

HTLS

Historical and
Theological Lexicon
of the Septuagint



Volume I



Mohr Siebeck

Editors:

Eberhard Bons (University of Strasbourg)

Jan Joosten (University of Oxford)

Advisory Board:

James Aitken, University of Cambridge

Erik Eynikel, University of Regensburg

Christoph Kugelmeier, University of Saarbrücken

Tobias Nicklas, University of Regensburg

Anna Passoni Dell'Acqua, Catholic University, Milan

Emanuela Prinzivalli, University of Rome "La Sapienza"

Michael Segal, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Editorial Staff:

Ralph Brucker (University of Kiel)

Patrick Pouchelle (Centre Sèvres, Paris)

Daniela Scialabba (University of Strasbourg)

Romina Vergari (University of Florence)

Stefanie Plangger (University of Strasbourg)

Jill Husser (Strasbourg)

Antonella Bellantuono (University of Strasbourg)

Katharine Perry (University of Oxford)

Cristina Buffa (University of Strasbourg)

Pauline Signoret (University of Strasbourg)

Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint

This large-scale collective and interdisciplinary project aims to produce a new research tool: a multi-volume dictionary providing an article of between two and ten pages (around 600 articles in all) for each important word or word group of the Septuagint. Filling an important gap in the fields of ancient philology and religious studies, the dictionary will be based on original research of the highest scientific level.

This project has benefitted from funding from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (French Research National Agency), the Maison Interuniversitaire des Sciences de l'Homme – Alsace (Strasbourg), the Melanchthon-Stiftung (Tübingen), and the Armin Schmitt Stiftung (Regensburg).

Wider context

The Hebrew Bible has played an important part in the development of Western culture. However, its central ideas – such as monotheism, the demythologization of nature or the linearity of time – had to be taken out of the national and linguistic milieu in which they had developed if they were to become fertile on a

wider scale. They also needed to be rendered palatable to a mind-set that had experienced the scientific, rationalist revolution presented by the Greeks. The Septuagint – the oldest Greek translation of the Jewish Bible, produced over the last three centuries B.C.E. – is the first important step in this process of acculturation.

During the last thirty years, the Septuagint has come out of the shadow of its Hebrew source. Historians of Judaism, linguists, and biblical scholars have come to view the Septuagint as a significant document in its own right. As the discoveries in Qumran have shown, the Hebrew source text of the Septuagint was not identical to the traditional text received by the synagogue (the Masoretic Text). Also, the translators appear to have taken a degree of liberty in interpreting the text. Dominique Barthélemy used the term 'aggiornamento': the Septuagint is a kind of update of the Jewish scriptures.

Several projects are aimed at producing annotated translations of the Septuagint: in France, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, of which about twenty volumes have appeared since 1986;

in the English-speaking world, the *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, published in 2007; and in Germany, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, published in 2009. A host of conferences and collaborative efforts enhances the interaction of these projects.

Further progress in the exploration of the Greek version can be obtained only by going into more depth. The rediscovery of the text as linear discourse is to be supplemented by research on the words of which it is composed: their roots in Greek and Hellenistic culture and their exploitation within the biblical language.

Objectives and methodology

The project's objective is to provide an analysis of the typical vocabulary of the Septuagint. For each word or word group, an article will be written retracing: 1) the background of the word in Classical and Hellenistic Greek: meanings, usage, connotations and semantic development; 2) its distribution and meaning in the biblical books: the way the Greek word matches Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents and absorbs their meaning and usage; 3) the further development of the word in Jewish Hellenistic writings, in the New Testament and in early Christian literature. Because the vocabulary of the Septuagint will be placed in a much larger context, the dictionary will address not only biblical scholars,

but also classical and patristic scholars, general linguists, and historians of religion. As such, the dictionary will fill an important gap.

The project is confronted with several methodological challenges. The debate can be illustrated with a few remarks:

- The Greek language of the translators is not classical Greek, nor is it the literary Koine of the Hellenistic period. Septuagint Greek comes closer to the popular language attested in documentary papyri. Without neglecting the great body of classical literature, Septuagint scholars should always take the papyrological data into account.
- When comparing the Greek words of the translation and the Hebrew words of the source text, one should take into consideration the evolution of the Hebrew language. The translators may have known Hebrew meanings that do not reflect the biblical usage intended by the author but a later usage, as attested, for example, in the Qumran texts.
- The original function and intended readership of the Septuagint are still subject to discussion. According to some recent publications, the Greek version was originally meant to serve the study of the Hebrew source text as a kind of interlinear crib. Others argue

that the version is part of Hellenistic culture and scholarship and would have had a Greek readership. Research in preparation of the dictionary may contribute to this important debate.

Organization of the project

The project is led by Eberhard Bons (University of Strasbourg) and Jan Joosten (University of Oxford). They are seconded by an advisory board consisting of the following scholars:

- James Aitken, reader at Cambridge University, Old Testament.
- Erik Eynikel, Professor of Old Testament at the University of Regensburg, lexicography.
- Christoph Kugelmeier, professor at the University of Saarbrücken, classics.
- Tobias Nicklas, professor at the University of Regensburg, New Testament.

- Anna Passoni Dell’Acqua, professor at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, papyrology.
- Emanuela Prinzivalli, professor at La Sapienza University in Rome, Early Christian Literature.
- Michael Segal, lecturer at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, rabbinic literature.

The articles will be written by a large group of participants especially from Europe and America.

Practical matters and time schedule

The dictionary will be published in English. The project will cover about a decade. The objective is to publish a first volume of around 700 pages in 2018. Three other volumes of the same size should follow over the years 2020–2028.

Wordlist of the First Volume

ἄβυσσος	ἀγχιστεύω, ἀγχιστεία,	ἀθλητής, ἄθλον	αἰσχύνη, αἰσχύνω
ἀγαλλίασμα,	ἀγχιστεύς,	ἀθῶος, ἀθῶω	αἰτία, αἴτιος, ἀναίτιος,
ἀγαλλίαμα,	ἀγχιστευτής	αἰδέομαι, αἰδήμων,	παραίτιος, μεταίτιος
ἀγαλλίασις	ἀγών, ἀγωνία, ἀγωνιάω,	αἰδώς, ἀναίδεια,	αἰχμαλωσία,
ἄγαλμα	ἀγωνίζομαι	ἀναιδής	αἰχμαλωτεύω,
ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη	ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή,	αἶμα	αἰχμαλωτίζω,
ἄγγελος	ἀδελφίδος,	αἴνεσις, αἰνετός, αἰνέω,	αἰχμάλωτος
ἀγιαζώ	ἀδελφότης	αἶνος	αἰών, αἰώνιος
ἀγίασμα, ἀγιασμός	ἄδης	αἴνιγμα	ἀκαθαρσία, ἀκάθαρτος
ἄγιος	ἄδικος, ἀδικημα, ἀδικία	αἰρέω (αἰρέομαι),	ἄκακος, ἀκακία
ἀγνοέω, ἀγνόημα,	ἀδυνατέω, ἀδύνατος	αἴρεσις, αἰρετίζω,	ἀκροβυστία
ἄγνοια	ἄδω	αἰρετός, αἰρετής	ἀλαζονεία, ἀλαζών,
ἀγνός, ἀγνεΐα, ἀγνίζω,	ἀθανασία, ἀθάνατος	αἰσθάνομαι, αἰσθησις,	ἀλαζονεύομαι
ἀφαγνίζω, ἄγνισμα,	ἀθεσία, ἀθετέω,	αἰσθητήριον,	ἀλείφω → χρίω
ἀγνισμός	ἀθέτημα, ἀθέτησις	αἰσθητικός	

ἀλήθεια ἀληθής, ἀληθινός, ἀληθεύω	ἀπατάω, ἀπάτη ἀπειθέω, ἀπειθεία, ἀπειθής	ἀσθένεια, ἀσθενέω, ἀσθενής	βουλεύω, βουλή, βουλευτής
ἀλλάσσω, ἀνταλλάσσομαι, ἄλλαγμα, ἀντάλλαγμα	ἀπειλέω, ἀπειλή ἄπιστος, ἀπιστία, ἄπιστος	ἀσπίς ἀσφάλεια, ἀσφαλής, ἀσφαλίζομαι	βραχίων βρέχω, βροχή βροτός βωμός
ἀλλογενής ἀλλότριος, ἀλλοτριόομαι, ἀλλοτριότης, ἀλλοτριώσις, ἀπαλλοτριώω	ἀπλοῦς, ἀπλότης ἀποικεσία, ἀποικία, ἀποικίζω, ἀποικισμός	ἀσχημονέω, ἀσχημοσύνη, ἀσχήμων	γαζοφυλάκιον γαῖα → γῆ
ἀλλόφυλος, ἀλλοφυλέω, ἀλλοφυλισμός	ἀποκάλυψις → ἀνακαλύπτω	ἄσωτος, ἄσωτία ἀτιμάζω, ἀτιμία, ἀτιμος, ἀτιμώω	γάμος, γαμέω, γαμβρέυω, ἐπιγαμβρέυω
ἄλλος	ἀποκρύπτω, ἀπόκρυφος ἀπόλλυμι, ἀπώλεια	ἀτμίς ἄτοπος, ἀτοπία	γαυρίαμα, γαυριάω, γαυρόομαι, γαυρίομαι
ἀμάρτημα, ἀμαρτία ἄμεμπτος, ἄμωμος ἀμύνω, ἄμυνα	ἀπολύω ἀποπομπάοις, ἀποπομπή	αὐτάρκεια, αὐτάρκης, αὐταρκέω	γειώρας, γιώρας γελάω + compound verbs, γέλως
ἀνάγκη ἀνάθημα, ἀνάθεμα, ἀναθεματίζω	ἀποσκορακίζω, ἀποσκορακισμός	αὐτόχθων ἀφαιρέω (ἀφαιρέσις), ἀφαίρεμα	γενεά γένεσις
ἀναίδης → αἰδέομαι ἀνακαλύπτω, ἀποκαλύπτω ἀποκάλυψις	ἀπόστασις, ἀποστασία, ἀποστατέω, ἀποστάτης, ἀποστάτης	ἀφανίζω, ἀφανισμός ἀφθαρσία, ἀφθαρτος ἀφήμι, ἄφεις, ἀνίημι, ἄνεσις	γεννάω, γέννημα γένος
ἀναμνηστικῶς, ἀνάμνησις → μνηστικῶς	ἀποστάσιον ἀποστέλλω, ἀποστολή, ἀπόστολος, ἀνταποστέλλω, ἐπαποστέλλω, ἐξαποστέλλω, ἐξαποστολή, συναποστέλλω	ἀφορίζω, ἀφορισμα, ἀφορισμός	γερούσια γεύω (γεύομαι), ἀπογεύω, γεύμα, γεύσις
ἀνάπαυσις, ἀναπαύω ἀνάστασις → ἀνίστημι ἀναστρέφω, ἀναστροφή ἀνατολή	ἀποστάσιον ἀποστέλλω, ἀποστολή, ἀπόστολος, ἀνταποστέλλω, ἐπαποστέλλω, ἐξαποστέλλω, ἐξαποστολή, συναποστέλλω	ἀφρονεύομαι, ἀφροσύνη, ἄφρων ἄωρος, ἄωρία	γῆ, γαῖα γηγενής γῆρας γίγας
ἀναφέρω, ἀναφορά, ἀναφορεύς	ἀποστρέφω, ἀποστροφή ἀποτίνω	βαθύς, βαθύνω, βάθος βάπτω, βαπτίζω	γινώσκω, γνώμη, γνώσις
ἀνδρεία, ἀνδρείος, ἀνδρίζομαι	ἀποφθεγγομαι, ἀπόφθεγμα	βάρβαρος, βαρβαρόω, βαρβάρως	γλυκύς, γλυκύτης, γλυκερός, γλυκαίνω, γλυκάζω, γλυκάσμα, γλυκασμός, γλεῦκος
ἀνδρόγυνος, ἀνδρογύναιος	ἀπωθέω, προσπαυθέω, ἀπωσμός	βασιλεία, βασιλεύς, βασιλεύω, βασιλίσσα	γλύμμα, γλυπτός, γλυφή, γλύφω
ἄνεσις → ἄφεις ἀνέχω, ἀνοχή ἀνθρωπάρεσκος ἀνθρωπος	ἀρά, ἀράομαι, κατάρα, κατάρατος, κατάρσις, καταράομαι, ἐπικατάρσις, ἐπικατάρσις	βασιλίσκος βασκαίνω, βασκανία, βάσκανος	γλώσσα γνόφος γογγύζω, γόγγυσις, γογγυσμός, διαγογγύζω, καταγογγύζω
ἀνίημι → ἀφήμι ἀνίστημι, ἀνάστασις ἀνόητος, ἄνοια, ἄνους ἀνόμημα, ἀνομία ἄνομος	ἀργέω, ἀργία ἀργύριον	βδελύσσω (βδελύσσομαι), βδέλυγμα, βδελυγμός, βδελυκτός	γραμμα, γραφή γραμματεύς, γραμματεία, γραμματεύω, γραμματικός
ἀντάλλαγμα, ἀντάλλασσομαι → ἄλλασσω	ἀρέσκω, ἀρεστός, ἀρέσκεια/ἀρεσκεία	βέβαιος, βεβαίωω, βεβαίωσις	γρηγορέω, γρηγόρησις → ἐγείρω
ἀντιλαμβάνομαι, συναντιλαμβάνομαι, ἀντιλή(μ)πτωρ, ἀντιλη(μ)ψις	ἀρετή ἀρμόζω, ἀρμονία, ἀρμόνιος	βία, βιάζομαι βιβλίον, βιβλος βίος, βιώω, βίωσις βλασφημέω, βλασφημία, βλάσφημος	γρύψ γυμνός, γυμνότης/ γύμνωσις, γυμνός
ἄξιος ἄορατος, ἄορασία ἀπαρχή, ἀπάρχομαι	ἀρνέομαι + compound verbs ἄρουρα ἄρχη ἀρχιερεύς ἄρχω, ἄρχων ἄσεβεια, ἀσεβέω ἀσεβής	βοήθεια, βοηθέω, βοηθός	

Samples

ἄκακος, ἀκακία

ἄκακος

1. Greek literature. Composed of the alpha privative and the adjective κακός “bad, evil”, the word ἄκακος is not very frequent in Greek literature, though more common than the noun ἀκακία.

