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.*

Cf. LXX Exod 10:27 etc.

πείσεται. Our translation assumes *πείθω* as the lexical form rather than *πάσχω*, as e.g., Euripides *Hel.* 446 *πείθει γὰρ οὐδὲν ὧν λέγω* (as noted by Kuiper, 256). This corresponds more closely with LXX Exod 11:9, even though Ezekiel uses *πείσεται* instead of *εἰσακούσεται*. Also, as van der Horst, "Notes," 371, observes, it makes more sense of v 151 *καὶ τότε φοβηθεὶς λαὸν ἐκπέμψει ταχύ*. Similarly, Kuiper, 255-56; Wieneke, 86; Robertson, 814, n. q^2; Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 128.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 119-20 (also 114), by contrast, prefers *πάσχω*. Accordingly, Pharaoh himself is not directly affected, i.e., "will not suffer," until the final plague, in which case Ezekiel's version of the previous plagues represents a significant departure from the biblical account (cf. LXX Exod 7:29; 8:17, 25).

154. *πλὴν τέκνου αὐτοῦ <u>πρωτόγονον</u> ἕξει νεκρόν* (v 150).

LXX Exod 11:5 καὶ τελευτήσει πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ ἀπὸ πρωτοτόκου Φαραω, ὃς κάθηται ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου ...

155. καὶ τότε φοβηθεὶς λαὸν ἐκπέμψει ταχύ (v 151).

LXX Exod 11:6 καὶ ἔσται κραυγὴ μεγάλη κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν Αἰγύπτου, ἥτις τοιαύτη οὐ γέγονεν καὶ τοιαύτη οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται.

156. πρὸς τοῖσδε λέξεις πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ (v 152).

God's proclamation of Passover is described in LXX Exod 12:1-20. Cf. 12:3 λάλησον πρὸς πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν υἱῶν Ισραηλ λέγων ...

πρὸς τοῖσδε. Cf. Sophocles *Ph.* 1339 καὶ πρὸς τοῖσδ' ἔτι. Wieneke, 86.

πᾶσιν Ἑβραίοις ὁμοῦ. Cf. Frg. 9, line 16 = v 110.

157. **Ὁ** μεὶς ὅδ' ὑμῖν **πρῶτος** ἐνιαυτῶν πέλει (v 153).

LXX Exod 12:2 (God speaking to Moses and Aaron) **ὁ** μὴν οὗτος ὑμῖν ἀρχὴ μηνῶν, **πρῶτός** ἐστιν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς μησὶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ.

μείς. Cf. Homer *Il.* 19.117; *h.Merc.* 11. Wieneke, 86; *LSJ*, 1094. On Ezekiel's use of ἐνιαυτῶν instead of μηνῶν, and Gutman's suggestion that Ezekiel refers to the tradition that the Exodus begins a new *era*, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 129, who also sees possible Herodotean influence in Ezekiel's use of μείς.

158. ἐν τῷδ' ἀπάξω λαὸν εἰς ἄλλην χθόνα, | εἰς ἣν ὑπέστην **πατράσιν** Ἑβραίων γένους (vv 154-155).

LXX Exod 12:17 ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐξάξω τὴν δύναμιν ὑμῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ... 13:5 καὶ ἔσται ἡνίκα ἐὰν εἰσαγάγῃ σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν Χαναναίων καὶ ... ἣν ὤμοσεν τοῖς **πατράσιν** σου δοῦναι σοι ...

Also cf. LXX Exod 12:25.

159. λέξεις δὲ λαῷ παντί, μηνὸς οὗ λέγω | διχομηνίᾳ (vv 156-157).

LXX Exod 12:3 λάλησον πρὸς πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν υἱων Ισραηλ λέγων· τῇ δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου λαβέτωσαν ἕκαστος πρόβατον ... (also v 21). 12:6 καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν διατετηρημένον ἕως τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου, καὶ σφάξουσιν αὐτὸ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος συναγωγῆς υἱῶν Ισραηλ πρὸς ἑσπέραν (also v 18).

διχομηνίᾳ. διχόμηνος, literally, "dividing the month," mid-month, i.e., "*at* or *of the full moon*" (*LSJ*, 439). Cf. Homer *h.Hom.* 32.11. LXX (hapax) Sir 39:12 καὶ ὡς διχομηνία ἐπληρώθην. For other classical references, cf. Wieneke, 87.

160. τὸ πάσχα θύσαντας θεῷ (v 157).

LXX Exod 12:21 (Moses to Israel) θύσατε τὸ πασχα.

161. τῇ πρόσθε νυκτὶ αἵματι φαῦσαι θύρας (v 158).

LXX Exod 12:7 καὶ λήμφονται ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ θήσουσιν ἐπὶ τῶν δύο σταθμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν φλιὰν ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις, ἐν οἷς ἐὰν φάγωσιν αὐτὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. 12:22 λήμψεσθε δὲ δεσμὴν ὑσσώπου καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ παρὰ τὴν θύραν καθίξετε τῆς φλιᾶς ...ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, ὅ ἐστιν παρὰ τὴν θύραν.

τῇ πρόσθε νυκτὶ. Kuiper, 256, proposes νυκτός, on which cf. Wieneke, 87.

φαῦσαι. Cf. LXX (hapax) 4 Macc 17:1. Cf. Aeschylus *Ch.* 182 εἰ τῆσδε χώρας μήποτε φαύσει ποδί. Other classical examples in Wieneke, 87.

162. ὅπως παρέλθῃ σῆμα δεινὸς ἄγγελος (v 159).

LXX Exod 12:13 καὶ ἔσται τὸ αἷμα ὑμῖν ἐν σημείῳ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκιῶν, ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐκεῖ, καὶ ὄψομαι τὸ αἷμα καὶ σκεπάσω ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν πληγὴ τοῦ ἐκτριβῆναι, ὅταν παίω ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ. 12:23 καὶ παρελεύσεται κύριος τὴν θύραν καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσει τὸν ὀλεθρεύοντα εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰς οἰκίας

ὑμῶν πατάξαι.

In the biblical account, it is the Lord himself who will pass over the marked houses (LXX Exod 12:13). An angel, however, figures prominently elsewhere in the story, e.g., LXX Exod 3:2; 4:24; 14:19; 23:20, 23; 32:34; 33:2. Cf. Frg. 14, line 16 (v 187), where it is *θάνατος* which passes over. Ezekiel's version resembles other traditions in which an "angel of death" is featured, e.g., *Tg. Yer.* Exod 12:13; also cf. *Jub.* 49:2; *Exod. Rab.* 17:5; references noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 208-209, n. 8, who also provides additional bibliography on the rabbinic debate. Also cf. van der Horst, "Notes," 371, who mentions the variant of *Tg. Neof. I* Exod 12:13, "and the destroying angel who is appointed over death will not have power to injure you when I am revealed to slay the first born in the land"; also *Memar Marqah* 1.9, with reference to J. E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr, 1985) 225-26.

σῆμα. Cf. Homer *Il.* 7.189 γνῶ δὲ κλήρου σῆμα ἰδών etc. Wieneke, 87. Not in LXX.

163. ὑμεῖς δὲ <u>νυκτὸς</u> **ὀπτὰ** δαίσεσθε **κρέα** (v 160).

LXX Exod 12:8 καὶ φάγονται τὰ **κρέα** τῇ <u>νυκτὶ</u> ταύτῃ· **ὀπτὰ** πυρὶ καὶ ἄζυμα ἐπὶ πικρίδων ἔδονται.

164. **σπουδῇ** δὲ βασιλεὺς <u>ἐκβαλεῖ</u> <u>πρόπαντ'</u> ὄχλον (v 161).

LXX Exod 11:1 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξαποστελεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐντεῦθεν· ὅταν δὲ ἐξαποστέλλῃ ὑμᾶς, σὺν <u>παντὶ</u> ἐκβαλεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐκβολῇ. 12:33 καὶ κατεβιάζοντο οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν λαὸν **σπουδῇ** <u>ἐκβαλεῖν</u> αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

πρόπαντ'. For the poetic form πρόπας, cf. Euripides *Or.* 972 etc. Wieneke, 87. Not in LXX.

165. ὅταν δὲ μέλλητ' ἀποτρέχειν, **δώσω χάριν** | **λαῷ** (vv 162-163).

LXX Exod 3:21 καὶ **δώσω χάριν** τῷ **λαῷ** τούτῳ ἐναντίον τῶν Αἰγυπτίων· **ὅταν δὲ** ἀποτρέχητε, οὐκ ἀπελεύσεσθε κενοί.

Also cf. LXX Exod 11:3; 12:36.

δώσω χάριν λαῷ. Cf. Euripides *El*. 1146 *δώσω χάριν σοι*. Wieneke, 88.

166. **γυνή** τε παρὰ γυναικὸς λήψεται | **σκεύη** κόσμον τε πάνθ', ὃν ἄνθρωπος φέρει, | χρυσόν τε **καὶ** <τὸν> ἄργυρον ἠδὲ καὶ στολάς (vv (vv 163-165).

LXX Exod 3:22 αἰτήσει **γυνὴ** παρὰ γείτονος καὶ συσκήνου αὐτῆς **σκεύη** ἀργυρᾶ **καὶ** χρυσᾶ καὶ ἱματισμόν, καὶ ἐπιθήσετε ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ὑμῶν.

Also cf. LXX Exod 11:2; 12:35; LXX Ps 104:37.

κόσμον ... καὶ στολάς. Cf. Sophocles *Tr*. 764 κόσμῳ τε χαίρων καὶ στολῇ. Wieneke, 88. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 192; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 185, n. 7.

χρυσόν τε καὶ <τὸν> ἄργυρον. On the text-critical problem, cf. app. crit. and discussion in Kuiper, 256; Wieneke, 88.

167. ἵν' ὧν ἔπραξαν μισθὸν ἀποδῶσι βροτοῖς (v 166).

LXX Exod 3:22b καὶ σκυλεύσετε τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. 12:36 καὶ ἔχρησαν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐσκύλευσαν τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους.

Cf. Philo *V. Mos*. 1.141-42, esp. μισθὸν κομιζόμενοι.

On the debate concerning the Jews' appropriation of Egyptian goods, cf. Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*, 213, n. 89; also Artapanus, Frg. 3.34 = *P.E*. 9.27.34 (*FHJA* 1.222-23, 242, n. 113); Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 126-27, noting *b. Sanh*. 91a; Philo *V. Mos*. 1.141-42; Josephus *Ant*. 2.14.6 ¶ 314; *Jub*. 48:18; *Esth. Rab*. 7:13; LXX Wis 10:17, 20; Robertson, 815, n. u^2. Also cf. Stein, "Ein

jüdisch-hellenistischer Midrasch," 570-72; also R. Le Déaut, *Targum du Pentateuque II* (Paris, 1979) 92 n. 30, who also notes Theodoret *Quaestiones in Exodum* (*PG* 80. col. 249) and Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 2.20.4; van der Horst, "Notes," 371.

168. ὅταν δ' ἐς ἴδιον χῶρον <u>εἰσέλθηθ'</u>, ὅπως | ἀφ' ἥσπερ ἠοῦς ἐφύγετ', Αἰγύπτου δ' ἄπο | **ἑπτὰ** διοδοιποροῦντες **ἡμέρας** ὁδόν (vv 167-169).

LXX Exod 12:25 ἐὰν δὲ <u>εἰσέλθητε</u> εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἂν δῷ κύριος ὑμῖν, καθότι ἐλάλησεν, φυλάξεσθε τὴν λατρείαν ταύτην (also 13:5). 13:7 ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε τὰς **ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας**.

ἴδιον χῶρον. Cf. Aristotle *Mu.* 6 (399^{b}9) ὁ δὲ φιλὸς εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκτρέχει χώραν. Wieneke, 88. Also, cf. LXX 1 Esdr 4:20 ἐκγαταλείπει ... καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν χώραν ... κολλᾶται. Also LXX Job 2:11.

ἠὼς. Cf. Euripides *IA* 158; Homer *Il.* 1.493; cf. Wieneke, 88. Not in LXX. For discussion of the term, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 128.

δ' ἄπο. On the text-critical problem, cf. Kuiper, 257; Wieneke, 88-89. Kuiper, 257, conjectures Αἰγύπτου πέδον, based on Euripides *Hel.* 2 Αἰγύπτου πέδον. Wieneke, 16, 89, adopts Wünsche's emendation νομόν, since νομός was the standard Egyptian designation for land division, as e.g., Herodotus 2.164; also, cf. Artapanus, Frg. 3.4 = *P.E.* 9.27.4 (*FHJA* 1.210-11).

ἑπτὰ διοδοιποροῦντες ἡμέρας ὁδόν. On the text-critical problem, cf. app. crit. and discussion in Weieneke, 89. Stephanus' emendation ἑπτὰ διοδοιποροῦντες is adopted by Mras. διοδοιπορέω occurs in Herodotus 8.129; Josephus *Ag.Ap.* 2.16 ¶ 157.

On the non-biblical motif of the seven-day journey, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 125-26, with particular reference to Artapanus, Frg. 3.34 = *P.E.* 9.27.34 (*FHJA* 1.222-23, 243, n. 114), who mentions a three-day journey (also Josephus *Ant.* 2.15.1 ¶

315); also *b. Sota* 12b.

169. πάντες τοσαύτας **ἡμέρας** ἔτος κάτα | ἄζυμα **ἔδεσθε** καὶ <u>θεῷ</u> <u>λατρεύσετε</u> (vv 170-171).

LXX Exod 12:15 ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἄζυμα **ἔδεσθε** (generally 12:14-20). 13:5b-7 καὶ ποιήσεις τὴν <u>λατρείαν</u> ταύτην ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τούτῳ. 6 ἓξ ἡμέρας **ἔδεσθε ἄζυμα**, τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἑορτὴ κυρίου· 7 **ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε** τὰς ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας, οὐκ ὀφθήσεταί σοι ζυμωτόν, οὐδὲ ἔσται σοι ζύμη ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ὁρίοις σου. 13:10 καὶ φυλάξεσθε τὸν νόμον τοῦτον κατὰ καιροὺς ὡρῶν ἀφ' ἡμερῶν εἰς **ἡμέρας**. Cf. 12:25 φυλάξεσθε τὴν <u>λατρείαν</u> ταύτην; also 12:31 <u>λατρεύσατε</u> κυρίῳ τῷ <u>θεῷ</u> ὑμῶν.

ἔτος κάτα. "annually," cf. Thucydides 4.53.2; Diodorus Siculus 3.2.3. Wieneke, 89.

ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε. Cf. Plato *Tim.* 74 D σαρκὸς ἀζύμου; 1 Cor. 5:7. For the plural form, cf. LXX 2 Chr 8:13; Luke 22:1; Acts 12:3. Wieneke, 89-90. Cf. H. Windisch, ζύμη κ.τ.λ.," *TDNT* 2 (1964) 902-906. Also, cf. discussion in Jacobson, *Exagoge* 128-29.

θεῷ λατρεύσετε. On the use of λατρεύω in Greek tragedy, cf. examples in Wieneke, 90.

170. τὰ <u>πρωτότευκτα</u> ζῷα <u>θύοντες</u> θεῷ, | <u>ὅσ' ἂν</u> τέκωσι παρθένοι πρώτως τέκνα | τἀρσενικὰ <u>διανοίγοντα μήτρας</u> μητέρων (vv 172-174).

LXX Exod 13:2 (God to Moses) ἁγίασόν μοι πᾶν <u>πρωτότοκον πρωτογενὲς</u> <u>διανοῖγον</u> πᾶσαν <u>μήτραν</u> ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους· ἐμοί ἐστιν. 13:12 καὶ ἀφελεῖς πᾶν <u>διανοῖγον μήτραν</u>, τὰ ἀρσενικά, τῷ κυρίῳ ... <u>ὅσα ἐὰν</u> γένηταί σοι, τὰ ἀρσενικά ...

13:15 διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ <u>θύω</u> τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν <u>διανοῖγον μήτραν</u>, τὰ **ἀρσενικά**, καὶ πᾶν <u>πρωτότοκον</u> τῶν υἱῶν μου λυτρώσομαι.

πρωτότευκτα. "first-fashioned," hapax, *LSJ*, 1545; Kuiper, 257; Wieneke, 90.

θύοντες. On the possible misconstrual of this

as implying human sacrifice, cf. Robertson, 815, n. v[2].

παρθένοι. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 613; so Jacobson *Exagoge* 185, n. 7.

ὅσ' ἂν. On the text-critical problem, cf. Wieneke, 90, who adopts Stephanus' emendation *ὅσα τ' ἂν*.

διανοίγοντα μήτρας μητέρων. Cf. LXX Num 12:12 *ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρός*; also LXX Job 3:16. Wieneke, 90.

171. This fragment follows the previous fragment without interruption. Eusebius continues to quote directly from Alexander Polyhistor. Mras prints the introductory words to the fragment in lines 1-3 to indicate that they are from Eusebius rather than Polyhistor. If so, this would break Eusebius' usual pattern of citing Polyhistor's introductory words to the poetic fragments, or, as he did in Frg. 13, doing both -- providing his own introductory words, then citing Polyhistor's introduction, and then the poetic lines themselves. Cf. discussion below in n. 173. For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

This fragment continues to provide instructions concerning the observance of Passover. As was the case with Frg. 13, lines 26-48 (= vv 152-174), this fragment is based primarily on material drawn from LXX Exod 12:1-28, and most likely Moses' speech to the elders of Israel in 12:21-27 (cf. discussion below).

Like Frg. 13, the poetic lines in this fragment are couched in the form of an address (e.g., *φυλαχθήτω* [line 6 = v 177]; *φάγεσθε* [line 9 = v 180]; etc.). The critical interpretive question, however, is whether this fragment continues the speech of God begun in Frg. 13, whether it constitutes another speech by God on a later occasion (Kraus, Trencsényi-Waldapfel), or

whether it is an excerpt from an address by Moses.

While earlier scholars attributed the speech to God, more recently, scholars have become convinced that Moses is the speaker here. One of the chief reasons for this shift of opinion is the frequent repetition of material that appears in Frg. 13, lines 26-48 (= vv 152-74), e.g., instructions concerning preparation of the sacrificial animals (lines 7-9 = vv 178-80 *καὶ πρὸς ἑσπέραν θύσαντες ὀπτὰ πάντα σὺν τοῖς ἔνδοθεν οὕτως φάγεσθε ταῦτα*; cf. Frg. 13, line 34 = v 160 *ὑμεῖς δὲ νυκτὸς ὀπτὰ δαίσεσθε κρέα*); Pharaoh's hasty expulsion of the Hebrews (lines 11-12 = vv 182-83 *ἐν σπουδῇ τε γὰρ βασιλεὺς κελεύσει πάντας ἐκβαλεῖν χθονός*; cf. Frg. 13, line 35 = v 161 *σπουδῇ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐκβαλεῖ πρόπαντ' ὄχλον*); the instruction to observe Passover (line 13 = v 184 *κεκλήσεται δὲ πᾶς [πάσχ', ὅταν* Strugnell]. *καὶ ὅταν θύσητε δέ*; cf. Frg. 13, line 31 = v 157 *τὸ πάσχα θύσαντας θεῷ*); the instruction to smear the door posts with blood (line 15 = v 186 *εἰς αἷμα βάψαι καὶ θιγεῖν σταθμῶν δυοῖν*; cf. Frg. 13, line 32 = v 158 *τῇ πρόσθε νυκτὶ αἵματι φαῦσαι θύρας*); the reference to the "passing over" of God/death (line 16 = v 187 *ὅπως παρέλθῃ θάνατος Ἑβραίων ἄπο*; cf. Frg. 13, line 33 = v 159 *ὅπως παρέλθῃ σῆμα δεινὸς ἄγγελος*); the reference to seven days unleavened (lines 18-19 = vv 189-90 *ἕφθ' ἡμέρας ἄζυμα· καὶ οὐ βρωθήσεται ζύμη*; cf. Frg. 13, lines 43-45 = vv 169-71 *ἑπτὰ διοδοιποροῦντες ἡμέρας ὁδόν, πάντες τοσαύτας ἡμέρας ἔτος κάτα ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε καὶ θεῷ λατρεύσετε*); the Passover as the beginning of their months and seasons (line 21 = v 192 *ἀρχὴ δὲ μηνῶν καὶ χρόνων οὗτος πέλει*; cf. Frg. 13, line 27 = v 153 *ὅ μεὶς ὅδ' ὑμῖν πρῶτος ἐνιαυτῶν πέλει*); reference to God's "exodus" (line 20 = v 191 *καὶ τοῦδε μηνὸς ἔξοδον διδοῖ θεός*; cf. Frg. 13, line 28 = v 154 *ἐν τῷδ' ἀπάξω λαὸν εἰς ἄλλην χθόνα*).

(For a comparison of the two speeches, cf.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 122-23, who notes how certain motifs introduced in the first speech are elaborated or clarifed in the second speech, an indication that Ezekiel has "executed this repetition skillfully through selectivity and elaboration.")

In addition, certain features of the address in this fragment appear odd if God is the speaker, e.g., *δεσπότῃ* in line 17 = v 188. The term *δεσπότης* is not ordinarily used in LXX as a term of self-reference by God. In the earlier speech (Frg. 13, line 31 = v 157; lines 45-46 = vv 171-72), God's term of self-reference is *θεός*, which, however, occurs in this fragment in line 20 = v 191. The use of the first person singular, which occurs throughout Frg. 13 is absent in Frg. 14 (cf. Frg. 13, line 28 = v 154 *ἐν τῷδ' ἀπάξω λαὸν εἰς ἄλλην χθόνα* and Frg. 14, line 20 = v 191 *καὶ τοῦδε μηνὸς ἔξοδον διδοῖ θεός*; also cf. Frg. 13, line 10 = v 136 *πάσω*; line 15 = v 141 *πικράνω*; line 18 = v 144 *θήσω*; line 19 = v 145 *πέμψω*; etc.). Combined with this are the second person plural forms, which seem appropriate in a speech by Moses to the people, e.g., *φάγεσθε* (line 9 = v 180), *ὑποδέδεσθε* (line 10 = v 181), *θύσητε* (line 13 = v 184), etc.

There are certain features, however, which are problematic, if Moses is the speaker, e.g., the references to the "Hebrews" (line 4 = v 175; line 16 = v 187) would appear to be more appropriate in an address by God to Moses; *ἀπαλλαγήσεται* in line 19 = v 190 seems odd in an address directed by Moses to the Jews (though, cf. text-critical discussion below, n. 183).

Based on these considerations, it is likely that this fragment contains an excerpt from a speech by Moses, which corresponded to his address before the elders of Israel in which he gave instructions concerning the Passover (LXX Exod 12:21-27). This would then make clearer sense of

God's earlier command to Moses in Frg. 9, line 15 = v 109 ἀλλ' ἔρπε καὶ σήμαινε τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις. Accordingly, another scene, in which Moses addressed the people (or their leaders), is likely to have occurred between the burning bush scene and that of the messenger, which follows in Frg. 14.

Primary credit for attributing this speech to Moses appears to go to Strugnell, "Notes," 449. The case is stated succinctly by Robertson, 815, n. w^2, and more elaborately by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 121-24. Also, cf. van der Horst, "Notes," 359.

172. I.e., Polyhistor (so, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 208, n. 4; Robertson, 815, n. w^2), though conceivably Ezekiel (Kuiper, 257; Vogt, *JSHRZ* [4.3], 129, n. on 174a). Cf. discussion below, n. 173.

173. Καὶ πάλιν περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ταύτης ἑορτῆς φησὶν ἐπεξεργαζόμενον ἀκριβέστερον εἰρηκέναι.

As already noted (cf. n. 171 above), these introductory words may be attributed either to Eusebius (Mras) or Polyhistor (Gaisford, Kuiper), and accordingly the referents of φησίν (Polyhistor or Ezekiel) and ἐπεξεργαζόμενον (Ezekiel or God) are determined.

The problem is recognized in the text-critical tradition. The most radical solution is B, which omits ἐπεξ. --- εἰρηκέναι, thus yielding "and again concerning this same feast, he says...," in which case "he" could be Polyhistor, Ezekiel, or God (or possibly even Moses). The reading of ON ἐπεξεργαζόμενος, which requires the participle to modify the subject of φησίν, is difficult because it makes the final infinitive εἰρηκέναι redundant. The reading of I ἐπεξεργαζομένης, which connects the participle with ἑορτῆς, would yield, "and again he speaks concerning this feast, (which is) elaborated in greater detail ...," but here too the final infinitive is redundant. Stephanus'

emendation ἐπεξεργαζόμενον provides the most satisfactory solution grammatically, since it allows the final infinitive to be rendered sensibly, thus "and again concerning this same feast, he reports the one having elaborated in greater detail to have said..." This allows two possibilities: either that "he" is Polyhistor and "one" is Ezekiel (so Mras, *GCS* [43,1] 533, n. on line 18); or, that "he" is Ezekiel and "one" is God (so Kuiper, 257).

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 122, also observes that πάλιν tends to be used by Eusebius in transitional statements to signify more decisive shifts (e.g., Frg. 15, line 1; Frg. 16, line 1). By contrast, when portions are being excerpted from the same section or scene, the words used in the transitional, introductory summaries are εἶτα or ὑποβάς (e.g., Frg. 3, line 1; Frg. 5, line 1; Frg. 9, line 1; Frg. 10, line 1; Frg. 11, line 1; Frg. 17, line 1). Accordingly, Jacobson concludes that the following poetic lines are likely from a different scene or speech than those in the previous fragment.

174. Ἀνδρῶν Ἑβραίων τοῦδε τοῦ **μηνὸς** λαβὼν | **κατὰ** *συγγενείας* **πρόβατα** καὶ μόσχους βοῶν | ἄμωμα **δεκάτῃ** (vv 175-177).

LXX Exod 12:3 λάλησον πρὸς πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν υἱῶν Ισραηλ λέγων· τῇ **δεκάτῃ** τοῦ **μηνὸς** τούτου λαβέτωσαν ἕκαστος **πρόβατον** κατ' οἴκους πατριῶν, ἕκαστος **πρόβατον** κατ' οἰκίαν. 12:21 (Moses to Israel) ἀπελθόντες λάβετε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς **πρόβατον** κατὰ *συγγενείας* ὑμῶν καὶ θύσατε τὸ πασχα. Cf. 12:5 **πρόβατον** τέλειον ἄρσεν ἐνιαύσιον ἔσται ὑμῖν.

λαβών. Stephanus' emendation λαβέ supplies an otherwise absent main verb, and one that matches the imperative φυλαχθήτω in line 6 = v 177. The MSS reading λαβών, however, lacks a stated subject, which suggests that some previous lines have been omitted. Cf. Kuiper, 257; Wieneke, 90. Mras, *GCS*

(43,1) 533, n. on line 20, sees anacoluthon as the solution: *ἕκαστος λαβὼν ... φάγεσθε*. Similarly, Snell, *TrGF* 1.297, n. on line 175: "ante (v 175) expectes *ἕκαστος* et imperat." Cf. Robertson, 815, n. x^2.

μόσχους βοῶν ἄμωμα. Cf. LXX Lev 4:3 *μόσχον ἐκ βοῶν ἄμωμον*; also 4:14; Num 15:24; Ezek 45:18; cf. Exod 29:1. The use of this LXX expression in these passages is perhaps the simplest explanation for Ezekiel's use of *ἄμωμα* instead of *τέλειον* from LXX Exod 12:5. An anti-mystical motivation, as suggested by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 210, n. 25, seems unlikely. Also cf. LXX Deut 16:2 *πρόβατα καὶ βόας*; also cf. 2 Chr 35:8. Wieneke, 90, notes the use of *ἄμωμος* in Hesiod *Th.* 259; Aeschylus *Per.* 185.

On the regulations concerning which animals were to be sacrificed at Passover, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge* 129-131.

175. *καὶ φυλαχθήτω μέχρι | τετρὰς ἐπιλάμψει δεκάδι* (vv 177-178).

LXX Exod 12:6a *καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν διατετηρημένον ἕως τῆς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου.*

Also, cf. LXX Exod 12:18.

ἐπιλάμψει. Cf. LXX Wis 5:6; Isa 4:2. Also Herodotus 8.14 *ἡμέρη ἐπέλαμψε*. Wieneke, 91.

176. *καὶ* **πρὸς ἑσπέραν** | *θύσαντες* **ὀπτὰ** *πάντα σὺν τοῖς ἔνδοθεν* | **οὕτως φάγεσθε** *ταῦτα* (vv 178-180).