The meaning of ἄκακος has developed in two directions: On the one hand, the adjective denotes the lack of experience, knowledge, intelligence or responsibility, namely of young people; on the other, it has the meaning “blameless, innocent”.

(1.) In a philosophical context, the adjective occurs in a debate about various degrees of “lack of wisdom” (ἄφροσύνη), of which the ἄκακοι are said to represent a milder form, like the inexperienced (ἄπειροι); see Ps.-Plato, *2 Alc.* 140d. Thus, the adverb ἀκάκως is attested in the description of the hazardous manner in which unsuccessful military decisions have been taken (e.g. Polybius, *Hist.* 5.20.5; 7.17.9). Moreover, the adverb ἀκάκως occurs with reference to somebody who responds to a request “readily and guilelessly”, albeit not without ulterior motives (Ps.-Demosthenes, *Everg.* 50: ῥαδίως μοι καὶ ἀκάκως ἀποκρίνεται, see also *Everg.* 75: ἀκάκως καὶ ταχύ μοι ὠμολόγησεν “he agreed with me guilelessly and promptly”).

In a number of occurrences, the adjective ἄκακος especially alludes to lack of experience and to a certain guilelessness. This can be illustrated by examples taken from different authors, epochs and literary genres. Thus, ἄκακος is used in the context of the behavior of children not yet acquainted with dangers of everyday life. In the Aesopic fable “The Boy and the Scorpion”, a scorpion

warns “the guileless boy (τὸν παῖδα ἄκακον)”, who has mistaken the scorpion for one of the locusts he had been hunting (Aesop, *Fab.* 215.3δ). Likewise, Plutarch, *Thes.* 8.4, describes as “exceedingly innocent and childish (ἀκάκως πάνυ καὶ παιδικῶς)” the attitude of a young girl, Sinis, who supplicates wild plants and makes vows to them as though they could understand her. Even younger persons having political or military responsibilities can be characterized as ἄκακος, e.g. a certain Apollonius in Polybius, *Hist.* 31.11.7 (ἄκακος ὦν καὶ κομιδῆ νέος “unsuspecting and quite young”), Dion in Plutarch, *Dion* 4.7 (ἀκάκως πάνυ καὶ νεωτερικῶς “in an entirely innocent and youthful way”), and the future emperor Commodus in Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.* 73.1.1 (εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων ἄκακος, ὑπὸ δὲ δὴ τῆς πολλῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ προσέτι καὶ δειλίας ἐδούλευσε τοῖς συνοῦσι “[he was] as guileless as any man that ever lived. His great simplicity, however, together with his cowardice, made him the slave of his companions”). Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 13.76.2, gives a short description of the Spartan admiral Callitratidas, a “very young man, without guile and straightforward in character, since he had had as yet no experience of the ways of foreign peoples, and was the most just man among the Spartans (οὗτος δὲ νέος μὲν ἦν παντελῶς, ἄκακος δὲ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπλοῦς, οὐπω τῶν ξενικῶν ἠθῶν πεπειραμένος, δικαιοτάτος δὲ Σπαρτιατῶν)”. Menander, *Dysc.* 222–223, focuses on dangers which could threaten a young person. Thus, a slave blames his master for having left his daughter alone, a young innocent girl (ἄκακον κόρη μόνην ἀφεις ἐν ἐρημίαι ἔαις), i.e. without thinking of possible risks; in particular the

presence of a young man, Sostratos, her future husband. The adjective has an even more pejorative meaning in Plutarch, *Rect. rat. aud.* 41A, where it refers to enthusiastic and credulous audiences who are inclined to believe anything (οἱ δὲ θαυμαστικοὶ καὶ ἄκακοὶ μᾶλλον βλάπτονται “but the enthusiastic and ingenuous are more liable to get damaged”; → 5. [Rom 16:18]). Likewise, the ἄκακοὶ fall victim to superstition. Thus, Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 379E, maintains that the animal cult is “a dangerous belief which plunges the weak and innocent into sheer superstition (δόξα... δεινὴ τοὺς μὲν ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἀκάκους εἰς ἄκρατον ὑπερείπουσα τὴν δεῖσδαιμονίαν)”.

(2.) By contrast, in a fewer number of quotations the adjective ἄκακος has a clearly positive meaning, without any connotation of “guileless” or “inexperienced”. In a myth about the origins of mankind (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 5.66.3–4), Kronos is said to have introduced “justice and sincerity of soul (τὴν τε δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὴν ἀπλότητα τῆς ψυχῆς)” among humans (*Bibl.* 5.66.4). Hence, as myth has it, in Kronos’ time people were still good-hearted and altogether guileless (εὐήθεις καὶ ἀκάκους παντελῶς, → ἀκακία 3. [Philo, *Opif.* 156]). In some cases, the context does not provide further information about the attitudes or virtues of the person designated by the adjective, e.g. in Aeschylus, *Pers.* 671, where the deceased Persian king Darius is addressed πάτερ ἄκακε “blameless father” in a necromancy; see also *Pers.* 855, with reference to Darius (using the Doric poetic form ἀκάκας [= ἀκάκης], which is also attested in *IG VII* 117.3 as an epithet of Hades, → 2.): ὁ γηραιὸς πανταρκὴς ἀκάκας ἄμαχος βασιλεὺς ἰσόθεος Δαρειῶς “the aged, all-powerful, guileless, unconquerable king, god-like Darius”. – Here and there, ἄκακος is employed to point out how girls or women are perceived by men. In Menander, *Her.* 19, the adjective is used by a slave who has fallen in love with a young girl that he believes is a slave as well (παιδίσκην ὀρῶν συντρεφομένην ἄκακον

“seeing an innocent girl reared with me”). A young woman of Pergamum, who had dared to bury an executed person, appeared “altogether young and innocent” (νέας παντάπασι καὶ ἀκάκου τῆς παιδίσκης φανείσης) when arrested and presented to the king Mithradates (Plutarch, *Mulier. virt.* 259C). A wife who did not criticize her husband despite of his offensive breath is described as σώφρων καὶ ἄκακος “virtuous and innocent” (Plutarch, *Inim. util.* 90B).

2. Papyri and inscriptions. The adjective is not attested in the extant papyri of the Hellenistic era. However, it appears in various funerary inscriptions of unknown date that describe the virtues of the deceased, e.g. Olympus (Lyca): Πισίδις Ἑρμαῖος, υἱὸς Ἑρμοῦ, ἄκακον παιδεῖν ἐνθάδε κείται “Pisidis Hermaeus, son of Hermas, a small innocent child, is lying here” (*TAM II* 1147); Alabanda (Caria): χαίρεται παρὰ Τρύφωνος τῆς ἀκάκου ψυχῆς τοῦ Φειλογνωρίμου “Farewell by Trypho of the innocent soul of Philognorimos” (REINACH, “Inscriptions d’Asie Mineure”, 410, no. 5); Ephesus, funerary inscription of Eucharistus: ὤχετο πρὸς φθιμένους, παῖς νέος ὢν ἄκακος “he departed to the deceased, a young boy, still innocent” (*IEph* 2102.13–14); Rome: Φιλοπονίδης Ποντικῆ συμβίβη ψυχῆ ἀκάκῃ μνείας χάριν “Philoponides in remembrance of his innocent wife Pontike” (*IG XIV* 2077.3–6).

The poetic first declension form ἀκάκης that can be found in Aeschylus, *Pers.* 855 (→ 1.), is also attested in *IG VII* 117.3 (4th/5th cent. C.E., Megara), as an epithet of Hades: σοὶ δὲ χάρις, Πλουτε(ῦ), ἀκάκη θε(ῶ)ι.

3. Septuagint. a) *Statistical observations.* The adjective occurs 17 times in the LXX: 8 times in the book of Proverbs, 3 times in the book of Job, 3 times in the Psalms of Solomon, once in the Psalms, in Jeremiah, and in the book of Wisdom.

b) *Hebrew equivalents.* The adjective ἄκακος corresponds to different Hebrew roots. Two tendencies are recognizable: (1) Where ἄκακος means “blameless, innocent” (→ 1.), the Hebrew equivalent is *tōm*

“blameless” (Ps 24[25]:21; Job 2:3; 8:20), *tōm dərək* “whose way is blameless” (Prov 13:6) or *tāmīm* “blameless” (Prov 2:21). (2) However, where the adjective rather means “inexperienced” or “simple-minded” (→ 1.), the Hebrew equivalent is *paṭī* “naive”, “simple” (Prov 1:4, 22; 8:5; 14:15; 21:11). Furthermore, the adjective translates *rā*^c “bad, evil” (Prov 15:10) and *ʿallūp* “trusting” (Jer 11:19). In Job 36:5, ἄκακος has no Hebrew equivalent. No Hebrew texts are available for the occurrences in the Psalms of Solomon and in the book of Wisdom.

c) *LXX use*. Generally speaking, two usages of ἄκακος can be distinguished: ἄκακος with the meaning of “innocent” and with the meaning of “guileless, inexperienced” (→ 1.–2.).

The adjective refers to innocence as being appreciated by God. This is the case in Job 8:20; 36:5: The Lord will not reject the ἄκακος (ὁ κύριος οὐ μὴ ἀποποιήσῃται τὸν ἄκακον). Likewise, God highlights Job’s integrity presenting him as a blameless and God-fearing person who stays away from evil (Job 2:3). In the only attestation of ἄκακος in the Psalms, the emphasis is not on the relationship of the ἄκακοι with God, but with the psalmist whom they have joined: ἄκακοι καὶ εὐθεῖς ἐκολλῶντό μοι (Ps 24 [25]:21). The fact that ἄκακος is used in parallel with εὐθύς suggests the conclusion that ἄκακος once more denotes a moral quality, i.e. integrity. A similar parallel appears in Prov 2:21 where the ἄκακος and the χρηστός are promised to dwell in the land. Obviously, the idea of reward underlies this promise (→ ἀκακία 2.c).

Except for Prov 2:21, in the book of Proverbs the situation is quite different (see also BibAlex 17, 159), insofar as the adjective ἄκακος does not allude to moral integrity but to a lack of knowledge and experience. This can be illustrated by some quotations: The aim of reading and learning Proverbs is that shrewdness is given to the ἄκακοι, and that both perception and insight be given to the young person (ἵνα δῶ ἄκακος πανουργίαν

παιδί δὲ νέῳ αἰσθησὶν τε καὶ ἔννοιαν (Prov 1:4). This implies that the adjective ἄκακος refers to a person who lacks skill, experience and knowledge, particularly because of his or her youth. The idea that the ἄκακος needs πανουργία, perhaps in the sense of “subtlety”, is underlined by the personified Wisdom inviting her audience to listen to words of wisdom: νοήσατε ἄκακοι πανουργίαν (Prov 8:5). Moreover, the ἄκακος might suffer from measures of “education”, “discipline” (παιδεία) that cannot be hidden from other people (Prov 15:10; the LXX diverges considerably from the MT). Conversely, the lack of experience and knowledge could have serious consequences: The ἄκακος is inclined to believe every word (ἄκακος πιστεύει παντὶ λόγῳ Prov 14:15, → 1. [Plutarch, *Rect. rat. aud.* 41A]). On the other hand, the ἄκακος does not lack moral guidance if he or she holds on δικαιοσύνη (Prov 1:22). Similarly, δικαιοσύνη is said to guard the ἄκακοι whereas ἀμαρτία makes the impious worthless (Prov 13:6; see Wis 4:12 for an analogous idea: ῥεμβασμὸς ἐπιθυμίας μεταλλεῦει νοῦν ἄκακον “roving desire undermines an innocent mind” [NETS]). Finally, observing that the intemperate is punished, the ἄκακος is able to become wiser (Prov 21:11). It can therefore be concluded that in the book of Proverbs the adjective ἄκακος has a quite ambiguous meaning. With the exception of Prov 2:21, it refers to a person who lacks experience and knowledge. In the worst case, he or she has to bear the consequences of being ἄκακος. However, this does not mean that the destiny of an ἄκακος is sealed for ever. On the contrary, as a matter of principle the ἄκακοι are considered capable of learning. Moreover, allowing themselves to be guided by virtues such as δικαιοσύνη, the ἄκακοι are able of leading a life that does not plunge them into ruin (Prov 2:21 LXX).

The Psalms of Solomon underline the idea that the ἄκακος is liable to be influenced, namely by hypocrites (Ps Sol 4:22) or transgressors of the Law (Ps Sol 12:4).

On the other hand, the sinner is said to proceed “as though innocent (ὡς ἄκακος)” (Ps Sol 4:5).

A difficult example is the comparison in Jer 11:19: ὡς ἀρνίον ἄκακον. Does the adjective allude to the innocence of the lamb because it is “not suspecting that it was being led to its death” (SPICQ, *TLNT* 1, 54)? This interpretation cannot be ruled out entirely. However, if the focus of the comparison is on the unjust suffering of the prophet Jeremiah, who endures persecution, then the adjective ἄκακον might allude to innocence: Both the prophet and the lamb are doomed to die even though they are innocent (cf. WALSER, *Jeremiah*, 267).

4. Jewish literature in Greek. The adjective is only attested in the works of Philo where it occurs eight times, e.g. in connection with youth in the phrase ἄκακος ἡλικία “innocent age” (*Legat.* 234; *Virt.* 43, *Flacc.* 68 [of children as victims of the anti-Jewish pogroms in Alexandria in the year 38 C.E.]), in the description of Joseph as a young man of guileless character who recounts his dream to his brothers (*Jos.* 6; cf. Gen 37:7), and finally in the characterization of the serpent who by means of “the most innocent manners” (ἀκακωτάτοις ἤθεσι) seduces the woman (*Agr.* 96).

5. New Testament. The pejorative meaning of ἄκακος can be found in Rom 16:18, where Paul warns against opponents, perhaps missionaries, who “by smooth talk and flattery deceive the hearts of the simple-minded” (διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἐξαπατῶσιν τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων), i.e. credulous people (→ 1. [Plutarch, *Rect. rat. aud.* 41A]). By contrast, the positive meaning of ἄκακος appears in Heb 7:26 with reference to Christ as the heavenly High Priest. The word is part of an enumeration of adjectives describing his blamelessness: ὁσιος ἄκακος ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν “holy, blameless, undefiled, separated from sinners” (NRSV).

6. Early Christian literature. The adjective ἄκακος appears in parenetic contexts as

a virtue for which to strive. Thus, the *Didache* exhorts its addressee, “be long-suffering, and merciful, and guileless” (*Did.* 3.8: γίνου μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλεήμων καὶ ἄκακος). Likewise, the *Shepherd of Hermas* recommends a childlike innocence in order to avoid iniquity (*Herm. Mand.* 2.1: Ἀπλότητα ἔχε καὶ ἄκακος γίνου καὶ ἔση ὡς τὰ νήπια τὰ μὴ γινώσκοντα τὴν πονηρίαν τὴν ἀπολλύουσαν τὴν ζωὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων “be simple and innocent, and you will be as the children who do not know the wickedness that ruins the life of men”); see also *Herm. Mand.* 2.7. In *Diogn.* 9.2, however, the adjective is used in a pun that refers to Jesus Christ: God has given his son as a ransom for mankind, “the blameless one for the wicked (τὸν ἄκακον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν)”.

ἀκακία

1. Greek literature. In general, the noun ἀκακία is rare. The idea that young peoples’ ἀκακία might lead to error (→ ἄκακος 1.) results from Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*. In a long section about characters (τὰ ἤθη) of humans, Aristotle deals with the characters of young people (*Rhet.* 1389a2–b13), including their strengths and weaknesses. According to him, one of their false assumptions is based on their own ἀκακία: Young people are wont to think that sufferings of other people are unmerited (*Rhet.* 1389b9–10; for the two ways the phrase can be interpreted see GRIMALDI, *Aristotle, Rhetoric II*, 200).

Several texts stress the link between ἀκακία and lack of experience which can lead one to commit serious errors, or to put oneself in danger. Thus, the alleged or real inexperience of a person is supposed to explain his or her faults. This is the case e.g. in Ps.-Demosthenes, *Against Neaera*, where a certain Theogenes defends himself in a lawsuit. The central point of the issue is the question of whether Theogenes had known about the real identity of his future wife, with whom he had performed the sacred

expected: “judge me, O Lord, according to my δικαιοσύνη and according to the ἀκακία that is in me” (Ps 7:9), “but you have upheld me because of my ἀκακία” (Ps 40[41]:13).

This idea of reward is clothed in the form of a macarism in Ps Sol 4:23: Μακάριοι οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον ἐν ἀκακία αὐτῶν “Happy are those who fear the Lord in their innocence”. The macarism is followed by the promise that the Lord will save his righteous. Unlike the canonical Psalms, Ps Sol 8:23 uses the phrase ἐν ἀκακία in a comparison: God’s faithful are like innocent lambs (ὡς ἀρνία ἐν ἀκακία – cf. the similar expression in Jer 11:19: ὡς ἀρνίον ἄκακον, → ἄκακος 3.) in the midst of the nations of the earth.

The book of Job corroborates the idea that ἀκακία denotes the integrity of humans that God is expected to take into consideration. In Job 2:3, God himself characterizes Job by a series of adjectives beginning with ἄκακος: ἄκακος ἀληθινός ἄμεμπτος θεοσεβής ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ “an innocent, genuine, blameless, religious man, staying away from all wrong” (NETS). The series is concluded by the phrase ἔτι δὲ ἔχεται ἀκακίας “and he still maintains his innocence” (NETS). Therefore, it is apparently the concept of ἀκακία by which Job’s virtues are summarized. Ironically, his friend Eliphaz asks him if his ἀκακία is not based on folly (Job 4:6). In one of his replies, Job, however, is determined not to relinquish his ἀκακία, but to hold fast to his δικαιοσύνη (Job 27:5–6). Finally, Job is convinced that God knows his ἀκακία (Job 31:6). Once again, one cannot but conclude that the noun ἀκακία denotes the human quality of integrity, particularly in relationship with God. On the other hand, there is no evidence in the respective contexts that ἀκακία carries the connotation “guilelessness” or “simplicity”.

4. Jewish literature in Greek. The noun occurs twice in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and six times in the works of Philo.

The phrase ἐν ἀκακία, combined with the verb πορεύομαι (→ 2.c), is employed in a parenthetic context in *T. Iss.* 5.1: φυλάξατε οὖν νόμον θεοῦ, τέκνα μου, καὶ τὴν ἀπλότητα κτήσασθε, καὶ ἐν ἀκακία πορεύεσθε “Keep, therefore, the law of God, my children, acquire simplicity and walk in innocence”. Conversely, abandoning the attitude of ἀκακία leads to wickedness (κακουργία, see *T. Iss.* 6.1).

In the works of Philo, ἀκακία has a two-fold meaning. In line with LXX use, he considers it a desirable human quality, like truth and moderation (*Virt.* 195). In *Opif.* 156, Philo holds that the Fall of Man is as a transition from original ἀκακία and ἀπλότης “simplicity” to the condition of πανουργία, here probably in the sense of craftiness (see also *Opif.* 170; for the use of this terminology in myths of the origin of mankind, → ἄκακος 1. [Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 5.66.3–4]). Nonetheless, the negative meaning of ἀκακία is not unknown to Philo: In *Ebr.* 6, he argues that certain vices are due to a lack of knowledge (ἄγνοια). As for nakedness (Gen 9:21), he maintains that it is caused by ἀκακία καὶ ἀφέλεια ἡθῶν “innocence and simplicity of manners”.

5. New Testament and early Christian literature. The noun is not attested in the NT but occurs once in a quotation of Ps 36 [37]:37 in *1 Clem.* 14.5 and seven times in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, where ἀκακία is considered a kind of virtue. Thus, Hermas himself is called “full of all simplicity and of great innocence” (*Herm. Vis.* 1.2.4: πλήρης πάσης ἀπλότητος καὶ ἀκακίας μεγάλης). One of the symbolic female figures appearing in the visions is Ἀκακία who represents one of the Christian virtues supposed to be necessary for entering into the kingdom of God (*Herm. Vis.* 3.8.5, 7; *Herm. Sim.* 9.15.2; as a non-personified virtue *Herm. Vis.* 3.9.1; *Herm. Sim.* 9.29.3). Finally, the LXX idea of “walking in innocence” appears in *Herm. Vis.* 2.3.2 (πορευομένους ἐν ἀκακία καὶ ἀπλότητι).

Bibliography:

W. GRUNDMANN, “ἀκακος”, *TWNT* 3 (1938), 483. ♦ C. SPICQ, “ἀκακος”, *TLNT* 1 (1994), 53–55.

E. BONS, “Ἀκακία and ἀκακος: Considerations on a Septuagint term for ‘innocence’”, *Die Septuaginta – Orte und Intentionen*, ed. S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser, M. Sigismund (WUNT 361),

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 491–501. ♦ W. M. A. GRIMALDI, *Aristotle, Rhetoric II: A Commentary*, New York: Fordham University Press, 1988. ♦ C. LUZ, *Technopaignia: Formspiele in der griechischen Dichtung* (Mn.S 324), Leiden: Brill, 2010, 280–285. ♦ T. REINACH, “Inscriptions d’Asie Mineure”, *REG* 5 (1892), 409–414.

EBERHARD BONS

ἀποστέλλω, ἀποστολή, ἀπόστολος, ἀνταποστέλλω, ἐπαποστέλλω, ἐξαποστέλλω, ἐξαποστολή, συναποστέλλω

The verb ἀποστέλλω, two derivatives ἀποστολή, ἀπόστολος, four compounds (which, in fact, are double compounds) ἀντ-, ἐπ-, συν-, and especially ἐξαποστέλλω with the derivative ἐξαποστολή are found in the LXX.

ἀποστέλλω

1. Greek literature. The first three parts of this section are dedicated to the three different nuances that the verb ἀποστέλλω conveys in classical Greek: (a) to make or to let somebody or something go away, (b) to bring someone to another place, (c) to dispatch someone for a specific purpose. In the fourth part (d), the usage of this verb with god as subject is briefly described.

a) *To make or to let somebody or something go away.* The first nuance is due to the fact that the verb is composed of στέλλω, suggesting the notion of sending, and of the prefix ἀπο-, always conveying the idea of distance or separation (CHANTRAINE): to disband an army (Euripides, *Phoen.* 485), to send far away from one's country (*Cycl.* 468), to dismiss a guest (*Hel.* 1280), to banish (*Med.* 934), to expel (Sophocles, *El.* 71; Plato, *Resp.* 607b) or to release prisoners (Xenophon, *Hell.* 5.1.23). The object can also be impersonal: the sea is pushed back (Thucydides, *Hist.* 3.89.5), clothes are removed (Aristophanes, *Lys.* 1084), missiles are released (Philo Mechanicus, *Bel.* 5 [p. 51, 12–13 Thevenot]), light or particles are emitted (Euclid, *Opt.* 22; Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. philos.* 10.52), or shadows are cast (Theon of Alexandria, *Comm. Alm.* 1.5, p. 413, 19 Rome).

b) *To bring someone to another place.* Another nuance is to bring somebody from one place to another, especially as a prisoner (Herodotus, *Hist.* 4.164) or as a hostage (Isocrates, *Hel. enc.* 27; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 4.77.4).

c) *To dispatch someone for a specific purpose.* Finally, the meaning that will prevail is for a superior to dispatch one or more subordinates (e.g. ὁ ἀποστειλας ἢ ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος, Demosthenes, *Cor.* 74). Thus, Thucydides uses this verb to express all kinds of military dispatches (*Hist.* 1.45.1; 3.49.2; 7.58.3; 8.5.3), diplomatic missions (*Hist.* 1.91.3; 3.28.1; 4.15.2), or appointments of governors or commanders (*Hist.* 1.129.1; 7.2.2). Furthermore, various kinds of mission can be expressed by ἀποστέλλω: to scout (Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.152; Sophocles, *Phil.* 125), to found a colony (Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.123; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1306b31), to consult an oracle (Sophocles, *El.* 669; Plutarch, *Rom.* 28.6), to rebuild the wall of a city (Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.8.9), to engage in commerce (Demosthenes, *Dionys.* 7), to represent a powerful person (Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.53) or a city (Herodotus, *Hist.* 5.85) and to speak on their behalf (Demosthenes, *Cor.* 135; Aeschines, *Tim.* 21). The expression of dispatching people to send money (Thucydides, *Hist.* 6.93.4), or offerings for a temple (Herodotus, *Hist.* 4.33), later becomes the simple expression of sending money (Demosthenes, *Dionys.* 8; Aristotle, *Oec.* 1351b24) or offerings (Plutarch, *Cam.* 8.3; *Marc.* 8.11) and then books or letters (Hippocrates, *Ep.* 7; 18), without mention of the person commissioned for this purpose.

d) *With God as subject.* Sometimes the subject of ἀποστέλλω is a god (see SCHWEIZER, “Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund”, 83–85). Gods expelled justice and goodness from earth (Sophocles, *Phil.* 450). Zeus asks Heracles to go and obey Eurystheus (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 4.10.7). He also sends a spokesperson (Heraclitus, *All.* 61.1, Cornutus, *Nat. deor.* 20). Epictetus presents the cynic philosophers as having been sent by a god to announce a message (*Diss.* 3.22.23).

2. Papyri and inscriptions. Owing to the structure of their kingdoms, the Diadochi govern a political system in which ἀποστέλλω is of great importance. Kings send copies of laws (*P.Rev.* 37.6, 259/258 B.C.E, Arsinoites [?]), and dispatch troops (*OGIS* 45.5–6, 266/262 B.C.E., Itanus) or messengers (e.g. ἀπεσταλμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως, *P.Hal.* 1.124, 147, 154, 259 B.C.E, Apollonopolites, see also BERNAND, *Pan du désert*, 256). In economic contexts, merchants send off for different types of goods (*O.Douch* 5.630.5–6, 12, 18, 4th cent. C.E., Kysis, Oasis Magna); *P.Lond.* 7.1941.11, 257 B.C.E, Alexandria; *P.Lond.* 7.2057.8, 261/229 B.C.E, Philadelphia), slaves (*P.Lond.* 7.2007.22, 248 B.C.E [?], Philadelphia [?]) or money (*P.Lond.* 7.2007.12; *P.Oxy.* 4.744.3, 1 B.C.E, Alexandria). Employees are dispatched to escort deliveries (*P.Lond.* 7.1982.2, 252 B.C.E., Memphis; *P.Sorb.* 1.22.2, 250 B.C.E., Arsinoites) and to send receipts in return (*P.Lille* 1.13.4, 243 B.C.E., *P.Lille* 1.17.3–17, 250/238 B.C.E., Ghoran, Arsinoites). Inspectors are appointed to check prices (*P.Lille* 1.3.56, 216/215 B.C.E., Magdola, Arsinoites). To combat fraud, the tax administration of the Ptolemaic kingdom sends for copies of accounts (*P.Rev.* 18.6; 51.22, 259/258 B.C.E; *P.Sorb.* 1.18.1, 256/250 B.C.E., Arsinoites [?]). The verb ἀποστέλλω also becomes a legal term to designate the presentation of a person to a judge (*P.Hib.* 1.60.6, 245 B.C.E., Oxyrhynchites; *P.Lille* 2.1.15; *CPJ* 37.9–10, 222 B.C.E., Magdola, Arsinoites). Furthermore, it

sometimes means “to divorce” (INSTONE-BREWER, “1 Corinthians 7”, 116). In the Hellenistic Age, ἀποστέλλω appears in a religious context: People are dispatched in order to handle religious matters in distant cities (see OSTER, “Holy days”, 81).