LXX Exod 12:6b *καὶ σφάξουσιν αὐτὸ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος συναγωγῆς υἱῶν Ισραηλ* **πρὸς ἑσπέραν**. 12:8 *καὶ φάγονται τὰ κρέα τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ·* **ὀπτὰ** *πυρὶ καὶ ἄζυμα ἐπὶ πικρίδων ἔδονται*. 12:9 *οὐκ ἔδεσθε ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὠμὸν ... ἀλλ' ἢ ὀπτὰ πυρί, κεφαλὴν* **σὺν** *τοῖς ποσὶν καὶ τοῖς ἐνδοσθίοις*. 12:11a **οὕτως** *δὲ* **φάγεσθε** *αὐτό.*

177. **περιεζωσμένοι** | *καὶ κοῖλα ποσσὶν ὑποδέδεσθε*

καὶ χερὶ | βακτηρίαν ἔχοντες (vv 180-182).

LXX Exod 12:11b αἱ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν **περιεζωσμέναι**, καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, καὶ αἱ βακτηρίαι ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν· καὶ ἔδεσθε αὐτὸ μετὰ σπουδῆς· πασχα ἐστὶν κυρίῳ.

κοῖλα. Dübner's emendation κᾶλα is generally rejected; cf. Kuiper, 258; Wieneke, 91, with references where κοῖλα occurs with ὑποδήματα, e.g., Strabo 15.3.19 ὑπόδημα κοῖλον διπλοῦν; κοῖλα ὑποδήματα, "boots that reach to mid-leg," *LSJ*, 967, citing Aelian *NA* 6.23, and this reference from Ezekiel; also Pollux 7.84. Also, cf. LXX Josh 9:5 καὶ τὰ κοῖλα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτῶν.

On the difficult syntax of the verbs in this, and the following lines, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 211-12, n. 44, who suggests that ὑποδέδεσθε possibly governs "in a kind of zeugma, both κοῖλα ποσσίν and χερὶ βακτηρίαν with ἔχοντες merely tacked on." Alternatively, van der Horst, "Notes," 371-72, sees it as an example of ellipsis of the imperative of εἶναι, citing as a parallel Pseudo-Phocylides 57 μὴ προπετὴς ἐς χεῖρα, with additional bibliography.

178. ἐν **σπουδῇ** τε γὰρ | βασιλεὺς κελεύσει πάντας ἐκβαλεῖν χθονός (vv 182-183).

LXX Exod 12:33 καὶ κατεβιάζοντο οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν λαὸν **σπουδῇ ἐκβαλεῖν** αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

Cf. Euripides *IT* 931 ἐκβάλλει χθονός. Wieneke, 91.

179. κεκλήσεται δὲ πᾶς (v 184).

LXX Exod 12:11c πασχα ἐστὶν κυρίῳ.

Our translation renders Mras's text, but Strugnell's emendation, "Notes," 449-52, κεκλήσεται δὲ πάσχ', ὅταν θύσητε δέ is printed by Snell; also accepted in the translations by Robertson, 816; Vogt, *JSHRZ* (4.3), 129; van der Horst, *JHP*, 40. It has the merit of being suitable metrically as well

as supplying *πάσχα* in a context similar to the biblical narrative (LXX Exod 12:11), where the feast is named in connection with the instructions concerning proper clothing.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 132-34, while acknowledging Strugnell's suggestion, remains unconvinced, and in a rare exception diverges from Snell in his printed text (p. 62) and translation. Among his arguments for retaining the MSS reading is his observation that instructions concerning the observance of Passover (e.g., Exod 12:6; *Jub.* 49:6, 8, 16; Philo *Q. Exod.* 1.10; *Spec. Leg.* 2.144-46) typically stressed the need for everyone to participate. In reference to *κεκλήσεται*, in the sense of being summoned, he adduces *b. Pes.* 61a: "The Paschal lamb is not slaughtered save for those who are registered (numbered) for it."

But as van der Horst, "Notes," 372-73, observes, in evaluating Jacobson's position, the following phrase *καὶ ... δέ* remains problematic (cf. text in next note, n. 180). He notes the previous editorial attempts to resolve the difficulty, notably Dindorf's deletion of *καί* (cf. app. crit.), and Stephanus' earlier emendation: reading *δεῖ* instead of *δέ* and emending *λαβόντες* to *λαβόντας*, hence *κεκλήσεται δὲ πᾶς· καὶ ὅταν θύσητε, δεῖ | δέσμην λαβόντας χερσὶν ὑσσώπου κόμης | εἰς αἷμα βάψαι καὶ θιγεῖν σταθμῶν δυοῖν*. Thus, "And everyone will be summoned. And whenever you sacrifice, it will be necessary for you, having taken in your hands a bunch of hyssop twigs, to dip them in blood and smear them on the two door posts."

He also observes that *κεκλήσεται δὲ πάσχα* need not be a needless repetition of Frg. 13, line 31 = v 157, since *καλεῖσθαι* can simply function as an equivalent of *εἶναι* (so, *LSJ*, 866, II.2), hence "then it will be Pesach" (cf. LXX Exod 12:11b *πασχα ἐστὶν κυρίῳ*).

180. καὶ ὅταν θύσητε δέ, | **δέσμην** λαβόντες χερσὶν **ὑσσώπου** κόμης | εἰς αἷμα βάψαι καὶ θιγεῖν **σταθμῶν** δυοῖν, | ὅπως παρέλθῃ θάνατος Ἑβραίων ἄπο (vv 184-186).

LXX Exod 12:7 καὶ λήμψονται ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ θήσουσιν ἐπὶ τῶν δύο **σταθμῶν** καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν φλιὰν ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις, ἐν οἷς ἐὰν φάγωσιν αὐτὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. 12:21 (Moses to the elders of Israel) ἀπελθόντες λάβετε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς πρόβατον κατὰ συγγενείας ὑμῶν καὶ θύσατε τὸ πασχα. 22 λήμψεσθε δὲ **δεσμὴν ὑσσώπου** καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ παρὰ τὴν θύραν καθίξετε τῆς φλιᾶς καὶ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν **σταθμῶν** ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, ὅ ἐστιν παρὰ τὴν θύραν· ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐξελεύσεσθε ἕκαστος τὴν θύραν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἕως πρωί. 23 καὶ παρελεύσεται κύριος πατάξαι τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους καὶ ὄψεται τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τῆς φλιᾶς καὶ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν **σταθμῶν**, καὶ παρελεύσεται κύριος τὴν θύραν καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσει τὸν ὀλεθρεύοντα εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ὑμῶν πατάξαι.

Also cf. LXX Exod 12:13.

δέσμην ... ὑσσώπου κόμης. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 2.14.6 ¶ 312 ὑσσώπου κόμαις. Robertson, 816, n. a[3].

181. ταύτην δ' **ἑορτὴν** δεσπότῃ τηρήσετε, | **ἔφθ' ἡμέρας ἄζυμα** (vv 188-189).

LXX Exod 12:14 καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμῖν αὕτη μνημόσυνον, καὶ ἑορτάσετε αὐτὴν **ἑορτὴν** κυρίῳ εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν· νόμιμον αἰώνιον ἑορτάσετε αὐτήν. 15 **ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἄζυμα** ἔδεσθε ...

Also, cf. LXX Exod 12:17-20; 13:6, 10.

Robertson, 816, n. b[3], adopts a different punctuation, placing a full stop after τηρήσετε, and taking ἔφθ' ἡμέρας ἄζυμα with the next clause: "so keep this festival unto the Lord; for seven days you'll eat unleavened bread."

On ἄζυμα, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 129.

182. **καὶ οὐ βρωθήσεται | ζύμη** (vv 189-190).

LXX Exod 12:15b ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πρώτης ἀφανιεῖτε ζύμην ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ὑμῶν ... 13:3 **καὶ οὐ βρωθήσεται ζύμη**.

Also cf. LXX Exod 12:20; 13:7.

183. *κακῶν γὰρ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγήσεται* (v 190).

ἀπαλλαγήσεται. Mras, *GCS* (43,1) 534, n. on line 10: "unpersönlich: *Befreiung von ... wird stattfinden.*" The difficulty here is recognized as early as Stephanus, who proposes *ἀπαλλαγὴ ἔσσεται*. Gaisford, recognizing that the context seemed to require a second person verb, reads *ἀπαλλαγήσετε*, even though the MSS support is weak. Kuiper, 258, suggests a more radical solution, emending the text to read *κακῶν γάρ ἐστι τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγή*. Wieneke follows Münscher in reading *ἀπαλλαγήν τε σοι*, taking *ἀπαλλαγήν* as the object of *διδοῖ* in the next line. Following Gaisford, van der Horst, "Notes," 373, prefers to read *ἀπαλλαγήσετε*, in spite of the weak MSS support, but convincingly suggests that *-ήσεται* has derived from the end of the previous line: *βρωθήσεται*, a mistake expedited by the lack of a distinction in pronunciation between *αι* and *ε* in the third and second century B.C.E.

184. *καὶ τοῦδε μηνὸς ἔξοδον διδοῖ θεός* (v 191).

LXX Exod 12:17 *ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐξάξω τὴν δύναμιν ὑμῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.*

Cf. LXX Exod 12:42, 51; 13:3-4, 9, 14, 16; 19:1; LXX Ps 113:1; 120:8.

Cf. Euripides *Ph.* 875 *οὔτ' ἔξοδον διδόντες*. Wieneke, 92.

185. *ἀρχὴ δὲ **μηνῶν** καὶ χρόνων οὗτος πέλει* (v 192).

LXX Exod 12:2 *ὁ μὴν οὗτος ὑμῖν **ἀρχὴ μηνῶν**, πρῶτός ἐστιν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς μησὶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ.*

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 135, notes the absence in these instructions concerning Passover of the biblical proscription against foreigners'

participation (LXX Exod 12:43-49) and suggests that it was apologetically motivated.

186. In this fragment, which immediately follows Frg. 14 without interruption, Eusebius continues to quote directly from Alexander Polyhistor, introducing the latter with a brief transitional comment, then quoting Polyhistor's introductory words, followed by the poetic lines from Ezekiel (vv 193-242). Clearly, Eusebius has omitted some sections from Polyhistor between this and the previous fragment, and the Ezekiel material appears to come from a later scene, doubtless toward the end of the drama.

The fragment's essential focus is the Exodus, more specifically, the crossing of the Red Sea, which is depicted through the words of a "messenger," an Egyptian soldier who was an eyewitness. Much of the material in the messenger's speech is obviously Ezekiel's free creation, but it draws primarily from the biblical account in LXX Exod 14. For parallel accounts, cf. LXX Ps 77:13-16; 104:37-39; 105:7-12; Philo *V. Mos.* 1.163-180; Josephus *Ant.* 2.15.1-16.6 ¶¶ 315-49 (both of which, especially Josephus, knew Ezekiel, according to Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 152); Pseudo-Philo *Bib. Ant.* 10:2-6; *Jub.* 48:12-19.

In crafting a scene using a messenger to report a major battle, Ezekiel draws on a well established dramatic technique. Parallels with Aeschylus *Pers.* have especially been noted, e.g., by Wieneke, 93-94; Snell, "Ezechiels Moses-Drama," 170-93; and in great detail by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 136-40, who also sees influence from Herodotus. These parallels from Aeschylus and Herodotus are included at the appropriate places in the notes below.

187. I.e., Polyhistor. Cf. next note, n. 188.

188. *πάλιν μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει.*

The use of *πάλιν* suggests that this is Eusebius' transitional remark, which is generally acknowledged and indicated by the print type in Gaisford, Mras, and Denis. On the wording used in transitional devices, cf. above, n. 173.

How much material (*ἕτερα*) he omitted from Polyhistor is not known.

189. *Φησὶ δὲ καὶ 'Εζεκιῆλος ἐν τῷ δράματι τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ 'Εξαγωγή.*

On the title, cf. Frg. 1A, line 4 (also Frg. 1B, line 5); Frg. 2B, line 2; Frg. 13, line 4; and Frg. 16, line 10; also cf. above, n. 138.

190. *παρεισάγων ἄγγελον λέγοντα τήν τε τῶν 'Εβραίων διάθεσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φθορὰν οὕτως.*

ἄγγελον. On the use of a "messenger" in Greek drama, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 136.

191. *'Ως γὰρ σὺν ὄχλῳ τῷδ' ἀφώρμησεν δόμων* (v 193).

γὰρ ... τῷδ'. An indication, according to Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 149, that "we have been plunged into this scene by Polyhistor *in medias res*." Based on the messenger's dialogue with Atossa and the chorus in Aeschylus *Pers*. 249-514, he suggests that Ezekiel may have provided a similar dialogue in an omitted section.

τῷδ' ἀφώρμησεν δόμων. Cf. Euripides *Or*. 844 *τῶνδ' ἀφώρμηται δόμων*. Also; Aeschylus *Pers*. 394 *ὁρμῶντες*; cf. Herodotus 7.34, 37. Kuiper, 259; Wieneke, 94.

Wieneke, 92, observes that Ezekiel devotes approximately equal length to the description of the Egyptian army (vv 193-203) and the Jews (vv 204-214); also Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 215, n. 50.

192. *βασιλεὺς Φαραὼ μυρίων ὅπλων μέτα | ἵππου τε*

πάσης καὶ ἁρμάτων τετραόρων | καὶ προστάταισι καὶ παραστάταις ὁμοῦ (vv 194-96).

LXX Exod 14:6-8 ἔζευξεν οὖν Φαραω τὰ ἅρματα αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ συναπήγαγεν μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ 7 καὶ λαβὼν ἑξακόσια ἅρματα ἐκλεκτὰ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἵππον τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ τριστάτας ἐπὶ πάντων. 8 καὶ ἐσκλήρυνεν κύριος τὴν καρδίαν Φαραω βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου καὶ τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατεδίωξεν ὀπίσω τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐξεπορεύοντο ἐν χειρι ὑψηλῇ.

μυρίων ὅπλων μέτα. Cf. Euripides *Ph.* 113 πολλοῖς μὲν ἵπποις, μυρίοις δ' ὅπλοις βρέμων. Wieneke, 94. ὅπλων is used here for ὁπλῖται. *LSJ*, 1240, III.4, as noted by van der Horst, "Notes," 373.

ἁρμάτων τετραόρων. Cf. Euripides *Suppl.* 666-67 ἱππεῦσι δ' ἱππῆς ἦσαν ἀνθωπλισμένοι τετραόροισί τ' ἀντί' ἅρμαθ' ἅρμασιν. Also Pindar *P.* 10.65 ἅρμα ... τετράορον, etc. Wieneke, 94.

προστάταισι. Cf. Xenophon *Cyr.* 3.3.41; *Eq.Mag.* 2.2.6.