3. Septuagint. a) *The close relationship between ἀποστέλλω and compounds and šālah.* A quick glance at the statistics shows that the verb appears about 690 times, mainly corresponding to šālah “to send” (about 675 times). The close relationship between ἀποστέλλω and compounds and šālah is due to their large common semantic field. Indeed, many uses of šālah are similar to those of ἀποστέλλω in classical Greek (→ 1.), and in papyri and inscriptions (→ 2.): Jacob offers a gift to his brother (Gen 32:19), Joseph sends goods to Jacob (Gen 45:23), Moses dispatches scouts (Num 13:2), messengers are sent to speak with a king (Deut 2:26), Joshua dispatches troops (Josh 8:3), Israel pays a tribute to Moab (Judg 3:15), Abraham sends away Hagar (Gen 21:14), arrows are released (Ps 17[18]:15; 143[144]:6). Texts originally written in Greek or with no original Semitic extant, especially 1 Maccabees, use ἀποστέλλω in the same way: to dispatch troops (1 Macc 3:39), scouts (1 Macc 12:26), a diplomatic delegation (1 Macc 8:17), a maid (Tob 8:12), a copy of a decree (1 Macc 8:22), a gift (1 Macc 10:20, 89; 2 Macc 4:20), money (Bar 1:10), books (Bar 1:14), or letters (1 Macc 1:44; 10:17; 12:7).

b) *Translating to extend one’s hand: a theological issue.* However, the correspondence between ἀποστέλλω and compounds and šālah is not systematic. Indeed, as šālah qal basically means “to set someone or something in motion towards a goal” (DAHMEN, *TDOT* 15, 59), it does not express the idea of separation, as ἀποστέλλω does. For this, šālah needs the preposition *min* (Gen 37:14) or a specific usage of the Hebrew stem *pi’el* (Gen 3:23; 8:8; Exod 11:1, see DAHMEN, *TDOT* 15, 69–70). The object or the person who is sent remains linked to the sender (DAHMEN, *TDOT* 15, 50) as expressions

such as *šālah yād* “to extend one’s hand” clearly imply (Exod 3:20). Accordingly, about one eighth of the occurrences of the Hebrew verb correspond to a verb other than ἀποστέλλω and compounds. In many cases, they belong to the same semantic field as ἀποστέλλω, such as ἀπελαύνω “to expel”, βάλλω “to throw”, φέρω “to bring”, or all the occurrences of πέμπω and compounds (→ 3.d). Nevertheless, *šālah yād* is mainly translated by expressions such as ἐκτείνω χεῖρα (“to extend one’s hand”, e.g. Gen 14:22; Exod 4:4) or by a single verb such as χειρόω (“to lay a hand on someone”, i.e. to attack someone, Job 30:24). Similar translations can be found for expressions such as “to extend one’s foot” (e.g. Judg 5:15), “a firmly seized scepter” (3 Kgdms [1Kgs] 14:27) or “a vine shoot” (Ps 79 [80]:12). The translation of *šālah yād* by ἀποστέλλω τὴν χεῖρα is a Hebraism in Cant 5:4. Elsewhere (Exod 9:15; Job 1:11; 2:5; Ps 143[144]:7 with ἐξαποστέλλω), the use of ἀποστέλλω τὴν χεῖρα corresponds to a theological usage as it occurs only when God is the subject, then presenting the hand of God as a demonstration of His strength and weakening the anthropomorphism. Furthermore, God is often the subject of *šālah* and ἀποστέλλω. God is presented as sending blessings (Lev 25:21), calamities (Exod 15:7; Num 21:6; Ep Jer 61), angels (Exod 23:20; 2 Macc 11:6; 15:2, 23), stars (Ep Jer 59) or various gifts (light, Bar 3:33; food, Bel 37; praise, Sir 15:9; dreams, Sir 34:6). This theological nuance mainly corresponds to that of *šālah* pi. and hi. However, this significance also occurs frequently in the passages where ἀποστέλλω does not correspond to *šālah* (e.g. Exod 15:10; Lev 25:21; Deut 28:8; 29:22[21]; Ezek 34:26) and is attested in texts written originally in Greek (e.g. Wis 12:8; 16:18). It can also be rendered by ἐξαποστέλλω (→ ἐξαποστέλλω) and by ἐπαποστέλλω (→ ἐπαποστέλλω).

c) *Possible Hebraisms and Hebraistic phraseology.* Due to the close relationship between ἀποστέλλω and *šālah*, Hebraistic

phraseology is sometimes encountered (COLLINS, *NIDOTTE* 4, 121): to send fire (always with God as subject, e.g. Amos 1:4; Hos 8:14), to send a place into fire (Judg 20:48; 4 Kgdms [2 Kgs] 8:12; cf. Judg 1:8; Ps 73[74]), and to send away a pain (Job 39:3).

Furthermore, it also occurs with the juxtaposition of ἀποστέλλω and another verb with καί (Deut 19:12; Judg 4:6; 1 Macc 7:19). This pattern, unknown to extra-biblical Greek, is the literal translation of a usual association of *šālah* with another verb (COLLINS, *NIDOTTE* 4, 119) so as to express “to send (someone) in order to do something”. Three other patterns are used in the LXX: (1) the use of a participle of ἀποστέλλω followed by a conjugated verb, especially to express “to send someone on a mission to fetch another person” (Gen 27:45; Exod 9:27), which otherwise is found in ancient Greek with πέμπω (Xenophon, *Cyr.* 3.1.6; Appian, *Bell. civ.* 5.9.77). (2) The use of ἀποστέλλω followed by a present participle (especially with λέγω, Num 22:10; Josh 10:3; Gen 38:25). This usage may have rarely occurred in ancient Greek (see MAYSER, *Grammatik*, 2.1, 351) where this construction usually requires a future participle (e.g. Isocrates, *Panath.* 180; see MAYSER, *Grammatik*, 2.3, 64, and MANDILARAS, *Verb*, § 915–916). (3) The classical pattern, i.e. ἀποστέλλω followed by an infinitive (Gen 32:6; Num 22:37, to be compared to Herodotus, *Hist.* 4.44) corresponds to a Hebrew usage (COLLINS, *NIDOTTE* 4, 119). In all of these patterns, the person sent is rarely mentioned and ἀποστέλλω is employed without any object (Gen 38:25; 41:8; 45:27; Josh 2:3, etc.), which is never the case in classical Greek (with one exception, Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 4.10.7, where Hercules, who is sent by Zeus, is nonetheless explicitly named just before).

d) *Relationship with πέμπω.* Finally, little shall be said here about the relationship between πέμπω and ἀποστέλλω. In fact, πέμπω occurs rarely in the LXX, about fifty times including compounds (to be compared with

approximately one thousand occurrences of ἀποστέλλω and compounds) and mainly in recent texts such as 2 Maccabees (see LEE, “Ἐξαποστέλλω”, 104). In theory, the two verbs πέμπω and ἀποστέλλω are different, as the former does not convey the nuance of distance and is used to signify sending someone or something with an escort (CHANTRAINE; see also VON EICKEN/LINDNER, *NIDNTT* 1, 127, for whom these differences are the reason of the rarity of πέμπω). In practice, each author has his own way of using both of these verbs, sometimes inconsistently (cf. SPICQ, *TLNT* 1, 186 n. 2). The two verbs as well as their derivatives are often completely interchangeable in classical Greek and in the LXX (e.g. Thucydides, *Hist.* 2.85.3–4, Wis 9:10). The idea that the Gospel of John has a different theological usage for each (RADEMAKERS, “Mission”) is not widely accepted (SEYNAVE, “Les verbes”, and TARELLI “Johannine Synonyms”). Thus, what will be said below about the use of the compounds ἔξαποστέλλω and ἐπαποστέλλω in the LXX is mainly valid for ἐκπέμπω (e.g. Gen 24:54, 56, 59; Prov 17:11; Bar 4:23) and ἐπιπέμπω (Prov 6:19, Wis 11:17; 3 Macc 6).

4. Jewish literature in Greek. The verb ἀποστέλλω mainly expresses a mission: to send someone to arrest another person (*Asc. Isa.* 3.12), to announce a message (*Jos. Asen.* 23.2; 24.2) or to offer a diplomatic gift (*Ep. Arist.* 42). God is frequently the subject. He sends death (*T. Abr.* A.18.3) but also angels (*4 Bar.* 6.22; *3 Bar.* 4.15; *T. Levi* 5.3). Apart from quoting and interpreting the LXX (Num 21:6 in *Leg. all.* 2.77, Exod 23:20 in *Agr.* 51 and *Migr.* 176), Philo expresses the emission of light (*Conf.* 8; *Post.* 57) or other emissions (*Fug.* 180; *Conf.* 65). In Josephus, ἀποστέλλω is mainly used in the same way as Greek historians would have used it (*Ant.* 12.401; 18.1; 19.292; 20.37).

5. New Testament. Jesus is often the subject of ἀποστέλλω. He is the one who expels demons (Matt 8:31; Mark 5:10), sends the Twelve (Matt 10:5; Mark 3:14), disciples

(Mark 11:1 par.), and apostles (Mark 6:7 par.). That Jesus is sent is said in a few verses of the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 10:40; 18:27; Mark 9:37; Luke 9:48; 10:16) and more frequently in the Johannine corpus where this sending is a characteristic of the relationship between God and Jesus (with both ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω, see SEYNAVE, “Les verbes”). In Jesus’ parables, a master sends off a worker or a servant (Matt 20:2; Mark 12:2–6 par.). The strange collocation ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, literally “he sends the sickle”, could be either a “Septuagintism”, that is to say an allusion to Joel 4[3]:13 (→ ἔξαποστέλλω 2.) – which is rejected by STUHLMANN, “Beobachtungen”, 161–162 – or a presentation of the sickle as a divine power (see also Rev 14:15, 18 with πέμπω), as God is here the subject (→ 3.b). Another significant usage of the verb is to express a group sending an emissary to Jesus for answers to difficult questions (Mark 12:13 par.). Elsewhere, Acts mainly uses ἀποστέλλω to describe the mission entrusted by the community to somebody (Acts 8:14; 9:38; 10:8). In the Pauline corpus, people are sent by God (Rom 10:15; 1 Cor 1:17) or by Paul (2 Cor 12:17; 2 Tim 4:12). In the remaining texts, God is the sender of angels (Heb 1:14; Rev 1:1; 22:6) and spirits (Heb 1:14; 1 Pet 1:12; Rev 5:6).

6. Early Christian literature. God sends the Word (*Diogn.* 7.2; 11.3), his Son (*Diogn.* 10.2) or angels (*Herm. Mand.* 12.6.1). A community can also send envoys (*Ign. Smyrn.* 12.1). However, unlike ἀπόστολος, ἀποστέλλω can also have profane meanings (*1 Clem.* 65.1; *Barn.* 3.3).

ἀποστολή

1. Greek literature. As the *nomen actionis* of ἀποστέλλω, the noun has no specific significance: the leaving of a guest (Plato, *Ep.* 1, 309c; Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1123a3), the dispatching of a fleet (Thucydides, *Hist.* 8.8.1; 8.9.3), the commissioning of an embassy (Polybius, *Hist.* 14.2.13; 25.4.1).

2. Papyri and inscriptions. In addition to classical usage such as dispatch (*P.Oxy.* 9.1190.12, 347 C.E., Oxyrhynchus; *PSI* 5.502.24, 257 B.C.E., Philadelphia, Arsinoites), it also means what is sent: goods (*PSI* 15.1569r.2, 6th cent. C.E., Antinoopolis [?]) or gifts (to a temple, *P.Fay.* 118.13, 110 C.E., Euhemeria, Arsinoites), or the mission for which an appointee is dispatched (*SEG* 9.1119.16, 2nd cent., Kos).

3. Septuagint. The noun ἀποστολή occurs 11 times with different meanings. In 1 Esdr 9:51, 54 it signifies the dispatch of goods (to be compared to 2 Esdr 18:10, 12). The LXX also uses this term for a gift (3 Kgdms 5:14b, for a daughter to be married; 1 Macc 2:18; 2 Macc 3:2). This last usage is similar to *P.Fay.* 118 (→ 2.). Therefore, it is not a Hebraism (*pace* GEHMAN, “Adventures”, 107). Apart from these usages, ἀποστολή corresponds to the absolute infinitive of *šālah* (Deut 22:7) as well as to Hebrew words which derive from the same root: the nouns *šēlah* “sprout” (Cant 4:13, see PRIJS, *Jüdische Tradition*, 39) and *mišlahat* “discharge” or “deputation” (Eccl 8:8; Ps 77[78]:49). Finally, in Jer 39[32]:36, it corresponds to Hebrew *dābār* “plague”. This could be a mistranslation (SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon*) but two meanings have been suggested: “exile” (LSJ.RS; this option can be supported by the use of ἐξαποστολή in 3 Macc 4:4, → ἐξαποστολή), or “plague (sent by God)” (SCHLEUSNER, *Novus thesaurus*) like Ps 77[78]:49 (TOV, *The Septuagint Translation*, 132, n. 18). In fact, this translation remains unclear (TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 30). Bar 2:25 uses ἀποστολή as Jer 39[32]:36 though it is not a direct quotation from Jeremiah.

4. Jewish literature in Greek. The noun is rarely used, meaning: “mission” (*T. Naph.* 2.1), “embassy” (*Ep. Arist.* 15), “expedition” or “departure” (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.146; 20.5). Philo uses it when he quotes the LXX and also to explain the etymology of the name Methuselah (*Post.* 73; *Gig.* 17).

5. New Testament and early Christian literature. In the New Testament, the noun occurs 4 times, meaning the apostolate (Acts 1:25; Rom 1:5; 1 Cor 9:2; Gal 2:8). This meaning is not attested in the LXX and is related to the NT usage of ἀπόστολος (→ ἀπόστολος) but could also point back to papyri (→ 2.). Apart from one non-canonical text (*Act. Jo.* 112), Origen is the first Christian author to reuse this word (e.g. *Comm. Jo.* 2.29.178).