παραστάταις ὁμοῦ. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 957 παραστάται; Herodotus 6.117; Xenophon *Cyr.* 3.3.58; 8.1.10.

For a discussion of Ezekiel's description of the battle formation of the Egyptians, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 149-50.

193. ἦν φρικτὸς ἀνδρῶν ἐκτεταγμένων ὄχλος (v 197).

φρικτὸς. Cf. LXX Wis 8:15; Jer 5:30; 18:13; 23:14.

ἐκτεταγμένων. Cf. Xenophon *An.* 5.4.12; Polybius 5.83.1; Aeschylus *Pers.* 381 τεταγμένος.

194. πεζοὶ μὲν ἐν μέσοισι καὶ φαλαγγικοὶ | διεκδρομὰς ἔχοντες ἅρμασιν τόπους (vv 198-199).

πεζοὶ. Cf. Herodotus 7.41. On the distinction between πεζοί and φαλαγγικοί, cf. Wieneke, 95, with examples.

φαλαγγικοὶ. Hapax for φαλαγγῖται. Wieneke, 95;

cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 215, n. 51.

διεκδρομὰς. Cf. Herodotus 7.36 *διέκπλους*; also Thucydides 1.49.3.

On the text-critical problems of these two verses, cf. Kuiper, 259; Wieneke, 95.

195. *ἱππεῖς δ' ἔταξε τοὺς μὲν ἐξ* **εὐωνύμων**, | *ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ πάντας Αἰγυπτίου στρατοῦ* (vv 200-201).

LXX Exod 14:9b *καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἵππος καὶ τὰ ἅρματα Φαραω καὶ οἱ ἱππεῖς καὶ ἡ στρατιὰ αὐτοῦ ἀπέναντι τῆς ἐπαύλεως ἐξ ἐναντίας Βεελσεπφων*. Also 14:22b *καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτοῖς τεῖχος* **ἐκ δεξιῶν** *καὶ τεῖχος ἐξ* **εὐωνύμων**.

ἱππεῖς. Cf. Herodotus 7.41.

ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ πάντας ... τὸν πάντα. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 399-400 *τὸ δεξιόν ... κέρας ... ὁ πᾶς στόλος*. Jacobson, *Exagoge* 216, n. 51 notes that *ἐξ εὐωνύμων ... ἐκ δεξιῶν*, which reflect LXX Exod 14:22b, are phrases "apparently not found in Hellenistic and classical texts."

Αἰγυπτίου στρατοῦ. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 412 ... *Περσικοῦ στρατοῦ*.

On the text-critical difficulties of these, and the following lines, and the related problems of translation, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 215-167, n. 51.

196. *τὸν πάντα δ' αὐτῶν ἀριθμὸν ἠρόμην ἐγώ* {*στρατοῦ*} (v 202).

τὸν πάντα δ' αὐτῶν ἀριθμὸν. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 339 *ὁ πᾶς ἀριθμός*. Also cf. 334-36, Atossa's inquiry concerning the number of opposing forces.

On the text-critical problem of this and the following verse, cf. app. crit. and discussion in Kuiper, 259-60; Wieneke, 96; Strugnell, "Notes," 456.

197. *μυριάδες* <*ἦσαν*> *ἑκατὸν εὐάνδρου λεώ*{*ς*} (v 203).

On the number of Egyptians destroyed in the sea, cf. *Jub.* 48:14 (1,000,000); Josephus *Ant.* 2.15.3 ¶ 324 (600 chariots, 50,000 horsemen, 200,000 heavy infantry). Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 140-41; van der Horst, "Notes," 373.

λεώ{ς}. Cf. Euripides *Hec.* 532 ... λεώς. Cf. *Ph.* 290; *Andr.* 19; etc. Wieneke, 96. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 383 ... λεών.

198. ἐπεὶ δ' Ἑβραίων οὐμὸς ἤντησε στρατός, | οἱ μὲν παρ' ἀκτὴν πλησίον βεβλημένοι | Ἐρυθρᾶς Θαλάσσης ἦεσαν ἠθροϊσμένοι (vv 204-206).

LXX Exod 14:9 καὶ κατεδίωξαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὀπίσω αὐτῶν καὶ εὗροσαν αὐτοὺς παρεμβεβληκότας παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

στρατός. Aeschylus *Pers.* 384 ... στρατὸς.

ἠθροϊσμένοι. Cf. Euripides *IA* 87 ἠθροισμένου ... στρατοῦ, etc. Wieneke, 96.

On the similarities between certain aspects of Ezekiel's description of the Jews here and Euripides *Ba.* 677-774, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 216, n. 52.

199. οἱ μὲν τέκνοισι νηπίοις δίδουν βορὰν | ὁμοῦ τε καὶ δάμαρσιν, ἔμπονοι κόπῳ (vv 207-208).

On the difficulty of οἱ μέν ... οἱ μέν ... αὐτοὶ δέ in vv 204-210, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 216, n. 53.

τέκνοισι ... ὁμοῦ τε καὶ δάμαρσιν. Cf. Euripides *Tr.* 392 σὺν δάμαρτι καὶ τέκνοις ᾤκουν; also *HF* 1290, 1374. The translation follows Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 216, n. 54, in taking δάμαρσιν with τέκνοισι, thus "The men, worn out, were giving food to their children and wives."

δίδουν. On the unaugmented form, cf. Wieneke, 96-97. Also cf. app. crit. The translation "trying to care" renders δίδουν βορὰν, literally "were giving food." Cf. Robertson, 817, n. j^3.

ἔμπονοι κόπῳ. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 2.15.3 ¶ 321

κεκοπωμένων. The translation "exhausted from exertion" follows the emendation ἔγκοποι πόνῳ suggested by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 150; also D. Sansone, *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984) 442-43 and W. G. Arnott, *American Journal of Philology* 106 (1985) 240-41 (the latter two references supplied by van der Horst privately). Because of the difficulty of ἔμπονος, "patient of labor," "toilsome," "painful" (*LSJ*, 547), ἔγκοπος, "wearied," as e.g., LXX Job 19:2; Isa 43:23, is clearly preferable.

200. κτήνη τε πολλὰ καὶ δόμων ἀποσκευή (v 209).

LXX Exod 12:38 καὶ ἐπίμικτος πολὺς συνανέβη αὐτοῖς καὶ πρόβατα καὶ βόες καὶ κτήνη πολλὰ σφόδρα.

ἀποσκευή. "children," e.g., LXX Gen 34:29; 43:8; 46:5; Exod 10:10, 24; 12:37; or "possessions," e.g., LXX Gen 14:12; 15:14; 31:18. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 150.

On the transposition of v 209 after v 206, which would supply a verb (ἦεσαν ἠθροϊσμένοι) for the line, thus, "and gathered in groups were their cattle and household possessions." Cf. Wieneke, 96; also Kuiper, 260.

201. αὐτοὶ δ' ἄνοπλοι πάντες εἰς μάχην χέρας (v 210).

LXX Exod 13:18b πέμπτη δὲ γενεὰ ἀνέβησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου. MT Exod 13:18b וחמשים עלו בני ישראל מארץ מצרים.

ἄνοπλοι. Cf. Herodotus 9.62; Plato *Euthd.* 299 B, etc. Kuiper, 98. On whether the Israelites left Egypt "unarmed," cf. Demetrius, Frg. 5 = *P.E.* 9.29.16 (*FHJA* 1.76-77) ἄνοπλοι; Josephus, *Ant.* 2.15.3 ¶ 321 ἀνόπλων; Philo *V. Mos.* 1.170 διὰ σπάνιν ἀμυντηρίων -- οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ πόλεμον ἀλλ' εἰς ἀποικίαν ἐξήεσαν. Also, cf. LXX Wis 10:20. In *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:13, one of four groups of Israelites wanted to do battle with the Egyptians, presumably with arms. At Dura Europos, the Israelites are

depicted as armed. Cf. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, vol. 11, plate xiv, fig. 330, as noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 216, n. 53.

Cf. Holladay, *FHJA* 1.89-90, n. 88 (remarks on Demetrius, Frg. 5); Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 150, 216, n. 53; van der Horst, "Notes," 374, who also refers to the "masterful examination" of the whole problem by R. Le Déaut, "A propos du Targum d'Exode 13,18: La Torah, arme secrète d'Israël," in M. Carrez, J. Dorez, & P. Grelot (edd.), *De la Tôrah au Messie: études d'exégèse et d'hermémeutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles* (Paris: Desclee, 1981) 525-33, esp. 531, n. 7 on Ezekiel.

ἄνοπλοι εἰς μάχην χέρας. Cf. Euripides *Or.* 926 μήθ' ὁπλίζεσθαι χέρα; 1223 ὁπλιζώμεσθα φασγάνῳ χέρας.

202. ἰδόντες ἡμᾶς ἠλάλαξαν ἔνδακρυν | φωνὴν πρὸς αἰθέρα τ' ἐτάθησαν ἀθρόοι, | θεὸν πατρῷον (vv 211-213).

LXX Exod 14:10 καὶ Φαραω προσῆγεν. καὶ ἀναβλέψαντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρῶσιν, καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἐστρατοπέδευσαν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα· ἀνεβόησαν δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ πρὸς κύριον.

ἠλάλαξαν. Cf. LXX Ps 80:2 ἀλαλάξατε τῷ θεῷ Ιακωβ, etc. Wieneke, 98. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 390 ἀντηλάλαξε.

αἰθέρα. On whether αἰθήρ is to be taken in apposition with θεός, and how this relates to Ezekiel's theological views, and the related text-critical question (cf. app. crit.), cf. Kuiper, 260; Wieneke, 98-99; Snell, "Jamben," 30-31; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 151, 217, n. 59; Strugnell, "Notes," 450; Robertson, 817, n. k^3. But, as before, since the sentiment occurs on the lips of the Egyptian messenger, this says less about Ezekiel's theology than his skill to create a credible dramatic character.

θεὸν πατρῷον. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 404 *θεῶν τε πατρώων ἕδη*; *Th*. 1016, etc. Wieneke, 99.

Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 393 *οὐ γὰρ ὡς φυγῇ παιᾶν' ἐφύμνουν σεμνὸν Ἕλληνες τότε*.

As Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 151, notes, Ezekiel omits the Israelites' complaint in LXX Exod 14:11-12.

203. *ἦν πολὺς δ' ἀνδρῶν ὄχλος* (v 213).

LXX Exod 12:37 *ἀπάραντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐκ Ραμεσση εἰς Σοκχωθα εἰς ἑξακοσίας χιλιάδας πεζῶν οἱ ἄνδρες πλὴν τῆς ἀποσκευῆς*.

ὄχλος. Kuiper, 260, emends to *ὄκνος*, "alarm," "fear," as more appropriate to LXX Exod 14:10 *καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα*; thus, "and there was great fear among their men, but on our side, we were all jubilant." Wieneke, 99, prefers the MSS reading, offering numerous supporting examples from Greek authors. Cf. Robertson, 817, n. 1[3].

204. *ἡμᾶς δὲ χάρμα πάντας εἶχεν ἐν μέρει* (v 214).

χάρμα. "malicious pleasure," as e.g., Aeschylus *Per*. 1034, as noted by van der Horst, "Notes," 374.

205. *ἔπειθ' ὑπ' αὐτοὺς θήκαμεν παρεμβολήν* | (Βεελζεφών τις κλήζεται πόλις βροτοῖς) (vv 215-216).

LXX Exod 14:9 *καὶ κατεδίωξαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὀπίσω αὐτῶν καὶ εὗροσαν αὐτοὺς παρεμβεβληκότας παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἵππος καὶ τὰ ἅρματα Φαραω καὶ οἱ ἱππεῖς καὶ ἡ στρατιὰ αὐτοῦ ἀπέναντι τῆς ἐπαύλεως ἐξ ἐναντίας* Βεελσεπφων.

Kuiper, 261, transposes vv 215 and 216, changing *ἔπειθ'* to *ἐκεῖθ'*, and citing as support Euripides *Hipp*. 1199; *IT* 260, 1450. He is followed by Wieneke, 20, who supplies in his notes (p. 100) supporting examples for this use of the indefinite article (Euripides *Hipp*. 1199, 1201 *al*.) and uses

of ἐκεῖθι (Aeschylus *Th.* 809 etc.).

On Baal-zephon, cf. Josephus *Ant.* 2.15.1 ¶ 315; also cf. W. F. Albright, "Baal-Zephon," in *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet* (ed. W. Baumgartner *et al.*; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950) 1-14, esp. 3-4; H. Cazelles, "Les localisations de l'Exode," *RB* 62 (1955) 321-64, esp. 332-40; "Données géographiques sur l'Exode," in *La Bible et l'Orient* (Travaux du premier Congrès d'archéologie et d'orientalisme bibliques; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955) 51-58; J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1959) 239-40, 242, 249; Robertson, 817, n. m^3.

206. ἐπεὶ δὲ Τιτὰν ἥλιος δυσμαῖς προσῆν (v 217).

Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 364-65 εὖτ' ἂν φλέγων ἀκτῖσιν ἥλιος χθόνα λήξῃ.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 214, n. 28, defends Ezekiel's "pagan" phrase here, noting other Jewish texts that similarly appropriate pagan phrases, e.g., Jdt 16:6 *υἱοὶ τιτάνων*; Josephus *Ag.Ap.* 1.28 ¶ 255 (also 2.37 ¶ 263). But surely this is Ezekiel's attempt to represent the Egyptian soldier's religious perspective not his own. So Robertson, 817, n. 817, n. n^3.

Τιτὰν ἥλιος. Cf. Nonnus *D.* 19.208 *οὐδὲ γενέθλην* | *Ἡελίου Τιτῆνος ὁμόχρονον ἥλικι κόσμῳ*. As Wieneke, 100, notes, the phrase is not found in the Greek tragedians, although it is often used among Latin poets, notably in Seneca's tragedies where Titan is personified as the sun-god. Cf. Seneca *Herc. Fur.* 124, 133, 443, 1060, 1333; *Med.* 5; *Troad.* 170; *Hippol.* 678, 779; *Oedip.* 1, 40; *Thyest.* 120, 785, 1095; *Agam.* 460, 908; *Herc. Oet.* 42, 291, 423, 488, 723, *al.*; *Octav.* 2.

207. ἐπέσχομεν, θέλοντες ὄρθριον μάχην, | πεποιθότες λαοῖσι καὶ φρικτοῖς ὅπλοις (vv 218-219).

Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 352 for the motif of unjustified confidence, as noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 137.