ἀπόστολος

The word ἀπόστολος is a *hapax legomenon* of the LXX, occurring only in 3 Kgdms[1 Kgs] 14:6 in a passage not present in the Codex Vaticanus and therefore believed to be a later addition to LXX possibly from Aquila (RENGSTORF, *TDNT* 1, 413–414). The word ἀπόστολος corresponds to *šālūah*. This participle of *šālah* has been understood as a substantive “the one who is sent” and accordingly translated with a substantive derived from ἀποστέλλω. Apart from 3 Kgdms[1 Kgs] 14:6, the word is attested once in Symmachus (Isa 18:2^{Sym}, corresponding to the MT *šir* “messenger” but also forming a paronomasia with ἀποστέλλω, and once in Josephus (*Ant.* 17.300). This meaning of “envoy”, which is the main usage in the NT, is attested infrequently (SPICQ, *TLNT*) in Greek literature (Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.21) where the meaning “expedition” is more usual (Demosthenes, *I Philipp.* 35; as for Josephus, *Ant.* 1.146, poorly attested however, cf. SPICQ, *TLNT*). As to the importance of this word in the NT, dictionaries such as *TDNT*, *EDNT*, *NIDNTT*, *TLNT* are to be referred to.

ἀνταποστέλλω

This double compound occurs only once before Polybius (Aeneas Tacticus, *Poliorc.* 31.9 ter) where it means to send backward

and forward (see also Josephus, *Ap.* 1.111). Polybius uses it to mean dispatch in exchange (*Hist.* 21.43.22). It can be used also to express the dispatch of someone or something already sent (the light reflected, Plutarch, *Mulier. virt.* 248C, or the return of a messenger, *P.Lond.* 7.2005.2–3 – however reconstructed). This is the meaning conveyed in the LXX where the verb is attested in 3 Kgdms 21:10 [1 Kgs 20:10] corresponding to *šālah* (however, some witnesses give ἀποστέλλω, see Ra and LXX Brooke/McLean).

ἐπαποστέλλω

The prefix ἐπι- could mean the notion of going toward, it conveys also the notion of accumulation (so to send in addition, cf. *PSI* 537.11, 247 B.C.E., Philadelphia) or of hostility. Polybius uses ἐπαποστέλλω to express the idea of sending someone after somebody else in order to supersede him (*Hist.* 6.15.6) or to attack (*Hist.* 32.5.11) as a synonym for ἀποστέλλω ἐπί (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 11.78.4). The verb ἐπαποστέλλω occurs 10 times in the LXX, always with God sending a hostile power (e.g. Exod 8:17; Deut 28:48; Job 20:23; Wis 11:15). The Hebrew *šālah* hi. shares this semantic field (COLLINS, *NIDOTTE* 4, 121). However, ἐπαποστέλλω also corresponds to the idiom *šālah* pi. followed by the preposition *bē*. (DAHMEN, *TDOT* 15, 67). The prefix ἐπι- is then due to the Hebrew preposition and conveys the notion of hostility. Thus, the verb ἐπαποστέλλω means “to let something loose upon someone”. The same meaning is conveyed by the *nomen actionis* ἐπαποστολή in Ps 77[78]:49^{Sym} used instead of ἀποστολή (cf. also *SEG* 53.1110.8–9).

ἐξαποστέλλω

1. Greek literature, papyri and inscriptions. Absent from classical literature, the

verb appears at the beginning of Hellenistic Age (Demosthenes, *Cor.* 77), it becomes common with Polybius (see DE FOUCAULT, *Recherches*, 29) but declines thereafter due to the development of Atticism. Therefore, Polybius uses it more often than ἀποστέλλω, Diodorus Siculus less and Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch almost ignore it. This evolution also occurs in inscriptions and papyri (LEE, “Ἐξαποστέλλω”, 99–103; see also GLASER, *De ratione*, 33–34).

The prefix ἐκ- probably intensifies ἀποστέλλω (BÜHNER, *EDNT* 2, 2) and does not mean (according to RENGSTORF, *TDNT* 1, 406, *pace* ZAHN, *Galater*, 200–201) that the person sent was originally in the presence of the sender. As a matter of fact, ἐξαποστέλλω is actually interchangeable with ἀποστέλλω (→ ἀποστέλλω 1.–2.) to expel (Polybius, *Hist.* 4.84.3), to dispatch forces (*OGIS* 90.A.20, 196 B.C.E., Bolbitine [Rosetta]), to deliver goods (*P.Lond.* 7.2188.14, 92, 148 B.C.E., Hermonthis), to release prisoners (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 5.84.1), to present a person to a judge (e.g. *P.Tebt.* 1.22.18, 112 B.C.E., Kerkeosiris, Arsinoites, see SEMEKA, *Ptolemäisches Prozeßrecht*, 247, and MM, 222), to discharge a missile (Heron Mechanicus, *Bel.* 3), to divorce (INSTONE-BREWER, “1 Corinthians 7”, 116). A deity can also be the subject of this verb: a cloud was sent by Zeus to deceive Ixion (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 4.69.5). Josephus tells of a pagan who asserted that a god had sent a bird as an omen (*Ant.* 18.201).

2. Septuagint. The verb appears about 285 times mainly corresponding to *šālah* pi. In this case, it usually conveys the notion of dismissal, release (→ ἀποστέλλω 3., e.g. the scapegoat, Lev 16:21–22) and particularly divorce (e.g. Deut 24:1, 3), corresponding to papyri usage (see INSTONE-BREWER, “1 Corinthians 7”, 116), but also according to the Hebrew meaning of *šālah* pi. (see COLLINS, *NIDOTTE* 4, 120) with more nuances than in the classical and Hellenistic Greek (LEE, *Pentateuch*, 94). It rarely corresponds to verbs other than *šālah* (e.g. translating *yā-*

šā' hi., 4 Kgdms[2 Kgs] 11:12 or *gāraš*, Gen 45:1) and can convey the notion of exodus (Exod 6:13; 21:2) and expulsion (Gen 3:23). Nevertheless, as in Hellenistic Literature, ἐξαποστέλλω is also used as a synonym of ἀποστέλλω and conveys its entire semantic field. As a matter of fact, each book has its own preference concerning the use of ἐξαποστέλλω. The Pentateuch uses ἀποστέλλω slightly more than ἐξαποστέλλω. Judges, Psalms and the Twelve Prophets use ἐξαποστέλλω more often, whereas Proverbs, 2 Esdras and Chronicles almost ignore the latter. It is not easy to determine whether the occurrence of ἐξαποστέλλω in a particular book is typical of the time when the translation was done (stylistic preference of ἐξαποστέλλω, see LEE, “Ἐξαποστέλλω”, 104–105) or was due to the translation technique used by the translator (translation of *šālah* qal by ἀποστέλλω and *šālah* pi. by ἐξαποστέλλω).

The formulation ἐξαποστείλατε δρέπανα, literally “send the sickles”, in Joel 4[3]:13 is probably not a Hebraism, as the sickles could here be a metaphor for the spears of an army (see Mic 4:3; Joel 4[3]:10; Isa 2:4). For such a missile the use of ἐξαποστέλλω is classical (→ 1.).

3. Jewish literature in Greek. The verb is a synonym of ἀποστέλλω (4 Bar. 7:8; Jos. Asen. 24:20; Josephus, *Bell.* 7:59). Philo uses it only when quoting and commenting on the LXX (e.g. *Leg. all.* 1:96). In *Cher.* 1–10, he develops an exegesis based on the opposition between the use of ἐξαποστέλλω in Gen 3:23 and ἐκβάλλω in Gen 3:24 (see TAGLIAFERRO, “Nota linguistica filoniana”).

4. New Testament and early Christian literature. In the New Testament, ἐξαποστέλλω occurs only in Luke, Acts (11 times altogether), and Paul (Gal 4:4, 6). It has no specific significance (pace ZAHN, *Galater*, 200–201) and is a “Septuagintism” according to LEE, “Ἐξαποστέλλω”, 105–113). Indeed, the survival of this verb in Christian authors from NT to late antiquity (e.g. Eu-

sebius or John Chrysostom) whereas it totally disappeared in Greek authors of the Roman era (→ 1.), is due to the influence of biblical texts (see LEE, “Ἐξαποστέλλω”, 102–103). In early Christian literature apart from the New Testament, it is used in *Herm. Vis.* 4.2.6 and 2 *Clem.* 20:5 (God sends the Savior). Just as Philo, Justin Martyr only uses the verb when quoting and commenting on the LXX.

ἐξαποστολή

As the *nomen actionis* of ἐξαποστέλλω, the noun ἐξαποστολή has no specific significance. It is first used by Polybius (*Hist.* 4.10.5; 15.25.20) as a synonym of ἀποστολή (→ ἀποστολή 1.) and according to his preference for ἐξαποστέλλω (→ ἐξαποστέλλω 1.). It is a *hapax legomenon* of the LXX (3 Macc 4:4) where it designates “exile” or “expulsion”, according to the specific nuance of ἐξαποστέλλω in the LXX (→ ἐξαποστέλλω 3.) Philo uses it the same way (*Post.* 41, 44).

συναποστέλλω

The verb συναποστέλλω means “to send together” (Thucydides, *Hist.* 6.88.8) or “to join in dispatching” (Xenophon, *Hell.* 5.2.37). In the LXX it is used 3 times (Exod 33:2, 12 corresponding to *šālah*, and 1 Esdr 5:2 with no Hebrew counterpart). *BibAlex* 2, 327, suggests that the translator of Exodus harmonized with συναναβαίνω (Exod 33:3). The usage of 1 Esdr 5:2 is classical: to join cavalry to people who depart. Paul also uses it once to describe a brother sent together with Titus (2 Cor 12:18).

Bibliography:

J.-A. BÜHNER, “ἀποστέλλω κτλ.,” *EDNT* 1 (1990), 141–142. ♦ IDEM, “ἀπόστολος κτλ.,” *EDNT* 1 (1990), 142–146. ♦ C. J. COLLINS, “*šālah*,”

NIDOTTE 4 (1997), 119–123. ♦ U. DAHMEN, “šālah”, *TDOT* 15 (2006), 49–73. ♦ E. VON EICKEN/H. LINDNER, “Apostle”, *NIDNTT* 1 (1976), 126–128. ♦ M. DELCOR/E. JENNI, “šālah”, *TLOT* 3 (1997), 1330–1334. ♦ J. LAMBRECHT, “ἐξαποστέλλω κτλ.”, *EDNT* 2 (1990), 2–3. ♦ K. H. RENGSTORF, “ἀποστέλλω κτλ.”, *TDNT* 1 (1964), 398–447. ♦ C. SPICQ, “ἀπόστολος κτλ.”, *TLNT* 1 (1994), 186–194.

A. BASH, *Ambassadors for Christ. An Exploration of Ambassadorial Language in the New Testament* (WUNT II 92), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997. ♦ A. BERNARD, *Pan du désert*, Leiden: Brill, 1977. ♦ J. A. DE FOUCAULT, *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1972. ♦ O. GLASER, *De ratione, quae intercedit inter sermonem Polybii et eum, qui in titulis saeculi III, II, I apparet*, Giessen: von Münchow, 1894. ♦ G. H. R. HORSLEY, “ἐξαποστέλλω”, *NewDocs* 2 (1982), 82–83. ♦ D. INSTONE-BREWSTER, “1 Corinthians 7 in the Light of the Graeco-Roman Marriage and Divorce Papyri”, *TynB* 51 (2001), 101–116. ♦ A. J. KÖSTENBERGER, “The Two Johannine Verbs for Sending: A Study of John’s Use of Words with Reference to General Linguistic Theory”, *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures* (JSNTSup 168, SNTG 5), ed. S. Porter, D. A. Carson, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999, 125–143. ♦ J. A. L. LEE, “Ἐξαποστέλλω”, *Voces Biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament* (CBET 49), ed. J. Joosten, P. J. Tomson, Leuven: Peeters, 2007, 99–113. ♦ A. S. MARCO, “Πέμπω: per una

ricerca del ‘campo semantico’ nel NT”, *RivB* 40 (1992), 385–419. ♦ T. MURAOKA, “Septuagintal Lexicography: Some General Issues”, *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (SBLSCS 28), ed. T. Muraoka, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1990, 17–47. ♦ R. OSTER, “Holy Days in Honour of Artemis”, *NewDocs* 4 (1987), 74–82. ♦ J. RADEMAKERS, “Mission et apostolat dans l’Évangile Johannique”, *Studia Evangelica* 2 (TU 87), ed. F. L. Cross, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964, 100–121. ♦ E. SCHWEIZER, “Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der ‘Sendungsformel’ Gal 4,4f., Röm 8,3f., Joh 3,16f., 1 Joh 4,9”, *IDEM, Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Zurich: Zwingli, 1970, 83–95. ♦ G. SEMEKA, *Ptolemäisches Prozeßrecht: Studien zur ptolemäischen Gerichtsverfassung und zum Gerichtsverfahren*, Munich: Beck, 1913. ♦ J. SEYNAVE, “Les verbes ἀποστέλλω et πέμπω dans le vocabulaire théologique de Saint Jean”, *L’Évangile de Saint Jean*, ed. M. de Jonge, Gembloux: Duculot, 1977, 385–389. ♦ R. STUHLMANN, “Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zu Markus IV. 26–29”, *NTS* 19 (1972–1973), 153–162. ♦ E. TAGLIAFERRO, “Nota linguistica filoniana (*Cher.* 1–10)”, *Helikon* 18–19 (1978–1979), 415–424. ♦ C. C. TARELLI “Johannine Synonyms”, *JTS* 47 (1946), 175–177. ♦ E. TOV, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch* (HSM 8), Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976. ♦ T. ZAHN, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (KNT 9), 3rd edition, rev. F. Hauck, Leipzig: Deichert, 1922.

PATRICK POUCHELLE

ἄτοπος, ἀτοπία

ἄτοπος

Greek uses various compound words formed with a prefix and τόπος, e.g. ἔκτοπος, ἔντοπος, etc. (cf. CHANTRAINE). To these may be added παρὰ τόπον “in the wrong context” (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Thuc.* 45). Of these words, only ἄτοπος and ἀτοπία are attested in the LXX.

1. Greek literature. Composed of alpha privative and the noun τόπος “place, space”, the adjective ἄτοπος literally means “out of place”. In Greek literature, where the word is frequently attested, the original meaning has acquired a more abstract sense, assuming three principal meanings (cf. e.g. ARNOTT, “Confrontation”, 120–122; DGE): (a) “strange, absurd, rare”; (b) “extraordinary, unusual”; (c) “repugnant, disgusting, wicked”.

(a) In the first sense, ἄτοπος is used with reference to emotions (e.g. Plato, *Phileb.* 49a: ἄτοπον ἡδονῆς καὶ λύπης ὄψεσθαι μείξιν “to see a strange mixture of pleasure and pain”) or to persons who are esteemed to be “strange, bizarre” (with εἰμί, e.g. Isocrates, *Panath.* 149; δοκέω, e.g. Plato, *Resp.* 493c; φαίνομαι, e.g. Plato, *Phaedr.* 230c; Ps.-Plato, *I Alc.* 106a [in both of the quotations, Socrates is qualified respectively by the comparative ἀτοπώτερος and the superlative ἀτοπώτατος]; Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1179a15). In the sense of “strange”, ἄτοπος characterizes human reactions connected with illness (e.g. Hippocrates, *Aph.* 4.52: tears shed involuntarily or not by ill people) as well as other strange events or behaviors: e.g., Socrates does not consider ἄτοπον the possibility of being sentenced to death as a result of false accusation by a wicked man

(Plato, *Gorg.* 521d: οὐδέν γε ἄτοπον εἰ ἀποθάνοιμι;). Likewise, in a discussion about a love relationship that provokes criticism, the person concerned, Sostratos, replies (Menander, *Dysc.* 288): ἄτοπον δέ σοι τι φαίνομαι νυνὶ ποεῖν; “Do I seem to you to be doing something strange [or “wrong”, → c]?” Moreover, ἄτοπος often appears in mathematical and geometrical contexts where it refers, as well as → ἀδύνατος, according to a *reductio ad absurdum*, to logically “impossible” properties and constructions (Euclid, *Elem.* 1.6; Archimedes, *Sph. cyl.* 1.76; cf. MUGLER, *Terminologie géométrique*, s.v.; → 4. [Philo, *Leg. all.* 3.205]).

(b) ἄτοπος in the sense of “extraordinary, unusual” is often found in substantivized form and can indicate a “novelty, originality” (Thucydides, *Hist.* 3.38.5: δοῦλοι τῶν αἰεὶ ἀτόπων “slaves to every novelty”) or what is “uncommon, rare” (Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 3.55: ἄτοπα φαγεῖν “to eat strange food”). Moreover, it occurs in adjectival form referring to something “out of the ordinary, unusual” (Euripides, *Iph. Taur.* 842: ἄτοπον ἡδονάν ἔλαβον “I have found an extraordinary joy”; for ἄτοπον ἡδονήν see also Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1149a15); Aristophanes, *Av.* 276: ἄτοπος ὄρνις “foreign bird” (or “strange bird?”); *Eccl.* 956: ἄτοπος πόθος “uncommon desire”).

(c) In the third meaning, “disgusting, repugnant, evil”, ἄτοπος, used as a euphemistic equivalent of adjectives such as κακός (see ARNOTT, “Confrontation”, 120), refers, e.g., to bad breath of people infected by disease (Thucydides, *Hist.* 2.49.2: πνεῦμα ἄτοπον, → 4. [Philo, *Legat.* 125]). The adjective is also used to indicate something “wrong, improper” (Plato, *Ep.* 7, 333c: καὶ μάλα

ἀτόπω τε καὶ αἰσχρᾶ νίκη “with a victory that was most unfair and shameful”; Polybius, *Hist.* 30.4.11: ἄτοπος ἐφαίνετο καὶ τελέως ἀπίθανος “[a speech that] appeared inappropriate and completely unconvincing”. Finally, in an ethical sense ἄτοπος characterizes persons or their behavior as wicked, illicit (Plutarch, *Adol. poet. aud.* 27F: εἴωθεν ἤθεσι φαύλοις καὶ ἀτόποις πράγμασι λόγους ἐπιγελάωντας καὶ φιλανθρώπους αἰτίας πορίζειν “for, as a fact, he [= Sophocles] is wont to provide for mean characters and unnatural actions alluring words and human reasons”; Plutarch, *Conj. praec.* 145E: ἄτοπα πολλὰ καὶ φαῦλα βουλευμάτα “many wicked and worthless purposes”).

2. Papyri and inscriptions. The adjective ἄτοπος is missing in the extant Hellenistic inscriptions; it is, however, attested several times in Ptolemaic papyri, mostly in the neuter and with *verba faciendi* (e.g. ποιέω, πράσσω, τελέω, → 1. [Menander]). In general, the word qualifies actions as “amiss, improper, harmful” and, consequently, subject to reproach or punishment. In *P.Cair.Zen.* 3.59484 (3rd cent. B.C.E.), a letter of denunciation, the writer states that a dishonest merchant deserves having his hands cut off for his various wicked actions (lines 6–9: ἔτι τούτων ἀτοπώτερα ἀπείργασται ... δίκαιόν ἐστιν τὰς χεῖρας ... αὐτοῦ ἀποκόψαι, for more details see ORRIEUX, *Les Papyrus de Zénon*, 121–122). In *P.Petr.* 2.19 fr. 1A (3rd cent. B.C.E.), the adjective occurs in a petition: In order to be released, a prisoner makes a request to Cleonymus to testify before Mezacus that he has not said anything unsuitable against him (lines 4–6: μηθὲν με εἰρηκέναι σοι καθ’ αὐτοῦ μηδέποτε ἄτοπον). In *P.Cair.Zen.* 3.59482 (3rd cent. B.C.E.), the petitioner, one of Zeno’s farmers, asks his employer to release his wife from prison, appealing to the fact that “no one has ever suffered unrighteous actions from you” (lines 17–19: καὶ οὐθεις διὰ σοῦ οὐθὲν πέποσχεν ἄτοπον, → 4. [Josephus, *Ant.* 11.134]).

In *P.Petr.* 3.43 fr. 3rp (241/240 B.C.E.), ἄτοπος indicates a possible negative reac-

tion of laborers in case they cannot bring their work to conclusion because of idleness (lines 17–18: ... μὴ ἄτοπ[ό]ν τι πράξωσιν. οὐ γὰρ ἀγνοεῖς οἶά ἐστιν τὰ κατὰ τὰ πληρώματα ἐὰν ἀργῶσιν “... in order that they do nothing strange. You are well aware how things are concerning the completion [of work] if they do nothing”; for the interpretation of the document see SCHUBART, *Ein Jahrtausend am Nil*, 28–29). It should be stressed that an expression like μὴ ἄτοπόν τι πράξωσιν does not specify the nature of the action to be avoided; for a similar expression see *P.Brem.* 2rp.12 (119/120 C.E.): παραφυλάξετε εἰς τὸ μηδὲν ἄτοπον ὑπ’ αὐτῶν παραχθῆναι “be on guard that nothing strange is done by them”. Furthermore, in *UPZ* 1.5 (163 B.C.E.) the expression οὐθὲν ἄτοπον appears in the context of a search executed by policemen. However, the latter observe that the suspects do not reveal any strange behavior (lines 12–13: οὐθὲν ἄτοπο[ν] ποιήσαντες, see also for a textual variant *UPZ* 1.6, line 11, 163 B.C.E.).

In *BGU* 757.21 (12 C.E.), ἕτερα ἄτοπα “other improper acts”, are imputed to some predators: Having unmade a farmer’s sheaves, they had thrown them to their pigs. In two cases the meaning of ἄτοπος is closer to the classical Greek use. *P.Tebt.* 3.1.800 (between 153 and 142 B.C.E.), a Jew’s petition, reports the case of his pregnant wife attacked by another woman. In this context, ἄτοπος appears with the verb συμβαίνω “to happen” (line 37) and indicates “some extraordinary event”, probably a miscarriage which could result from the attack (cf. line 30). In *P.Cair.Zen.* 3.59454r (after 246 B.C.E.), ἄτοπος is not referred to actions but to a person, Nicaron, whose character is said to be “strange, extravagant” (line 10, → 1.a [on Socrates]).

3. Septuagint. a) *Statistical observations.* In the LXX, ἄτοπος is found eight times, consistently in the neuter as a noun: six times, always in the plural form, in the book of Job (see COX, “Vocabulary”), and twice in the singular in Prov 30:20 and in 2 Macc 14:23.

b) *Hebrew equivalents.* In Prov 30:20; Job 4:8; 11:11; 36:21, ἄτοπος translates the Hebrew noun *ʾawwān* “harm, trouble, wickedness”. In the remaining cases, ἄτοπος corresponds to *šāw* “worthless, deceit, fraud” (Job 35:13) and ἄτοπα ποιήσιν renders the verb *rāšaʿ* hi. “to be wicked” (Job 34:12). Finally, in Job 27:6 ἄτοπος appears to be a plus of the LXX.

c) *LXX use.* The use of ἄτοπος in the texts of the LXX differs largely from classical Greek literature where the meaning “strange, absurd, unusual” prevails. Similarly to the papyri evidence (→ 2.), ἄτοπος is five times governed by the verbs ποιέω and πράσσω. In the LXX, ἄτοπος is mostly used to indicate actions which, albeit not clearly defined in their nature, have to do with “evil” or “wickedness”. In Job 27:6, the expression ἄτοπα πράξας, which has no equivalent in the MT, alludes to guilt: Job maintains his innocence saying that he has nothing with which to reproach himself (οὐ γὰρ σύννοια ἐμὰντῶ ἄτοπα πράξας “for I am not conscious to myself of having done anything wrong”). The same applies to God who is the subject of ἄτοπα ποιέω in Job 34:12: Whereas the MT affirms that God does not commit iniquity by perverting justice, but pays every man according to his way (v. 11), the LXX has a rhetorical question: οἴη δὲ τὸν κύριον ἄτοπα ποιήσιν; “do you think the Lord will do anything wrong?” Furthermore, God desires not to look on error and, knowing all men’s acts as an observer (Job 35:13: ἄτοπα οὐ βούλεται ὁ κύριος ἰδεῖν αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὀρατῆς ἐστιν), he will not overlook wicked actions (Job 11:11: αὐτὸς γὰρ οἶδεν ἔργα ἀνόμων ἰδὼν δὲ ἄτοπα οὐ παρόψεται). Bearing in mind that unjust behavior has negative consequences, in Job 36:21 Elihu admonishes his friend Job not to act wrongfully (μὴ πράξῃς ἄτοπα). Similarly, in Job 4:8, Eliphaz alludes to a saying quoted by Prov 22:8 and Sir 7:3: According to an image taken from agriculture, evil conduct produces fruits of sorrow (εἶδον τοὺς ἀροτριῶντας τὰ ἄτοπα οἱ δὲ σπεί-

ροντες αὐτὰ ὀδύνας θεριοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς “I saw those who plow wrongs, and those who sow them reap torments for themselves” [NETS]). 2 Macc 14:23 and Prov 30:20 also employ ἄτοπος with the verb πράσσω, referring to human behavior. 2 Macc 14:23 relates the actions of Nicanor who, staying in Jerusalem, just dismissed the crowds without doing anything out of place (ἐπραττεν οὐθὲν ἄτοπον). Prov 30:20 refers to the unawareness of the adulterous woman who does not consider her actions as wrong (οὐδὲν φησιν πεπραχέναι ἄτοπον).

4. Jewish literature in Greek. The word ἄτοπος occurs in Philo (over 50 times) and Josephus (20 times). In argumentative contexts, Philo employs a formula like οὐκ ἄτοπον in order to highlight a fact or an argument which is evident for him (e.g. *Abr.* 208; *Decal.* 29). Elsewhere, ἄτοπος means an idea that seems absurd (→ 1.a), e.g., to punish a person who had not committed any injustice (*Spec. leg.* 4.34) or to think that God takes an oath although he cannot testify for himself (*Leg. all.* 3.205; for another example see *Virt.* 150: annihilation of enemies as well as their orchards). The meaning “out of place” can be found e.g. in *Leg. all.* 3.53 where the state of soul of a wicked person is said to have no place. Moreover, ἄτοπος can mean “strange, unusual, extraordinary” (e.g. *Leg. all.* 3.234: strange nocturnal perceptions; *Migr.* 217: merchants take many risks and make dangerous journeys for little gain; *Flacc.* 39: an extraordinary cry). Sometimes, the term assumes a negative connotation: “improper” (e.g. *Leg. all.* 2.61: evil thoughts; see also *Post.* 87), “disgusting” (e.g. *Legat.* 125: ἄτοπον πνεῦμα “unwholesome breath”, → 1. [Thucydides, *Hist.* 2.49]) or “bad” (e.g. *Sacr.* 5: δόξαν ἄτοπον “evil doctrine”).

In the works of Josephus, most of the occurrences undoubtedly reflect the LXX use of ἄτοπος. In fact, ἄτοπος very often indicates “something bad” (*Ant.* 8.387: ἐκέλευε καὶ μηδὲν τῶν ἀτόπων προσδοκᾶν “and he exhorted them to be confident and to expect

no evil”; *Ant.* 11.134 καὶ τοῦ μηδὲν κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν παθεῖν ἄτοπον “that they might not suffer any mishap on the way”, → 2. [*P.Cair.Zen.* 3.59482]) or something that, from an ethical point of view, is wicked or wrong (*Ant.* 7.34: πράγμασιν ἀτόποις “[undertake something] by wicked actions”; *Ant.* 16.403 κεινημένον χωρήσαι πρὸς τι τῶν ἀτόπων “moved to commit something wicked”; *Ap.* 2.275 τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἡδονῶν “of disorderly and unnatural pleasures”). However, following classical Greek usage, ἄτοπος can mean “strange, absurd” (e.g. *Ant.* 9.205: Jeroboam adopts absurd foreign practices), especially in the neuter (cf. above on Philo): *Ant.* 4.32: it is absurd (ἄτοπον) to deprive God of the right of giving an honor to whomsoever he wants; *Ant.* 6.44: it was no way strange (ἄτοπον) for Israel to have the same form of government as the enemies; *Ant.* 6.82: it was absurd (ἄτοπον) to mix the victory given by God with the blood and slaughter of those that were of the same lineage; *Ap.* 2.244: it is absurd (ἄτοπον) to impute sexual excesses to the Greek gods.