πεποιθότες ... ὅπλοις. Cf. Aristophanes *Pl*. 449 *ποίοις ὅπλοισιν ἢ δυνάμει πεποιθότες*. Wieneke, 101.

208. *ἔπειτα θείων ἄρχεται τεραστίων | θαυμάστ' ἰδέσθαι* (vv 220-21).

θείων ἄρχεται τεραστίων. Cf. Herodotus 7.57 *τέρας ... μέγα*, which appeared to Xerxes, having just crossed the Hellespont en route to Hellas. Also cf. LXX Wis 19:8 *θαυμαστὰ τέρατα*.

τεραστίων. Cf. *τεράστιον* in Frg. 8, line 6 (= v 91), line 9 (= v 94).

θαυμάστ' ἰδέσθαι. Cf. Homer *Il*. 5.725 *θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι*; 10.439; 18.83, 377 etc. Wieneke, 101.

Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 345, 347, 454, 514, etc., for the motif of divine intervention, as noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 137.

On the grammatical problem in these two verses created by the lack of a subject, cf. Kuiper, 261; Wieneke, 101.

209. *καί τις ἐξαίφνης μέγας | **στῦλος** νεφώδης ἐστάθη πρὸ γῆς, μέγας* (vv 221-222).

LXX Exod 14:19 *ἐξῆρεν δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ προπορευόμενος τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἐκ τῶν ὄπισθεν· ἐξῆρεν δὲ καὶ ὁ **στῦλος** τῆς νεφέλης ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν καὶ ἔστη ἐκ τῶν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν*. Also 14:24 *ἐγενήθη δὲ ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ τῇ ἑωθινῇ καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν στύλῳ πυρὸς καὶ νεφέλης καὶ συνετάραξεν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων*.

πρὸ γῆς, μέγας. The text-critical problem is noticed as early as Dübner, who proposes *μέλας* for *μέγας*. Kuiper, 261, rejects this, however, suspecting homoeoteleuton. Instead he proposes *πυριφλεγής*, which is adopted by Wieneke, 22, 101,

apparently convinced by its occurrence in LXX Wis 18:3 *πυριφλεγῆ στῦλον*. According to van der Horst, "Notes," 374, Dübner's *μέλας* (as reported in Snell) is unsatisfactory since the problematic *πρὸ γῆς* remains; in fact, van der Horst sees no reason to retain the second *μέγας*. He does, however, supplement the brief mention of the problem in Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 214, n. 27), by referring to the proposal by E. Stein, "Een merkwaardige Griekse tragedie," *Hermeneus* 9 (1936/1937) 20, to emend *πρὸ γῆς, μέγας* to *πρὸ ἡμέρας*, which is preferable not only because it is less radical than Kuiper's emendation but also because it agrees with the biblical account, esp. *φυλακὴ ἑωθινή* in LXX Exod 14:24 (see above). Cf. Robertson, 817, n. o[3].

210. **παρεμβολῆς** *ἡμῶν τε καὶ Ἑβραίων* <u>*μέσος*</u> (v 223).

LXX Exod 14:20 *καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ἀνὰ* <u>*μέσον*</u> *τῆς* **παρεμβολῆς** *τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ἀνὰ* <u>*μέσον*</u> *τῆς* **παρεμβολῆς** Ισραηλ *καὶ ἔστη· καὶ ἐγένετο σκότος καὶ γνόφος, καὶ διῆλθεν ἡ νύξ, καὶ οὐ συνέμιξαν ἀλλήλοις ὅλην τὴν νύκτα.*

μέσος. Cf. Sophocles *OC* 1595. Wieneke, 102.

211. *κἄπειθ' ὁ κείνων ἡγεμὼν* <u>Μωσῆς</u>, *λαβὼν | ῥάβδον θεοῦ, τῇ δὴ πρὶν Αἰγύπτῳ κακὰ | σημεῖα καὶ τεράατ' ἐξεμήσατο* (vv 224-226).

LXX Exod 14:16 (God to Moses) *καὶ σὺ ἔπαρον τῇ ῥάβδῳ σου καὶ ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ῥῆξον αὐτήν.* 14:21a *ἐξέτεινεν δὲ* <u>Μωυσῆς</u> *τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν* ...(also v 27).

κἄπειθ' ὁ κείνων ἡγεμὼν Μωσῆς. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers*. 765 *Μῆδος γὰρ ἦν ὁ πρῶτος ἡγεμὼν στρατοῦ*. On the relative emphasis given to Moses, as compared with God, as the chief actor in these events, in different traditions, biblical and non-biblical alike, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge* 142-44.

λαβὼν ῥάβδον θεοῦ. Though the rod is not mentioned in LXX Exod 14:21, the reference here

doubtless derives from LXX Exod 14:16 (see above). It is similarly mentioned as the instrument Moses used for dividing the waters in Philo *V. Mos.* 1.177; Josephus *Ant.* 2.16.2 ¶ 338; Pseudo-Philo *Bib. Ant.* 10:5; Artapanus, Frg. 3.36 = *P.E.* 9.27.36 (*FHJA* 1.224-25); so Jacobson *Exagoge*, 141-42, 214, nn. 17-18, with discussion of the motif in other, notably rabbinic, traditions, but also, 214, n. 20, in the depiction of Moses at Dura Europos; cf. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, vol. 11; plate xiv, fig. 330. In *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:21, 27 Moses uses his hand only; there is no mention of the rod.

κακὰ σημεῖα καὶ τεράατ'. Cf. Frg. 13, line 6 (= v 132).

ἐξεμήσατο. van der Horst, "Notes," 374-75, reports the observation of D. F. Sutton, "Notes on the Vocabulary of Minor Tragic Poets," *Glotta* 55 (1977) 209, that *ἐκμήδομαι*, which does not occur in the lexicons, is a hapax, meaning "to contrive," "to devise." He notes the frequency of *μήδομαι* in classical poetry and suggests that *ἐκμήδομαι* may have been formed analogously to *ἐξευρίσκω*. The "unnecessary change" to *τέρατ' ἐξεμηχανήσατο*, because *ἐκμήδομαι* was nowhere else attested, is actually traceable to Stephanus, not Wieneke, as van der Horst reports (cf. app crit.). Cf. Wieneke, 102.

Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 345, 347, 454, 514, etc., for the motif of divine intervention; so, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 137.

212. *ἔτυψ' Ἐρυθρᾶς νῶτα καὶ <u>ἔσχισεν</u> μέσον | βάθος <u>Θαλάσσης</u>* (vv 227-228).

LXX Exod 14:21 *ἐξέτεινεν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν <u>θάλασσαν</u>, καὶ ὑπήγαγεν κύριος τὴν <u>θάλασσαν</u> ἐν ἀνέμῳ νότῳ βιαίῳ ὅλην τὴν νύκτα καὶ ἐποίησεν τὴν <u>θάλασσαν</u> ξηράν, καὶ <u>ἐσχίσθη</u> τὸ ὕδωρ.*

Ερυθρᾶς νῶτα ... Θαλάσσην. Cf. Homer *Il.* 2.159 *al.*; *Od.* 3.142 *al.*

ἔσχισεν. Cf. Pindar *P.* 4.228 σχίζε νῶτον γᾶς; also Apollonius of Rhodes *Arg.* 4.325 σχίζων ... ῥόον. The subject appears to be Moses, in which case responsibility for dividing the waters is his.

On the instant splitting of the waters in Ezekiel (also Philo *V. Mos.* 1.177; Josephus *Ant.* 2.16.2 ¶ 338; Pseudo-Philo *Bib. Ant.* 10:5, as compared with the all-night long splitting described in LXX Exod 14:21; similarly *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:21. Cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 141.

213. οἱ δὲ σύμπαντες σθένει | ὤρουσαν ὠκεῖς ἁλμυρᾶς δι' ἀτραποῦ (vv 228-229).

ὤρουσαν. Cf. Euripides *HF* 972; *IT* 297. Wieneke, 102. On the text-critical problem, cf. app. crit.; Robertson, 817, n. q^3.

ἁλμυρᾶς. Cf. Euripides *Tr.* 1-2 ἁλμυρὸν βάθος πόντου; also Herodotus 7.35 ἁλμυρῷ ποταμῷ; Homer *Od.* 5.100 etc. Wieneke, 103..

δι' ἀτραποῦ. Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.179 οἱ μὲν γὰρ 'Εβραῖοι διὰ ξηρᾶς ἀτραποῦ περὶ βαθὺν ὄρθον.

214. ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς ᾠχόμεσθα συντόμως | κατ' ἴχνος αὐτῶν (vv 230-231).

LXX Exod 14:22 καὶ εἰσῆλθον οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσην κατὰ τὸ ξηρόν, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτοῖς τεῖχος ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ τεῖχος ἐξ εὐωνύμων. 23 κατεδίωξαν δὲ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ εἰσῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτῶν, πᾶσα ἡ ἵππος Φαραω καὶ τὰ ἅρματα καὶ οἱ ἀναβάται, εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης.

κατ' ἴχνος αὐτῶν. Cf. Euripides *Rh.* 690 ἔρπε πᾶς κατ' ἴχνος αὐτῶν; *Hec.* 1059; *Tr.* 1003; Sophocles *Aj.* 32. Wieneke, 103.

215. νυκτὸς εἰσεκύρσαμεν | βοηδρομοῦντες.

LXX Exod 14:22b καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτοῖς τεῖχος ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ τεῖχος ἐξ εὐωνύμων (vv 231-32).

νυκτὸς. Taken here literally, "at night," which seems to fit with v 217, which marks the time

as after sunset. In *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:24, both sides wait all night, and in the morning God sends fire, asphalt, and hail on the Egyptians; similarly, *Tg. Onq.* Exod 14:24 places God's destruction of the Egyptians in the morning. On the chronological difficulties posed by Ezekiel's text, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 145-47. Perhaps the phrase should be rendered, "we entered *this tunnel of darkness*."

εἰσεκύρσαμεν. As Kuiper, 262, notices, this compound form is new, apparently a hapax (the only instance of εἰσκύρω, "enter," cited by *LSJ*, 495). Instances of related forms, e.g., ἐγκύρειν, εἰσκυρσις are given in Wieneke, 103. For a discussion of the term and its possible meanings, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 145-47, who prefers "encounter," "meet"; thus he translates the phrase (p. 65), "we hastened forward, but encountered night." On the text-critical difficulty, cf. app. crit. Kuiper, 262, mentions another reading ἐν δ' ἐκύρσαμεν, but it is not clear where it originates.

βοηδρομοῦντες. The term can mean "run to a cry for aid," "haste to help," but this seems inappropriate here. Robertson, 817, prefers the meaning "run with a cry," hence his translation, "in close pursuit with a shout." Cf. Appianus *Hann.* 42; so *LSJ*, 320. Also, cf. examples in Wieneke, 103-104.

216. **ἁρμάτων** δ' ἄφνω τροχοὶ | οὐκ ἐστρέφοντο, δέσμιοι δ' ὡς ἥρμοσαν (vv 232-233).

LXX Exod 14:24-25 ἐγενήθη δὲ ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ τῇ ἑωθινῇ καὶ ἐπέβλεφεν κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν στύλῳ πυρὸς καὶ νεφέλης καὶ συνετάραξεν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων 25 καὶ συνέδησεν τοὺς ἄξονας τῶν **ἁρμάτων** αὐτῶν καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς μετὰ βίας.

δέσμιοι δ' ὡς ἥρμοσαν. δέσμιος, literally, "bond," but here in the sense of manacles or

chains; cf. Euripides *Ba.* 226, 615; Sophocles *Aj.* 299; *Phil.* 608. Wieneke, 104. In *Tg. Yer.* and *Tg. Onq.* Exod 14:24 and *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:25 God removes the wheels of the Egyptian chariots, which causes them to be pulled backwards.

217. ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ δὲ φέγγος ὡς **πυρὸς** μέγα | ὤφθη τι ἡμῖν (vv 234-235).

LXX Exod 14:24 καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν στύλῳ **πυρὸς** καὶ νεφέλης καὶ συνετάραξεν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.

Also, cf. LXX Exod 13:21-22 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡγεῖτο αὐτῶν, ἡμέρας μὲν ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδόν, τὴν δὲ νύκτα ἐν στύλῳ πυρός· 22 οὐκ ἐξέλιπεν ὁ στῦλος τῆς νεφέλης ἡμέρας καὶ ὁ στῦλος τοῦ πυρὸς νυκτὸς ἐναντίον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ. Hos 7:6 ὡς πυρὸς φέγγος. Also Ezek 1:4.

φέγγος ὡς πυρὸς. Cf. Aeschylus *Ch.* 1037 πυρός τε φέγγος; *Eum.* 1029; *Pers.* 377 φέγγος ἡλίου. Also cf. LXX Ps 77:14 ἐν φωτισμῷ πυρός; also 76:19; Philo *V. Mos.* 2.254 ἐν ᾗ θεία τις ὄψις πυρὸς αὐγὴν ἀπαστράπτουσα ἦν; Josephus *Ant.* 2.16.3 ¶ 343; Artapanus, Frg. 3.37 = *P.E.* 9.27.37 (*FHJA* 1.224-25). In *Pal. Tgs.* and *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:24, God hurls on the Egyptians asphalt, fire, and hailstone. Jacobson, *Exagoge,* 148, 215, n. 41, also suggests that the "strange dots falling from heaven" in the Dura paintings may be flames of fire rather than pieces of manna, as Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols,* 10.106-107, thinks.

218. ὡς μὲν εἰκάζειν, παρῆν | αὐτοῖς ἀρωγὸς ὁ θεός (vv 235-236).

LXX Exod 14:30 καὶ ἐρρύσατο κύριος τὸν Ισραηλ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.

ὡς μὲν εἰκάζειν. Cf. Euripides *Ba.* 1078 ὡς μὲν εἰκάσαι. Wieneke, 104. *LSJ,* 484, "so far *as one can guess,* e.g., Herodotus 9.34 ὡς εἰκάσαι.

παρῆν ... ἀρωγὸς. Cf. Homer *Il.* 4.235 Ζεὺς ...

ἀρωγός; 8.205 (= helper in battle); Sophocles *OC* 1285; Aeschylus *Pers.* 414 ἀρωγὴ δ' οὔτις ἀλλήλοις παρῆν.

Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 345, 347, 454, 514, etc. on the motif of divine intervention; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 137.

219. ὡς δ' ἤδη πέραν | ἦσαν θαλάσσης, κῦμα δ' ἐρροίβδει μέγα | σύνεγγυς ἡμῶν (vv 236-238).