5. New Testament and early Christian literature. The word occurs 4 times (3 times in Luke-Acts and once in 2 Thess 3:2). In Luke 23:41, the subject of the expression οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξεν “he has not done anything wrong”, pronounced by the repentant thief, is Jesus (for details see BOVON, *L’Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 372–373). In this case, the adjective tends to highlight – in contrast to the just condemnation that the two thieves received (δικαίως “rightly, justly” and ἄξια “worthy”) – the non-involvement of Jesus in the evil deeds imputed to him. Although juridical undertones might be present (cf. BORMANN, *Recht*, 198), the dialogue between the two thieves appears to be composed in a colloquial, familiar language, which is also characteristic of the papyri quoted above (→ 2.). In Acts 25:5, ἄτοπος means something “irregular, wrong” that could justify charges against Paul. By contrast, in Acts 28:6 nothing un-

usual happened to him (μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον, cf. DENAUX/CORSTJENS, *The Vocabulary of Luke*, 89), and Paul remains alive despite the bite of a venomous viper (for a similar use of the term → 2. [*P.Tebt.* 3.1.800.37]). In 2 Thess 3:2, ἄτοπος refers not to actions but to people, i.e. the wicked and evil persons (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων), from whom the writer of the letter wants to be freed (cf. RIGAUX, *Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, 695). The adjective ἄτοπος is once more attested in *Pol. Phil.* 5.3: The author recommends refraining from desire because not only fornicators, effeminate and sodomites (see 1 Cor 6:9) will not inherit the kingdom of God, but also those who commit perverse sexual acts (οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα); for this interpretation see BAUER, *Polykarpbriefe*, 54; more nuanced BURINI, *Policarlo*, 76: “those who commit indecent actions”. According to *Ign. Magn.* 10.3 it is absurd to speak of Jesus Christ with one’s lips, and to practice Judaism (ἄτοπὸν ἐστίν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ ἰουδαΐζειν); see also SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 126.

ἀτοπία

In general, the meaning of the noun ἀτοπία is analogous to the corresponding adjective ἄτοπος.

1. Greek literature. The noun ἀτοπία has three principle meanings (cf. *DGE*): (a) “absurdity, strangeness, extravagance” (of a person, e.g. Plato, *Symp.* 215a: οὐ γὰρ τι ῥᾶδιον τὴν σὴν ἀτοπίαν ... καταριθμῆσαι “for it is not easy ... to give a fluent enumeration of your [= Socrates’] strangeness” (see also EIDE, “On Socrates’ ἀτοπία”); Polybius, *Hist.* 8.9.5: θαυμάσαι τὴν ἀτοπίαν τοῦ συγγραφέως “to be amazed at the writer’s extravagance”; of actions, e.g. Plutarch, *Cor.* 23: ἔφρασαν ... τὴν ἀτοπίαν τοῦ πράγματος “they spoke ... about the strangeness of what had happened”); (b) “rarity, anomaly, particularity” (of symptoms of an illness,

e.g. Thucydides, *Hist.* 2.51.1: τὸ μὲν οὖν νόσημα, πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα παραλιπόντι ἀτοπίας “the disease as such, if one passes over many other [of its] ‘unusual phenomena’”; of emotions, e.g. Plato, *Phaedr.* 251d, τῇ ἀτοπία τοῦ πάθους “[the soul which is troubled] by the strangeness of the suffering of love”; of mythical beings, e.g. Plato, *Phaedr.* 229e: καὶ ἄλλων ἀμηχάνων πλήθη τε καὶ ἀτοπίαι τερατολόγων τινῶν φύσεων “and numberless other inconceivable and portentous natures”; (c) in a pejorative sense, “alienation” (e.g. the alienation between two persons, Polybius, *Hist.* 3.11.3: ἐπὶ λόγον ἀχθῆναι τὴν ὑποικουρουμένην ἀτοπίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς “to explain the alienation which had been secretly developing between them [i.e. Hannibal and Antiochus]”) as well as “wickedness, misdeed” (e.g. Plutarch, *Caes.* 15: ἀτοπίαις καὶ ἀπιστίαις ἡθῶν ἃ καθωμίλησε, Caesar outshines previous military leaders “with regard to wicked and perfidious dispositions [of the enemies] he conciliated”; see also Plutarch, *Praec. ger. reip.* 800E).

2. Papyri and inscriptions. The noun ἀτοπία is not attested in the extant papyri of the Ptolemaic era or in the published inscriptions.

3. Septuagint and Jewish literature in Greek. In the LXX, ἀτοπία occurs only once in Jdt 11:11, namely in an ethical sense (→ ἄτοπος 3.c): God’s punishment will fall on sinners whenever they provoke God by committing a misdeed (ἂν ποιήσωσιν ἀτοπίαν). Elsewhere in Jewish literature, ἀτοπία only occurs five times in Philo and once in Josephus. Unlike Jdt 11:11, Philo uses ἀτοπία in the sense of “absurdity, strangeness” (→ 1.), e.g. when dealing with certain reasonings (*Aet.* 145: τῇ ... περὶ τὸν λόγον ἀτοπία τις ἀκολουθήσας “who follows the absurdity of this reasoning”; see also *Sacr.* 95: τὴν ... ἀτοπίαν τοῦ λόγου, *Leg. all.* 1.36: μὴ γὰρ τοσαύτης ἀτοπίας ἀναπλησθῆιμεν ὥστε νομίσει θεὸν στόματος ἢ μυκτῆρων ὄργανοις χρῆσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἐμφυσησάι “let us take care that we are never filled with such absurdity as to think that God employs the organs of

the mouth or nostrils for the purpose of breathing into anything”. Furthermore, in *Cher.* 91 ἀτοπία qualifies the festivals of barbarians and Greeks which Philo considers to be full of absurdities: γὰρ οὐδ’ ὁ σύμπασις ἀνθρώπων βίος ἐξαρκέσει πρὸς τὸ τὰς ἐνυπαρχούσας ἀτοπίας ἐκάσταις ἀκριβῶσαι “for the entire life of man will not be long enough to describe accurately all the absurdities which existed in each [of these festivals]”). Finally, in *Agr.* 145, Philo addresses the question of the physical qualities of certain animals with reference to their cultic purity: Any animal is declared clean that “avoided impropriety in both the aforementioned qualities” (τὴν περὶ ἐκάτερον τῶν λεχθέντων ἀτοπίαν ἐκπέφυγε), i.e. ruminant without being cloven-hoofed or cloven-hoofed without being ruminant. In Josephus, *Ant.* 4.147, Zimri accuses Moses of having established his own extravagance (i.e. as divine law) against everybody’s opinion (κατὰ τῆς ἀπάντων δόξης ἰσχυρὰν τὴν σεαυτοῦ κατεσκευακῶς ἀτοπίαν).

4. New Testament and early Christian literature. The noun ἀτοπία is missing in the New Testament and early Christian literature.

Bibliography:

- W. G. ARNOTT, “The Confrontation of Sostratos and Gorgias”, *Phoenix* 18 (1964), 110–123. ♦ J. B. BAUER, *Die Polykarpbriefe* (KAV 5), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995. ♦ L. BORMANN, *Recht, Gerechtigkeit und Religion im Lukasevangelium* (STUNT 24), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001. ♦ F. BOVON, *L’Evangile selon Saint Luc 19,28–24,53* (CNT 3d), Genève: Labor et Fides, 2009. ♦ C. BURINI, *Policarpo di Smirne. Lettera ai Filippesi – Martirio*, Bologna: EDB, 1998. ♦ C. COX, “Vocabulary for Wrongdoing and Forgiveness in the Greek Translation of Job”, *Textus* 15 (1990), 119–130. ♦ T. EIDE, “On Socrates’ ἀτοπία”, *SO* 71 (1996), 59–67. ♦ C. ORRIEUX, *Les Papyrus de Zénon: L’horizon d’un grec en Égypte au III^e siècle avant J.C.*, Paris: Macula, 1983. ♦ B. RIGAUX, *Saint Paul. Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniens* (EtB), Paris:

Gabalda / Gembloux: Duculot, 1956. ♦ W. R. SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia), Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985. ♦ W. SCHU-

BART, *Ein Jahrtausend am Nil: Briefe aus dem Altertum*, Berlin: Weidmann, 1923.

DANIELA SCIALABBA

βᾶρις, πυργόβαρις

1. Greek literature. Whereas older lexica (e.g. LSJ; PAPE) just have one entry βᾶρις with two meanings (following Hesychius, *Lex.* β 232: βᾶρις· πλοῖον· ἢ τεῖχος· ἢ στοά· ἢ πύργος, cf. *Etym. magn.* 188.31–32), it is now generally accepted that βᾶρις 1 “flat-bottomed boat” and βᾶρις 2 “large house, tower, citadel, palace” are in fact two distinct words of different origin (see LSJ.RS; DGE; FRISK; CHANTRAINE; BEEKES).

The noun βᾶρις 1 is an Egyptian word, attested e.g. by Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 874; Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.41; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 1.92.2 (for boats used in Egypt); Lycophron, *Alex.* 747 (for the raft of Odysseus). This word does not occur in the LXX.

The homonym βᾶρις 2, on the other hand, occurs almost only in the LXX (→ 3.) and in the writings of Josephus (→ 4.). According to Stephen of Byzantium (*Ethn.* β 43 [p. 159, 8–9 Meineke]), it was also used by the historian Ephorus of Cyme in Asia Minor (fr. 230 FGH, 4th cent. B.C.E.) and the Hellenistic poet Posidippus (fr. 149 Austin/Bastianini [= SH 707], 3rd cent. B.C.E.), who originated from Macedonia and after studying in Athens finally lived at the court of the Ptolemaic kings in Alexandria.

As for the etymology of this word, Jerome (*Ep.* 65.14.7) claims a Palestinian provenance (βᾶρις *verbum sit ἐπιχώριον Palaestinae*); he may have thought it was derived from the Hebrew *bīrāh* (→ 3.b–c). But more probably, it is an Illyrian loanword, cf. βαυρία = οἰκία “house” (FRISK; CHANTRAINE; BEEKES). In the extant texts, the basic idea is that of a residence that is more or less fortified (cf. WILL, “Qu’est-ce qu’une *baris*?”, who points to the French “château” as a

good equivalent and also offers an illustration).

Although some editors and lexicographers prefer the accentuation βάρις, there is actually no reason for this (cf. WALTERS, *The Text of the Septuagint*, 186).

In addition, a third word may be distinguished, namely the proper name Βᾶρις/Βάρις as a toponym of towns, mountains, etc. (see DGE).

The compound noun πυργόβαρις “towered fortress”, derived from βᾶρις 2 (for other compounds beginning with πυργο-, e.g. πυργομαγδῶλ, see LSJ), only appears in the LXX and later quotations from it (→ 3., 5.).

2. Papyri and inscriptions. The noun βᾶρις 2 is attested in two (or three) inscriptions. The first one is a stele from Asia Minor that comprises three official documents concerning a transaction of land (*IDidyma* 492, 254/253 B.C.E., Didyma). The Seleucid king Antiochus II, who had to get divorced from his first wife Laodice for political reasons (in order to marry Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II of Egypt), obviously wanted her to be provided with financial security. For this reason he gave her the village Panucome as her property. In the document he declares that he has sold to her (for the fictitious amount of 30 talents of silver) “the village and the manor house and the land which is attached to it (τὴν τε κώμην καὶ τὴν βᾶριν καὶ τὴν προσούσαν χώραν, lines 18, 41)”. The noun βᾶρις for a manor house (also found in lines 56, 62, 67, in the report of the *hyparch*) seems to be a common term in Asia Minor of the 3rd century B.C.E.

The second inscription is dated much later and found at the west coast of the Black Sea: *IGBulg* I² 400 (1st/2nd cent. C.E., Apol-

lonia [Sozopol]). The inscription states that a certain Metokos, “who founded the city after the catastrophe and restored the triple gate and the tower (τὸ τρίπυλον καὶ τὴν βάρην, lines 4–5)”, dedicated these to Apollon Ietros.

A doubtful case is *IPrusa* 2.b.6 (1st cent. B.C.E.), a rather fragmentary inscription, which contains the words κατὰ τὴν βάρην καὶ τὸν μῶλπον, probably in the context of the siege of a city. Since μῶλπος is a *hapax legomenon* of uncertain meaning, it could be a proper name, and in this case the same would be true of βᾶρις/βάρης – and both may be certain parts of the city wall (cf. SCHULER, *Ländliche Siedlungen*, 71 n. 86).

Furthermore, the toponym Βᾶρις/Βάρης is attested in several inscriptions (e.g. *IMagn* 122d.4–8, cadastral inscription, 3rd/4th cent. C.E., Magnesia), whereas βᾶρις 1 occurs in the papyri (*P.Hib.* 1.100v.13, 267/266 B.C.E., unknown provenance; *P.Coll.Youtie* 1.7.6, 224 B.C.E., Magdola or Ghoran [Arsinoites]).

3. Septuagint. a) *Statistical observations.* The term βᾶρις is used 9 times in the LXX. It occurs 3 times in the later historical books (2 Chronicles, 1 and 2 Esdras), 3 times in the Psalms, twice in the Lamentations and once in Daniel. Furthermore, the neologism πυργόβαρις occurs once in the Psalms and once in the Psalms of Solomon (never attested elsewhere).

b) *Hebrew equivalents.* In 2 Chr 36:19; Ps 47[48]:4, 14; Lam 2:5, 7, βᾶρις serves to translate *’armôn* “citadel, castle, palace”. In 1 Esdr 6:22; 2 Esdr 6:2 [both Ezr 6:2 MT]; DanTh 8:2, βᾶρις is the equivalent of the Hebrew *bîrâh* (Aramaic *bîrtâ*) “citadel, fortress”, maybe due to homoeophony. Only once, namely Ps 44[45]:9, βᾶρις renders *hê-kâl* “palace, temple” (which is in all other instances in the Psalms, including Ps 44[45]:16, translated with ναός “temple”).