LXX Exod 14:27 καὶ ἀπεκατέστη τὸ ὕδωρ πρὸς ἡμέραν ἐπὶ χώρας.

κῦμα. Kuiper, 262, reads κύματα, which Wieneke, 104-105, rejects. This is a "natural addition" to the text, according to Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 213, n. 42. Cf. *Tg. Yer.* and *Tg. Onq.* Exod 14:27, *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:28.

ἐρροίβδει. Cf. *Anth.Gr.* 7.636.6; Homer *Od.* 12.106 (of Charybdis). Wieneke, 105.

220. καί τις ἠλάλαξ' ἰδών (v 238).

ἠλάλαξ'. Cf. above, line 25 (= v 211), note 202.; also cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 390 ἀντηλάλαξε.

221. Φεύγωμεν οἶκοι πρόσθεν Ὑψίστου χέρας (v 239).

LXX Exod 14:25b καὶ εἶπαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι· Φύγωμεν ἀπὸ προσώπου Ισραηλ.

πρόσθεν ... χέρας. van der Horst, "Notes," 375, "...we either have a unique instance of πρόσθεν *cum accusativo* or else we have to change χέρας into χέρος, as Stephanus did." Cf. app. crit. On the text-critical problem, cf. Kuiper, 262; Wieneke, 105.

On the "hand of God," cf. LXX Exod 14:31; 15:12; Isa 63:12; Wis 19:8; as noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 149, 215, n. 48, along with rabbinic references and notation of the hand of God in the Dura painting of the crossing of the Red Sea.

Ὑψίστου. The term is frequently used as a divine epithet in a wide range of biblical and non-

biblical literature. Cf. LXX Gen 14:18; Ps 7:18; 17:14; 49:14; Matt 21:9; Mark 5:7; 11:10; Luke 1:32, 35, 76; 2:14; 6:35; 8:28; 19:38; Acts 7:48; 16:17; Heb 7:1; Pindar *N.* 1.60; 11.2; Aeschylus *Eum.* 28. Wieneke, 105. This divine epithet is suitable on the lips of a pagan, as noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 217, 63, noting its similarity to 2 Macc 3:31. Also, cf. Philo the Epic Poet, Frg. 3, line 7, and annotations, n. 39.; also, Pseudo-Eupolemus, Frg. 1.5 = *P.E.* 9.17.5 (*FHJA* 1.172-73, 183, n. 21).

While ὕψιστος is not a divine epithet that signals monotheistic faith, the messenger's words here nevertheless belong to the well-established practice of placing a confession on the lips of a pagan. Cf. 2 Macc 9:17-18; Mark 15:39; similarly *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:25; also cf. *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Yer.* Exod 14:27.

Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 345, 347, 454, 514, etc. on the motif of divine intervention; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 137.

For a quotation within a messenger's speech, cf. Sophocles *Aj.* 764-65; as noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 215, n. 46.

222. οἷς μὲν γάρ ἐστ' ἀρωγός, ἡμῖν δ' ἀθλίοις | ὄλεθρον ἔρδει (vv 240-241).

LXX Exod 14:26 ὁ γὰρ κύριος πολεμεῖ περὶ αὐτῶν τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους.

ἀρωγός. Cf. above, line 50 (= v 236), and note 218. Also cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 414 ἀρωγὴ δ' οὔτις ἀλλήλοις παρῆν.

223. καὶ συνεκλύσθη πόρος | Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης καὶ στρατὸν διώλεσε (vv 241-242).

LXX Exod 14:26-29, esp. 27b καὶ ἐξετίναξεν κύριος τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης. 28 καὶ ἐπαναστραφὲν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐκάλυψεν τὰ ἅρματα καὶ τοὺς ἀναβάτας καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν Φαραω τοὺς

εἰσπεπορευμένους ὀπίσω αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ οὐ κατελείφθη ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἷς.

συνεκλύσθη. Cf. Plutarch *Mor.* 206 D συγκλυζομένου δὲ τοῦ πλοίου; κατακλυσθῆναι in Aeschylus *Th.* 1084. Wieneke, 106.

πόρος. Cf. Aeschylus *Supp.* 546; *Pers.* 367, 501, 864 etc. Wieneke, 106.

στρατὸν διώλεσε. Mras's text here follows Stephanus who emends the MSS reading πόρον to στρατόν. The received text would yield, "and has utterly destroyed the way" (Robertson). Obviously, Stephanus brings the text into closer conformity to LXX Exod 14:27b-28 (see above). Wieneke, 106, suggests στόλον, "army." Cf. Robertson, 818, n. s^3.

For the complete destruction of the Egyptian army, cf. LXX Ps 77:53; 105:11; Philo *V. Mos.* 1.179; Josephus *Ant.* 2.16.3 ¶ 344; Artapanus, Frg. 3.37 = *P.E.* 9.27.37 (*FHJA* 1.224-25); similarly *Tg. Neof.* Exod 14:28; *Tg. Yer.* and *Tg. Onq.* 14:27. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 152, sees Philo and Josephus' emphasis on the total devastation of the Egyptian army as polemic against Ezekiel, whose account of a "messenger" obviously had to allow a survivor. But would they have objected so seriously to this innocent dramatic technique? Their emphasis, after all, conforms to the biblical text in this case, and this may be the simplest explanation. Similar emphasis is also found in the above mentioned targums on this text.

224. The excerpt from Ezekiel in this fragment is separated from the previous fragment by a short excerpt from Demetrius the Chronographer, which has been included here to provide continuity of theme. Eusebius continues to quote directly from Alexander Polyhistor. For the general literary context of the fragments, cf. above, n. 1.

The central focus of this fragment is the oasis at Elim described in LXX Exod 15:27. The

extant Ezekiel fragments omit the song of Moses (LXX Exod 15:1-19), the song of Miriam (LXX Exod 15:20-21), the Israelites' journey through the wilderness of Shur and their first stop at Marah (LXX Exod 15:22-26). The latter event Polyhistor treats in the excerpt from Demetrius (Frg. 4). Whether Ezekiel also treated this last episode in his drama, is not clear; possibly not since the biblical account casts the Israelites in a negative light; so, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 156, against Trencsényi-Waldapfel, 155.

For other accounts of the Israelites' arrival at Elim, cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.188-190; *Fuga* 183-85; Josephus *Ant.* 3.1.3 ¶¶ 9-11; also *Tg. Neof.* Exod 15:27, which briefly mentions Elim and its allegorical significance: the twelve fountains corresponding to the twelve tribes and the seventy palms corresponding to the seventy members of the Sanhedrin; similary *Tg. Neof.* Num 33:9; also *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Yer.* Exod 15:27; Num 33:9. Cf. Robertson, 818, n. u[3]; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 217, n. 6.

Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 154-55, suggests that Ezekiel's depiction of Elim is influenced by the Hellenistic utopian tradition: "Ezekiel turned the scene of the desert well into a Hellenistic Utopia" (p. 155); on which, cf. D. Mendels, *HTR* 72 (1979) 207-22; F. E. Manuel and F. P. Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1979); J. Ferguson, *Utopias of the Classical World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975).

225. καὶ πάλιν μετ' ὀλίγα.

This is Eusebius' transitional phrase, as indicated by the use of πάλιν, also used in Frg. 14, line 1 and Frg. 15, line 1. Cf. discussion above, n. 173; also nn. 171, 188.

226. Ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθον ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ὡς αὐτός τε ὁ Δημήτριος λέγει καὶ συμφώνως τούτῳ ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος. μὴ ἔχοντα δὲ ὕδωρ ἐκεῖ γλυκύ, ἀλλὰ πικρόν, τοῦ θεοῦ εἰπόντος ξύλον τι ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν πηγὴν καὶ γενέσθαι γλυκὺ τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰς Ἐλεὶμ ἐλθεῖν καὶ εὑρεῖν ἐκεῖ δώδεκα μὲν πηγὰς ὑδάτων, ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ στελέχη φοινίκων.

For a discussion of this excerpt from Demetrius the Chronographer (= Frg. 4), cf. *FHJA* 1.76-77, 89, nn. 82-86.

227. *περὶ τούτων καὶ τοῦ φανέντος ὀρνέου.*

This transitional phrase by Polyhistor appears to suggest that both the description of the oasis at Elim (vv 243-253) and the phoenix (vv 254-269) belonged to the same scene; so, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 153.

For the "bird which appeared," cf. Frg. 17.

228. Ἐζεκιῆλος ἐν τῇ Ἐξαγωγῇ

The title is also given in Frg. 1A, line 4 (also Frg. 1B, line 5); Frg. 2B, line 2; Frg. 13, line 4; Frg. 15, line 3; on the title, cf. above, n. 138.

229. *παρεισάγει τινὰ λέγοντα τῷ* Μωσεῖ *περὶ μὲν τῶν φοινίκων καὶ τῶν δώδεκα πηγῶν οὕτως.*

Because of the content of the following poetic lines, the speaker is generally identified as a scout sent ahead by Moses.

230. Κράτιστε Μωσῆ, *πρόσχες, οἷον εὕρομεν | τόπον πρὸς αὐτῇ τῇδέ γ' εὐαεῖ νάπῃ* (vv 243-244).

Κράτιστε Μωσῆ. Cf. Sophocles *OT* 40 *ὦ κράτιστον πᾶσιν Οἰδίπου κάρα*. Luke 1:3; Acts 23:26; 24:3; 26:25.

πρόσχες. The sense seems to require Kuiper's emendation to *πρόσσχες*, from *προσέχω*, "turn to," "turn towards," i.e., *τὸν νοῦν* (various examples

cited in Wieneke, 109), hence "notice," "take note." So, Wieneke, 109. However, *πρόσχες* occurs frequently in LXX Ps, though with dative, e.g., 16:1 *πρόσχες τῇ δεήσει μου*; also 21:2, 20; 34:23; 37:23; 39:14; 54:3; 58:6; 60:2; 68:19; 69:1; 70:12; 79:2; 85:6; 140:1; 141:7; Dan 9:18 (Th 9:19); 3 Macc 2:2. Cf. LXX Exod 34:11 *πρόσεχε σὺ πάντα, ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαί σοι*. For *πρόσσχες*, cf. *An. Ox.* 1.121 (= J. A. Cramer, ed. *Anecdota Graeca* [4 vols; Oxford: 1835-37], vol. 1, p. 121, lines 17-19); also Critias 25.19D *προσέχων*. Cf. *LSJ*, 1512, III.4.

πρὸς αὐτῇ. Kuiper, 262-63, emends to *πρὸς αὖλιν*, thus literally "for a tent," as e.g., Homer *Il.* 9.232; *ἔπαυλιν* = quarters (military), e.g., Plato *Alc.* 2.149 C. *LSJ*, 611. Thus, "...what place we have found *for a camp*, indeed in a favorable vale." Accordingly, he retains the rest of the line found in the MSS tradition, viz. I.

τῇδέ γ' εὐαεῖ νάπῃ. Mras's text follows Dübner's emendation of the MSS tradition, which has *ἐπί* between *τῇδ'* and *εὐ(ν)αεῖ*, in various forms. (The textual evidence cited for v 244 in Snell, *TrGF* 1.300, appears to be incorrect, at least if Mras is correct. Snell: "244 *τῇδ' ἐπ' εὐαεῖ* (I, *ἐπευνά(ει)* ON): Dübner." Cf. app. crit.) Wieneke, 109, prefers Dübner's solution over that of Kuiper, citing instances of *ὅδέ γε*, e.g., Sophocles *OT* 383, 815; *OC* 836, 857. He also notes, Aeschylus *Th.* 283 *ἐγὼ δ' ἐπ' ἄνδρας*, which Wilamowitz emended to *ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄνδρας*.

εὐαεῖ νάπῃ. Literally, "airy glen"; cf. Hesiod *Op.* 599 *χώρῳ ἐν εὐαεῖ*. Cf. Wieneke, 109. *εὐαής* does not occur in LXX. Cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 1.188, in contrast to Josephus *Ant.* 3.1.3 ¶¶ 9-11.

231. *ἔστιν γάρ, ὥς που καὶ σὺ τυγχάνεις ὁρῶν,* | *ἐκεῖ* (vv 245-246).

τυγχάνεις ὁρῶν. On *τυγχάνω* with the

participiple, in the sense "just now," cf. Sophocles *Tr.* 370. *LSJ*, 1833, II.1.

232. τόθεν δὲ φέγγος ἐξέλαμφέ νυν | κατ' εὐφρόνης σημεῖον ὡς **στῦλος πυρός** (vv 246-247).

LXX Exod 13:21-22 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡγεῖτο αὐτῶν, ἡμέρας μὲν ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδόν, τὴν δὲ νύκτα ἐν στύλῳ πυρός· 22 οὐκ ἐξέλιπεν ὁ στῦλος τῆς νεφέλης ἡμέρας καὶ ὁ **στῦλος** τοῦ **πυρὸς** νυκτὸς ἐναντίον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ. 14:24 καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν **στύλῳ πυρὸς** καὶ νεφέλης καὶ συνετάραξεν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.

τόθεν. Kuiper, 263, conjectures τὸ θεοῦ, noting LXX Exod 15:25 ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ Κύριος ξύλον, which Wieneke, 110, finds unacceptable. On the temporal use of τόθεν, cf. Aeschylus *A.* 220; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 185, n. 7.

ἐξέλαμφέ. Cf. Frg. 9, line 5 (= v 99) and discussion above in n. 104. If ἐξέλαμφέ is understood in the present sense, i.e., "from there the light shines forth," the scout would presumably be directing Moses' attention to the light as it was shining at that moment.

φέγγος. Cf. Frg. 15, line 48 (= v 234), and above, n. 217.

νυν. Our literal translation attempts to make explicit Mras's emendation, which emphasizes that the scout is relating to Moses the sign that led him to the spot, hence "from there a light shone forth indeed ..." Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 157, proposes νῷν, the dative dual form of ἐγώ (*LSJ*, 477, III), e.g., Sophocles *Ant.* 3, etc. (other examples, 218, n. 23), assuming that Ezekiel envisions the scene with two scouts, one of whom reports while the other remains silent. Presumably, then, the line would be rendered literally, "from there a light flashed out to (the two of) us ..." This is not made explicit in Jacobson's translation (p. 57),

though it is perhaps implicit in the first person plural used throughout.

κατ' εὐφρόνης. Dübner's emendation *κατ' εὐφρόνην*, as noted by Kuiper, 263, brings Ezekiel's text into conformity with frequent poetic use, e.g., Aeschylus *Pers*. 221; *Eum*. 692; Sophocles *El*. 259; Euripides *Rhes*. 92, 736, 852; but Mras's (and Snell's) decision to retain the MSS reading also finds support, e.g., Euripides *IA* 109. On *εὐφρόνη* (*εὔφρων*), "the kindly time," as the poetic equivalent of *νύξ*, cf. Hesiod *Op*. 560; Pindar *N*. 7.3; for *εὐφρόνης* = *νυκτός*, "by night," cf. Anaximenes apud Diogenes Laertius 2.4 (*LSJ*, 737). The expression does not occur in LXX. Cf. Wieneke, 110; Robertson, 818, n. v^3. Also, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 156, who proposes that vv 246-247 be taken as a reference to the biblical report of the pillars of cloud and fire that accompanied the Israelites (LXX Exod 13:21; Num 9:15-23). Jacobson criticizes Gifford, Snell (and Mras) who retain the MSS reading *κατ' εὐφρόνης* and who "probably still assume the phrase to be temporal," yet he translates, 67, "From there a light flashed out *at night*, some sort of sign, a pillar of fire."

233. *ἐνταῦθα λειμῶν' εὕρομεν κατάσκιον | ὑγρὰς τε λιβάδας* (vv 248-249).

κατάσκιον. Cf. Aeschylus *Supp*. 346; Sophocles *El*. 422. Cf. Wieneke, 110. Cf. LXX Hab 3:3; Zech 1:8; Jer 2:20; Ezek 20:28.

λιβάδας. Cf. Aeschylus *Per*. 613; Diodorus Siculus 3.42.3, etc. Wieneke, 110.

234. *δαψιλὴς χῶρος βαθύς* (v 249).

δαψιλὴς. Cf. Herodotus 2.121; 3.130. Wieneke, 110. Cf. LXX Wis 11:7; 1 Macc 3:30; 3 Macc 5:2, 31.

235. *πηγὰς ἀφύσσων δώδεκ' ἐκ μιᾶς πέτρας* (v 250).

LXX Exod 15:27a *καὶ ἦλθοσαν εἰς Αιλιμ, καὶ*

ἦσαν ἐκεῖ **δώδεκα** <u>πηγαὶ</u> ὑδάτων ... Num 33:9a καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ Πικριῶν καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Αιλιμ· καὶ ἐν Αιλιμ **δώδεκα** <u>πηγαὶ</u> ὑδάτων.

πηγὰς Cf. Philo the Epic Poet, n. 53.

ἀφύσσων. Cf. Homer *Il.* 1.598; *Od.* 9.9; Euripides *Med.* 834; Athenaeaus 11.491 B νέκταρ δ' ἐκ πέτρης μέγας αἰετὸς αἰὲν ἀφύσσων. Wieneke, 110. Not in LXX.

δώδεκα. On the allegorical significance of the twelve springs, cf. Philo *Fuga* 183-84; *Tg. Neof.* Exod 15:27 (see above, n. 224). Cf. Goodenough, *By Light*, 209. For a comparison of Ezekiel's description here, and the tradition of the twelve-stream well that followed the Israelites in the wilderness, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 154-55, who also notes the suggestion of Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, 10.32, n. 25, that some of the Dura mural motifs depict events at Elim.

πέτρας. Cf. Euripides *Hipp.* 121 ὕδωρ στάζουσα πέτρα. Kuiper, 263.

236. στελέχη δ' ἐρυμνὰ πολλὰ **φοινίκων** πέλει | ἔγκαρπα, <u>δεκάκις ἑπτά</u>, καὶ | ἐπίρρυτος χλόη πέφυκε θρέμμασιν χορτάσματα (vv 251-253).

LXX Exod 15:27b καὶ <u>ἑβδομήκοντα</u> στελέχη **φοινίκων**. Num 33:9b καὶ <u>ἑβδομήκοντα</u> στελέχη **φοινίκων**, καὶ παρενέβαλον ἐκεῖ παρὰ τὸ ὕδωρ.

στελέχη φοινίκων. Cf. LXX Job 29:18; Sir 50:12. For other examples from Greek authors, cf. Wieneke, 110-111.

ἐρυμνὰ πολλὰ. Josephus *Ant.* 3.1.3 ¶ 9 stresses the meager number of trees and their frail condition.

δεκάκις ἑπτά. Cf. Frg. 1, line 10 (= v 2) ἑπτάκις δέκα.

ἐπίρρυτος. Kuiper, 263, emends to κατάρρυτος, which Wieneke, 111, rejects, proposing instead περίρρυτος, citing Hesiod *Th.* 193; Aeschylus *Eum.* 77, etc. But, as van der Horst, "Notes," 375,

observes, *ἐπίρρυτος* meaning "overflowing," "abundant," is fitting here. He notes Aeschylus *Eum.* 907 *καρπὸς ἐπίρρυτος.*

χλόη πέφυκε. Mras here accepts Gaisford's emendation of the MSS tradition *πέφυκε χλόη*, proposed for metrical reasons. Wieneke, 111, prefers Dübner's proposal *πέφυκε χλοίη.*

θρέμμασιν. θρέμμα, "nursling," "creature," mostly of tame animals, e.g., sheep and goats. *LSJ*, 805. Cf. Xenophon *Ages.* 9.6; *Oec.* 20.23; John 4:12; animals, generally, Plato *Criti.* 118 B *al.* Josephus *Ant.* 7.7.3 148. Not in LXX.

χορτάσματα. Cf. Gen 24:25, 32; 42:27; 43:24 etc. Wieneke, 112, with other classical references.

237. This fragment immediately follows the previous fragment, separated only by a brief transitional line from Alexander Polyhistor, from whom Eusebius continues to quote directly. For the general context of the fragments, cf. above n. 1.

Like Moses' dream and its interpretation by Raguel in Frgs. 6 and 7 (vv 68-89), this excerpt, which portrays a spectacular bird, is a non-biblical scene, having no basis or even indirect point of contact in the biblical narrative.

Kuiper, 274-76, proposes that Ezekiel did not create the description himself, but obtained it instead from pseudo-Hecataeus. This view has been sharply contested, however, e.g., by Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 2.989, n. 212; Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 219, n. 30.

Whether this excerpt derives from the same scene as the previous fragment is not clear. The form of Polyhistor's transitional line introducing the fragment probably suggests that it does (Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 153).

The most fascinating feature of this fragment is the probability that the bird being described is the legendary phoenix. If so, it appears to be the

earliest mention of the phoenix in any Jewish source (though, cf. LXX Job 29:18). While the fragment does not contain the term φοῖνιξ, it is nevertheless widely held to be a description of the phoenix, primarily owing to a passage in Pseudo-Eustathius *Commentarius in Hexaemeron* (*PG* 18.729 D), in which these lines are quoted and specifically said to be describing the phoenix. Pseudo-Eustathius, however, does not attribute the lines to Ezekiel (cf. Philippson, 18).

Even though the term does not occur in this fragment, the use of φοῖνιξ, "palm tree," in the previous fragment; cf. Frg. 67, lines 9, 12, 21 (= v 251), made it possible to relate the two. On the linguistic similarity, and consequent close association of the phoenix with the palm, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 220, n. 47.

Other passages from antiquity that mention the phoenix include: Hesiod Frg. 304, in Plutarch *De defectu oraculorum* 2 (*Moral.* 415 C); Hecataeus of Miletus *Periegesis*, in Herodotus 2.73; Antiphanes, in Athenaeus 14.655 B; Aenesidemus *Pyrrhonea*, in Diogenes Laertius 9.79; Manilius, in Pliny *H.N.* 10.2 ¶¶ 4-5; Laevius *Pterygion phoenicis*, in Charisius *Ars gramm.* 4.6 (= H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* 1.288); Ovid *Metam.* 15.392-407; *Amor.* 1.337; Cornelius Valerianus in Pliny *H.N.* 10.2 ¶ 5; Lucan *Bell. Civ.* 6.680; Martial *Epigr.* 5.7.1-4; 37.13; 6.55.2; Pomponius Mela 3.83-84; Seneca *Epist.* 42.1; Statius *Silvae* 2.4.36-37; 6.87-88; 3.2.114; Chaeremon, Frg. 3 in Tzetzes, *Chiliad.* 5.395-98 (= Jacoby, *FGrH* 3C.147); Pliny *H.N.* 7.48 ¶ 153; 10.2 ¶¶ 3-5; 11.44 ¶ 121; 12.42 ¶ 85; 13.9 ¶ 42; 29.9 ¶ 29; 29.13 ¶ 56; Tacitus *Ann.* 6.28; Solinus 33.11-14; in Christian sources, cf. 1 Clem 25; *Orig. World* II 5, p. 122 (Robinson, *NHL*, p. 176); Tertullian *de resurr.* 10; Lactantius, *De ave Phoenice* (genuineness disputed); Pseudo-Eustathius, *Comment. in Hexaëm.* (*PG* 18.729 C-D). Also,

phoenixes are mentioned in the following Jewish sources: *3 Apoc. Bar.* 6:2, 9-16; 8:1-3; 10:3-7; *2 Enoch* 12:1-2; 15:1; 19:6; and the twelfth-century collection *Jerahmeel* 22:6-8 (Gaster, 48); possibly *As. Mos.* 1:3, "departure from Phoenicia" (cf. Lightfoot, 85; see below).

For literature on the phoenix, the most recent definitive treatment is R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix*, from which many of the above references are derived (cf. esp. 393-96); also Hubaux and Leroy, *Le mythe du phénix* and M. Walla, *Der Vogel Phoenix* (complete entries for these three items are found in the bibliography on Ezekiel at the beginning of this section). Also, cf. the earlier work by M. C. Fitzpatrick, *Lactanti "De ave Phoenice," with introduction, text, translation and commentary* (Diss. University of Pennsylvania; Philadelphia, 1933). Still useful is J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Part I: S. Clement of Rome* (London: Macmillan, 1890) 2(1).84-89, esp. his catalog of patristic references; also cf. Kappelmacher, 82-83; Wieneke, 106-109; A. Rusch, "Phoinix (5)" *PW* 20 (1944) 414-23, esp. 419-22. Also, cf. R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Die zwei Clemensbriefe* (*HNT*, Erg., Bd. I; Tübingen, 1920) 88-89.

On the use of descriptions of birds in tragedy, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 219, n. 31.

For a discussion of why Ezekiel incorporated a description of the phoenix into his dramatic presentation of the Exodus, the Elim episode in particular, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 158-64. Particularly striking is the sixth-century Coptic sermon (reported by van den Broek), "When God brought the children of Israel out of Egypt by the hand of Moses, the phoenix showed itself on the temple of On, the city of the sun" (p. 159).

Wacholder and Bowman, *HTR* 78 (1986) 253-77, contest the usual identification of ζῷον as the

phoenix, arguing instead that it is best seen as a description of "a huge eagle that serves as a metaphor for God, drawn from Exod 19:4 and from chaps. 1 and 17 of the book of Ezekiel" (253). Jacobson, *HTR* 80 (1987) 229-33, convincingly responds to this novel interpretation.

238. I.e., Ezekiel.

239. *εἶτα ὑποβὰς περὶ τοῦ φανέντος ὀρνέου διεξέρχεται.*

εἶτα ὑποβὰς. These introductory words typify transitional phrases of Polyhistor, e.g., Frg. 3, line 1; Frg. 5, line 1; Frg. 9, line 1; Frg. 10, line 1; Frg. 11, line 1. Cf. above, n. 173; also nn. 171, 188. They probably imply that relatively little has been omitted; so, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 158.

The form of the introductory formula suggests that the *τοῦ φανέντος ὀρνέου* was part of the previous scene containing the scout's description of Elim (cf. Frg. 16).

240. *ἕτερον δὲ πρὸς τοῖσδ' εἴδομεν ζῷον ξένον | θαυμαστόν, οἷον οὐδέπω ὥρακέ τις* (vv 254-255).

ἕτερον. This opening term seems to suggest that Ezekiel has just finished presenting another "strange creature." Accordingly, it has been proposed, e.g., by Trencsényi-Waldapfel, 158, that between the previous fragment and this one, he treated the serpent figure described in the passage from Epiphanius, sometimes attributed to Ezekiel (cf. Frg. 18). For a dissenting view, cf. Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 158; also his "Ezekiel the Tragedian and the Primeval Serpent," *AJP* 102 (1981) 316-20.

πρὸς τοῖσδ'. Cf. Frg. 13, line 26 (= v 152). Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 158, takes the phrase to mean "in addition to this," or simply "moreover," citing Aeschylus *Pr.* 254; Sophocles *Ph.* 1339.

θαυμαστόν. Cf. Frg. 15, line 35 (= v 221).

οὐδέπω ὥρακέ τις. Kuiper, 263, conjectures *οὐδεπώποτ' εἶδέ τις* because of the hiatus after *οὐδέπω*. Wieneke, 112, retains the MSS tradition; he notes other instances of hiatus in Ezekiel (p. 116-17).

οἷον οὐδέπω ὥρακέ τις. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 3.6.5. ¶ 137, which not only speaks of an unusual "winged creature," but also has a comparative element (*παραπλήσια*) corresponding to *οἷον*; similarly, though less directly relevant, is Philo *V. Mos.* 1.76, 200. Both are noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 219, n. 29, along with other formulae variously analogous, e.g., Pseudo-Philo *Bib.Ant.* 9:8.

241. *διπλοῦν γὰρ ἦν τὸ μῆκος ἀετοῦ σχεδόν* (v 256).

ἀετοῦ. The phoenix is compared with an eagle in Pliny *HN* 10.2 "aquilae ... magnitudine"; Herodotus 2.73 *αἰετῷ περιήγησιν ὁμοιότατος καὶ τὸ μέγαθος*. Cf. *Jerahmeel* 22:8; so Jacobson, 219, n. 32; also cf. LXX Ps 102:5.

242. *πτεροῖσι ποικίλοισιν ἠδὲ χρώμασι* (v 257).

πτεροῖσι. Possibly "feathers" (cf. Homer *Od.* 15.527; Herodotus 2.73), though more likely "wings" (cf. Homer *Il.* 11.454; *Od.* 2.151; Aeschylus *Eum.* 1001; Euripides *Heracl.* 10). Cf. LXX Exod 19:4 *καὶ ἀνέλαβον ὑμᾶς ὡσεὶ ἐπὶ πτερύγων ἀετῶν καὶ προσηγαγόμην ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν*; also Prov 23:5; Isa 40:31; Dan 4:33b; 7:4 .

ποικίλοισιν. For *ποικίλος* in LXX, cf. Gen 37:3, 23, 32; etc. Of birds, cf. Plotinus 4.4.29 *ἐπὶ τῶν ποικίλων ὀρνίθων*. Also cf. LXX Sir 45:10; cf. below, n. 243.

Cf. Pliny *H.N.* 10.2 ¶ 3 "discolores maxime et inenerrabiles."

χρώμασι. The term appears to be redundant, but aptly rendered by Robertson, 819, "iridescent."

243. *στῆθος μὲν αὐτοῦ πορφυροῦν ἐφαίνετο* (v 258).

πορφυροῦν. Cf. LXX Sir 45:10 *στολῇ ἁγίᾳ, χρυσῷ καὶ ὑακίνθῳ καὶ πορφύρᾳ, ἔργῳ ποικιλτοῦ ... κεκλωσμένῃ κόκκῳ, ἔργῳ τεχνίτου*. Cf. Exod 28:5 *καὶ αὐτοὶ λήμφονται τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὴν ὑάκινθον καὶ τὴν πορφύραν* ... So, Wacholder-Bowman, 257.

Cf. Pliny *H.N.* 10.2 ¶ 3 "... cetero purpureus."

244. *σκέλη δὲ μιλτόχρωτα, καὶ κατ' αὐχένων | κροκωτίνοις μαλλοῖσιν εὐτρεπίζετο* (vv 259-260).

μιλτόχρωτα. *μιλτόχρως* is a hapax in Ezekiel. *LSJ*, 1134. Similar terms include *μιλτόχριστος* in *Sib. Or.* 3.589; *μιλτόπρεπτος*, Aeschylus *Fr.* 164M (cf. *Fr.* 474.24 M (*LSJ Suppl.*, 100). Cf. Wieneke, 112-113.

κροκωτίνοις. *κροκώτινος*, a rare term; *LSJ*, 988, lists this occurrence, along with two other 2nd cent. C.E. usages (*CPR* 27.9; *PHamb.* 10.24). = *κροκωτός*, "saffron-dyed," "saffron-colored," e.g., Pindar *N.* 1.38; Aristophanes *Lys.* 51; *Ran.* 46, etc. Wieneke, 113.

Pliny *H.N.* 10.2 ¶ 3 "auri fulgore circa colla ... caeruleam roseis caudam pinnis distinguentibus, cristis fauces..."

μαλλοῖσιν. *μαλλός*, "flock of wool," e.g., Hesiod *Op.* 234; Aeschylus *Eum.* 45; Sophocles *OC* 475, or "tress," e.g., Euripides *Ba.* 113; "plume," according to Wieneke, 113. Robertson, 819, "and its neck was furnished round *with tresses*, saffron-hued."

245. *κάρα δὲ κοττοῖς ἡμέροις παρεμφερές* (v 261).

The MSS reading *κοίτης ἰμέροις* (CFG, according to Wieneke, read *κοίτης ἡμέρης*; Pseudo-Eustathius *κοίτης ἡμέρας*), perhaps "of a bed (lair? nest?) for yearnings," or "soft nest" (Robertson), is recognized as problematic as early as Stephanus,

who emends ἰμέροις, from ἵμερος, "longing," "yearning after," or absolutely, "desire," "love" (*LSJ*, 830), to ἡμέροις, from ἥμερος, "tame," e.g., of animals (Homer *Od.* 15.162; Plato *Phdr.* 260 B; Xenophon *Cyr.* 1.3.6), and punctuates as follows: κάρα δὲ κοίτης, ἡμέροις παρεμφερὲς. Even so, the line is left untranslated (cf. *PG* [21] 747A).

Later, Voss, emends κοίτης, genitive of κοίτη, "bed," "lair," "nest" of a bird (e.g., Euripides *Ion* 155) to κοττοῖς, from κόττος = ἀλεκτρυών, "cock," also ἵππος, "horse," according to Hesychius (κοττός· ὄρνις. καὶ ἵππων δέ τινες οὕτως ἔλεγον). *LSJ* 986. Voss's emendation thus resolves the difficulty of the genitive. Accordingly, κοττοῖς ἰμέροις might then yield "and its head somewhat like that of *longing cocks*," i.e., "amorous cocks" (?).

However, by combining the emendations of Voss and Stephanus, it was possible to obtain a more manageable reading: κοττοῖς ἡμέροις, thus "its head was somewhat like that of tame cocks." As Robertson notes, 819, n. y^3, the description of the phoenix in Pliny *HN* 10.2 ¶ 3 *auri fulgore circa colla* lends credence to this generally accepted reading: "Ezekiel's text may preserve the figure of 'a tufted nest of feathers' on top of the bird's head." Thus he translates, "like to a coxcomb did its crest appear." Also, cf. Pliny *H.N.* 11.44 ¶ 121 "phoenici plumarum serie e medio eo exeunte alio."

For a discussion of the text-critical problem, cf. Kuiper, 264; Wieneke, 113.

παρεμφερές. The neuter here agrees with κάρα, although Wieneke, 113, defends it as being in agreement with ζῷον ξένον in line 3 (= v 254). Accordingly, he rejects παρεμφερής, which is read by Philippson (κάρη δὲ κοττοῖς ἡμέροις παρεμφερής = "Um Haupte glich er saßt dem zahmen Haushahn"), but also by Pseudo-Eustathius κάρα δὲ κοίτης ἡμέρας παρεμφερὴς = "Caput eius diei cubili non

dissimile"). Cf. Kuiper, 264. Wieneke, 113, gives examples of its use, e.g., Aristotle *HA* 4.1 ($524^{b}10$) *v.l.* παρεμφερῆ ὄρνιθι; Diodorus Siculus 1.35.8, etc.

van der Horst, "Notes," 375, cites this is "a good instance of *comparatio compendiaria*," thus "His head was like that of domesticated cocks."

246. καὶ μηλίνῃ μὲν τῇ κόρῃ προσέβλεπε | κύκλῳ (vv 262-263).

μηλίνῃ. μήλινος, "of an apple tree," derivatively "of quince-yellow," e.g., Theophrastus *HP* 9.18.1; Athenaeus 12.539E; Diodorus Siculus 2.53.6; *AnthGr.* 11.325.2. *LSJ*, 1126. Wieneke, 113.f.

τῇ κόρῃ. Cf. Plato *Alc.* 1.133 A; also Sophocles *Fr.* 634. κόρη occurs in LXX Deut 32:10; Ps 16:8; Prov 7:2; Sir 17:22; Zech 2:12; 3 Macc 5:47; 4 Macc 18:21, rendered by RSV as "*apple* of the eye". Cf. Theodotus, annotations, n. 57.

247. κόρη δὲ κόκκος ὡς ἐφαίνετο (v 263).

κόκκος. Literally, "grain," "seed," i.e., of pomegranate, e.g., Homer *h.Cer.* 372, 412; Herodotus 4.143; So, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 67, "...eye which looked like a *seed*"; Robertson, 819, "the pupil like some *pomegranate seed.*" By extension, the term is also used of the color scarlet, since the berry of the kermes oak was used to dye scarlet. So, *LSJ* 971. κόκκος occurs twice in LXX Sir 45:10; Lam 4:5 (= תולע), both times in this latter sense.

248. φωνὴν δὲ πάντων εἶχεν ἐκπρεπεστάτην (v 264).

φωνὴν. Of a bird's call, cf. Homer *Od.* 19. 521 (nightingale).

ἐκπρεπεστάτην. Cf. Aeschylus *Pers.* 184; so, Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 185, n. 7.

249. βασιλεὺς δὲ πάντων ὀρνέων ἐφαίνετο, | ὡς ἦν

νοῆσαι (vv 265-266).

βασιλεὺς ... ὀρνέων. Cf. Aeschylus *Agam.* 113-114 οἰωνῶν βασιλεύς; Pindar *O.* 13.21 οἰωνῶν βασιλέα δίδυμον.

250. πάντα γὰρ τὰ πτήν' ὁμοῦ | ὄπισθεν αὐτοῦ δειλιῶντ' ἐπέσσυτο (vv 266-267).

δειλιῶντ'. Cf. LXX Deut 1:21; 31:6; 1 Macc 16:6, etc. Wieneke, 114.

ἐπέσσυτο. Cf. Euripides *Ph.* 1065; *Hel.* 1162.

251. αὐτὸς δὲ πρόσθεν, ταῦρος ὣς γαυρούμενος (v 268).

ταῦρος ὣς γαυρούμενος. Cf. Euripides *HF* 869 ταῦρος ὣς ἐς ἐμβολήν. Wieneke, 115. Cf. Virgil *Georg.* 3.209-41, esp. 234-41; so Jacobson, *Exagoge*, 219, n. 31.

γαυρούμενος. Of an animal's proud bearing, cf. Dio Cassius 37.54.2; as noted by Jacobson, *Exagoge* 219, n. 31.

252. ἔβαινε κραιπνὸν βῆμα βαστάζων ποδός (v 269).

κραιπνὸν. Cf. Homer *Il.* 23.749; Euripides *Hipp.* 829, etc. Wieneke, 115.

βῆμα. Cf. Euripides *Tr.* 342; *El.* 954. Wieneke, 115.

253. Even though the poetic lines of this fragment are nowhere attributed to Ezekiel in ancient sources, nor do they correspond to any part of the poem that has been attributed to him (as was the case with Pseudo-Eustathius' description of the phoenix in Frg. 17; cf. above, n. 237), this fragment has been attributed to Ezekiel with varying degrees of certainty, and included in collections of his verses, by various editors and translators (Philippson [1830], 18-19 [discussion], 40-41 [text = vv 271-280]; Dübner, *Christus Patiens* [1846], 8; Riessler [1927], 345 [= vv 271-280];

Denis, *Fragmenta* [1970], 216 [= Frg. 4]; discussion in *Introduction*, 275). These lines are not included, however, in the Greek texts presented by Kuiper (1900), Stearns (1908), Wieneke (1931), Snell (1971, 1986^2), Fornaro (1982), Jacobson (1983), nor in the translations by Vogt (1983), van der Horst (1987), Robertson (1985).

According to Philippson, 18, it was J. Scaliger, in his annotations on the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, who first suggested that these ten verses should be attributed to Ezekiel, and thus wrote in the second edition of his *Thesaurus Temporum Eusebii Pamphili* (Amsterdam, 1658^2), 402: "Illi versiculi non sunt omittendi, Ezekielis poëtae Judaei, ut ego mihi persuasi, nisi doctioribus aliter videatur," later adding "Corruptissima exstant apud Epiphanium." Philippson identified the passage in the *Panarion* and became convinced that it belonged to a tragedy. Because of its formal similarity with Ezekiel's poem, Philippson agreed with Scaliger that the verses probably should be attributed to Ezekiel, and consequently included them.

Jacobson, "Primeval Serpent," 318, notes, however, that Scaliger, in his first edition of the *Chronicon* (Leiden, 1606), 242, attributed the lines to "Eleazar Pontifex Ierosolymorum," probably the high priest prominently mentioned in *Ep.Arist.* From this he concludes that Scaliger's proposal was likely quite tentative; indeed thinks "that Scaliger himself did not take the matter very seriously" (p. 318). He goes ahead to argue, 318-320, that the lines should not be attributed to Ezekiel, not only because the meter differs substantially from that of the *Exodus*, but because its fundamental tenor "seems manifestly Christian" (p. 319). Support for this latter claim he finds in the fact that the passage actually appears earlier in the Christian author Methodius, from whom

Epiphanius quotes it, and that Methodius himself, who "was familiar with some classical Greek poetry ... occasionally composing in verse" (p. 320), is the most likely author of these verses.

In a letter dated November 17, 1988, N. Walter observes that Jacobson's view agrees with that of J. Dummer, editor of the new *GCS* edition of Epiphanius *Panarion*. In a letter to Walter dated November 30, 1966, Dummer expressed this conviction: "Es scheint mir sicher zu sein, daß die Verse von Methodius selbst stammen, vor allem im Hinblick auf die Verbindungen bzw. sprachlichen Parallelen an anderes Stellen bei Methodius, die Bonwetsch im Apparat notiert hat. Methodius hat ja auch in sein Symposion einen Hymnus eingefügt: S. 131 ff. Bonw. Es hat also wohl zu den schriftstellerischen Mitteln des Methodius gehört, seine Prosadarlegungen mit Versen zu würzen. Übrigens hält auch Buchheit (Studien zu Methodius von Olympos, Berlin, 1958 [TU 69], 160) die Schlangenverse ohne weiteres für methodianisch (innerhalb des S. 153-160 geführten Echteitsbeweises für den Hymnus des Symposions)."

Dummer and Jacobson have offered convincing evidence (and Walter agrees) that these poetic lines should not be attributed to Ezekiel. Nevertheless, because of the role they have played in the history of interpretation of Ezekiel, they are included in this collection for comparative purposes.

Those who have attributed the lines to Ezekiel have assigned them different functions: as a prologue to the drama (Dübner), as either prologue or epilogue (Denis), as part of the Elim scene, immediately preceding the phoenix passage in Frg. 17 (Trencsényi-Waldapfel; cf. above, n. 240), as part of a choral passage (Gutman apud Jacobson, "Primeval Serpent," 317).

On this fragment generally, cf. Philippson,

18; Jacobson, "Primeval Serpent," 316-320.

254. In order to assess the significance of these lines, it should be noted that the larger section in which they occur in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 64.12-62) is actually an extensive excerpt from Methodius *On the Resurrection* (1.20-2.8.10). So, Quasten, *Patrology* 2.136. Consequently, this introductory line is to be attributed to Methodius, who previously has been discoursing on the subject of the devil (64.29.1-5). Although it has usually been thought that at this point Epiphanius (Methodius) now quotes poetic lines from another source, Jacobson, "Primeval Serpent," 320, proposes that Methodius concludes this section of his refutation by composing these poetic lines himself. Cf. above, n. 253.

Conceivably, ἐμμέτρως may simply mean "fitting," "appropriate," as e.g., Plato *Cra.* 395 C, thus "And now it occurs to me to say something fitting." Cf. *LSJ*, 542.

255. For the importance of the serpent motif as it relates to the exodus and wilderness story, and traditions in which the serpent is related to the phoenix, cf. Jacobson, "Primeval Serpent," 317-318.

In *Jerahmeel* 22:5-8, Eve is tempted not by a serpent but by a bird (חול). Serpents figure prominently in certain rabbinic traditions of the journey through the wilderness. Cf. *Exod. Rab.* 24:4.

442326

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

36856

BS
1197
F68
1983
V.2

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA
91711

442326

DEMCO

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS 30

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA SERIES 12

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE 1989