Furthermore, the term *’armôn* is rendered with the compound noun πυργόβαρις “towered fortress” in Ps 121:7, a word that occurs a second time in Ps Sol 8:19.

The comparison of DanTh 8:2 (ἐν Σούσοις τῇ βάρει) with Dan^{LXX} 8:2 (ἐν Σούσοις τῇ πόλει) may lead to the impression that βᾶρις was removed during the process of transmission and revision of the Greek bible. This is partially confirmed by evidence from other ancient versions (cf. WALTERS, *The Text of the Septuagint*, 304–305, n. 3): In Esth 1:2, all Greek manuscripts read ἐν Σούσοις τῇ πόλει for *b^ešûšan habbîrâh* of the MT, but two manuscripts of the *Vetus Latina* offer *t(h)ebari* = τῇ βάρει instead of τῇ πόλει. Likewise, in Esth 8:14, the edited LXX text merely has ἐν Σούσοις, but the Origenian recension adds τῇ βάρει. In 2 Esdr 11:1, the leading manuscripts offer the mere transliteration ἐν Σουσαν αβιρα, while the Lucianic text reads ἐν Σούσοις τῇ βάρει. In all these cases, the variant witnesses may well have preserved the original rendering.

In 2 Esdr 6:2, the term is kept, but seemingly explained by a gloss, resulting in a doublet: ἐν πόλει ἐν τῇ βάρει τῆς Μήδων πόλεως (cf., in contrast, 1 Esdr 6:22: ἐν Ἐκβατάνοις τῇ βάρει τῇ ἐν Μηδία χώρᾳ).

c) *LXX use.* The use of βᾶρις in the LXX follows that of its Hebrew equivalents (→ 3.b). As a basic meaning, “citadel, castle, palace” can be noted, of which two aspects may be distinguished: that of a fortified place and that of a place of splendor and luxury. The first aspect is especially present in Ps 47[48]:4, 14 within the context of the whole psalm; it also predominates in the use of πυργόβαρις “towered fortress” in Ps 121:7; Ps Sol 8:19. The second aspect is especially present in Ps 44[45]:9 (“myrrh, and stacte, and cassia [waft] from your garments and from the ivory palaces”). In the other instances, these aspects remain implicit. Whereas Ps 47[48] asserts that God defends Zion, Lam 2:5, 7 and also 2 Chr 36:19 (cf. v. 17!) depict him as the one who destroys Jerusalem and its palaces.

Curiously, a reader who is unaware of the Hebrew background of βᾶρις in Lam 2:5 (viz. *’armôn* “citadel, castle, palace”) may find here at first sight an occurrence of βᾶ-

ρις 1 because of the verb καταποντίζω that has the basic meaning “to throw into the sea, to plunge or drown therein” (thus TORALLAS TOVAR, “Egyptian Loan Words”, 691: “he drowned her boats” for κατεπόντισεν πάσας τὰς βάρεις αὐτῆς). But a closer look at the context reveals that in the same verse also Israel is the object of this verb (κατεπόντισεν Ἰσραηλ), which is obviously used metaphorically (cf. also Lam 2:2), and in Lam 2:7, τείχος βάρειων αὐτῆς can only mean “the wall of her palaces” (“the wall of her boats” would be senseless).

Finally, it has to be mentioned that some scholars have drawn extensive conclusions from Jerome’s claim of a Palestinian provenance of the word βᾶρις 2 (→ 1.), concerning the LXX Psalter: Since this translation uses the word three times, plus once the derivative πυργόβαρις, so the argument, it must have been produced in Palestine rather than in Egypt (thus VENETZ, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums*, 80–84, with two weaker supporting arguments; he is followed by VAN DER KOIJ, “Place of Origin”, 70–71, and SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 34–39; for the counter-arguments see MUNNICH, “La Septante des Psaumes”, 78–83; PIETERSMA, “Septuagint Research”, 309–311). As we have seen (→ 1.), Jerome was wrong in assuming a Palestinian origin of βᾶρις 2; consequently, the assumption of a Palestinian provenance of the Greek Psalter cannot be based on its use of this word.

4. Jewish literature in Greek. Josephus uses the noun βᾶρις 16 times, in particular for the citadel Antonia near the temple in Jerusalem, and reports that it was formerly called “Baris” or “the Citadel”, until Herod gave it the new name, honoring his political friend Mark Anthony (*Bell.* 1.75, 118, 353; *Ant.* 13.307; 14.prol., 481; 15.403, 409; 18.91–92; cf. RENGSTORF, *Concordance*, Suppl. 1, s.v. Βᾶρις, i.e. as a proper name). From other sources we know that this building originated from the time of Nehemiah (*Neh* 2:8), was restored by Hyrcanus, and enlarged by Herod. Apart from “Baris”, it

was also called “Acra” (1 Macc 3:45; 4:2, etc.) or “Acropolis” (2 Macc 4:12; 5:5), i.e. “the Citadel”.

Besides Antonia, Josephus refers to a fortress at Ecbatana in Media, built by Daniel, “a very beautiful work and wonderfully made” (*Ant.* 10.264–265; cf. DanTh 8:2), and to Ecbatana as a fortress/palace in Media (*Ant.* 11.99; cf. 1 Esdr 6:22).

In *Ant.* 12.230, βᾶρις denotes a fortress built by Hyrcanus in Transjordan. The plural occurs in *Ant.* 20.85 (Izates, awaiting his enemy, hides his grain in his citadels). *Vita* 246 is about the house, rather a large castle, of a certain Jesus at Gabaroth.

The proper name Βᾶρις/Βάρις (*Ant.* 1.95, quoting Nicolaus of Damascus [fr. 76]) refers to a mountain in Armenia.

In the remaining Jewish literature extant in Greek, there are one or two further occurrences of βᾶρις:

Jub. 37.17, retelling the meeting of Jacob and Esau described in Gen 33, goes beyond the biblical model: “Jacob, having closed the gates of the fortress (ἀποκλείσας τὰς πύλας τῆς βάρειος), exhorted Esau to remember the ancestral commandments”. (The “tower”, i.e. fortress, is introduced in ch. 36.20 of the Ethiopic version, for which no Greek fragment is extant.)

Ezekiel the Tragedian begins his drama about Moses with a description of the Jewish people in Egypt oppressed by “king Pharaoh” (*Exag.* 1–11; cf. Exod 1:9–14). According to the standard editions, the Israelites were maltreated “with bricks, buildings, and burdens (ἐν πλινθεύμασιν | οἰκοδομίαις τε βαρέσιν)” (*Exag.* 9–10) and compelled to build “his towered cities (πόλεις τ’ ἐπύργου)” (*Exag.* 11). Instead of βαρέσιν (from βάρος “burden”) in line 10, however, the variant reading βάρεισιν (from βᾶρις) is also attested, which would make sense as well (“with bricks, buildings, and palaces”).

In addition, *Sib.* 4.99 probably addresses “Baris” as a city in Asia Minor that will “fall” under the Macedonians (σύ, Βάρις, πέσειαι

cj. Badt; mss.: σύβαρις πέσεται/πεσεῖται “Sybaris/voluptuousness shall fall”).

5. New Testament and early Christian literature. There are no occurrences of the terms βᾶρις and πυργόβαρις in the New Testament.

In early Christian literature, both words appear only in commentaries on the LXX, in particular on the Psalms (βᾶρις e.g. Origen, *Fr. Lam.* 47; *Fr. Ps.* 44:9; Gregory of Nyssa, *Inscr. Ps.* 2.12 [GNO 5, 128]; πυργόβαρις e.g. Origen, *Fr. Ps.* 121:7; John Chrysostom, *Exp. Ps.* 121:7 [PG 55, 350]). Also Jerome, *Ep.* 65.14.7, mentioned above (→ 1., 3.c), is commenting on Ps 44:9, within the context of an explanation of the entire Psalm (*Ep.* 65.tit.: *Ad Principiam virginem explanatio Psalmi XLIV*). As for βᾶρις, he deals with the problem that the old Latin translations often mix it up with the adjective βαρύς “heavy, weighty” (itacism), so that ἀπὸ βάρων ἐλεφαντίνων is rendered by the senseless *a gravibus eburneis* instead of *a domibus eburneis* “from the ivory houses” (on this problem, also found at Ps 47:4, 14, and in the Coptic versions, see WEBER, “La traduction primitive de βᾶρις dans les anciens psautiers latins”, and Gö app. ad loc. and proleg. § 5.14; instead of *gravibus*, even the reading *gradibus* “from the stairs” is found, which seems to be a later correction).

Apart from these instances, Βᾶρις/Βάρις as a toponym occurs in Eusebius, *Onom.* 4 [p. 4, 21 Klostermann] = *Praep. ev.* 9.11.4, in a quotation from Josephus (*Ant.* 1.95, → 4.), referring to a mountain in Armenia.

Bibliography:

- A. VAN DER KOOIJ, “On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms”, *VT* 33 (1983), 67–74. ♦ O. MUNNICH, “La Septante des Psaumes et le groupe *kaigé*”, *VT* 33 (1983), 75–89. ♦ A. PIETERSMA, “Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues”, *VT* 35 (1985), 296–311. ♦ J. SCHAPER, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT II 76), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995. ♦ C. SCHULER, *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien* (Vestigia 50), Munich: Beck, 1998. ♦ S. TORALLAS TOVAR, “Egyptian Loan Words in Septuaginta and the Papyri”, *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Wien, 22.–28. Juli 2001*, ed. B. Palme (PapVind 1), Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007, 687–691. ♦ H. J. VENETZ, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums: Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforchung* (PIRHT I/2), Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974. ♦ R. WEBER, “La traduction primitive de βᾶρις dans les anciens psautiers latins”, *VC* 4 (1950), 20–32. ♦ E. WILL, “Qu’est-ce qu’une *baris*?”, *Syria* 64 (1987), 253–259.

RALPH BRUCKER

βραχίωv

1. Greek literature. Perhaps originally a comparative of βραχύς “short”, because “the upper arm is shorter than the forearm” (Pollux, *Onom.* 2.138; accepted by CHANTRAINE, but see BEEKES for the difficulties of the word formation), βραχίωv specifically designates the upper arm in contrast with πήχυς “forearm” (Xenophon, *Eq.* 12.5: a piece of armor “protects the shoulder, the upper arm and the forearm [τόν τε γὰρ ὤμων σκεπάζει καὶ τὸν βραχίονα καὶ τὸν πήχυν]”). However, anatomical precision is not always forthcoming. In some passages, the word loosely refers to the entire arm (Euripides, *Heraclid.* 858: Iolaus shows forth the newly youthful form of his arms). One should also note that Hector’s arm is described as καλλίπηχυς (Euripides, *Tro.* 1194). The lack of precision even affects scientific works. Aristotle, *Hist. an.* 513a2–3, uses the word in its precise meaning: τείνουσι διὰ τῶν βραχιόνων ἄνωθεν εἰς τὰς καμπάς, εἶτα διὰ τῶν πήχεων ἐπὶ τοὺς καρπούς “[the veins] stretch on through the upper part of the upper arms to the elbows and then through the fore-arms on to the wrists”. However, in *Hist. an.* 493b26–27, he expressly gives βραχίωv the general meaning “the whole arm”: βραχιόνος δὲ ὤμος, ἀγκῶν, ὠλέκρανον, πήχυς, χεῖρ “To the arm belong the ‘shoulder’, ‘upper-arm’, ‘elbow’, ‘forearm’, and ‘hand’.” This statement plays havoc with dictionary definitions for several anatomical parts. In yet another passage, Aristotle uses βραχίωv specifically for the forearm (*Mot. an.* 698b2–3 τοῦ μὲν βραχιόνος κινουμένου τὸ ὠλέκρανον “the elbow joint [remains at rest] when the forearm is moved”). Some of this variation in the use of anatomical terms may be due to the use of sources, such as Polybus (whom Aristotle

quotes in *Hist. an.* 513a2–3). The disparate phenomena also show, however, that precise medical nomenclature had not been established.

With animals, the word refers to the foreleg, any front leg of a four-footed animal (Aristotle, *Hist. an.* 516b9, 594b13).

In poetic language, “arms” may metonymically evoke the notion of strength (Euripides, *Suppl.* 738: “We thought our Argos irresistible, ourselves numerous and young of arms [πολλοὶ καὶ νέοι βραχίουσιν]”). The word is used as a metaphor of strength in Euripides, *Suppl.* 478: “Do not, angered at my words, and because ostensibly you rule your city with freedom, work yourself up to give a brawny answer [μῦθον ἐκ βραχιόνων]”, literally “an answer of arms”). This example shows that the noun had potential for metaphorical usage, but neither Euripides nor any other Greek writer seems to have exploited that potential elsewhere (but → 4. on Philo).

2. Papyri and inscriptions. The noun βραχίωv seems unattested in papyri from the Ptolemaic period. In later papyri, it is found a few times in passages identifying a person by a scar (οὐλή) on one of his arms (e.g. *PSI* 8.909.23, 44 C.E., Tebtynis; *PSI* 9.1057.6, 32 C.E., Euhemeria; *P.Tebt.* 2.312.9–10, 123/124 C.E., Tebtynis; *SPP* 22.22.10, 142 C.E., Tebtynis).

The term occurs more than ten times in inventory inscriptions from Delos, where it qualifies statues not having the right arm (οὐκ ἔχον τὸν δεξιὸν βραχίονα, *IDelos* 1417A.I.4, 155/154 B.C.E.; see also *IDelos* 1432b.II.8, 153/152 B.C.E.; *IDelos* 1449.ab.II.136).

In an inscription from Mykonos dated around 200 B.C.E., the word designates the part of the sacrificial animal that is to be given to the priest: “To the priest shall be given the tongue and the shoulder (βραχίων) of the bull” (SIG 1024.32). This is a striking parallel to the biblical rule stipulated in Deut 18:3 and also resembles a number of LXX passages (→ 3.).

3. Septuagint. *a) Statistical observations.* The noun βραχίων is found around 122 times in the LXX, being rather evenly divided throughout the corpus.

b) Hebrew equivalents. Most often βραχίων corresponds to Hebrew *zərōāʿ/zərōāʿ* (also *ʾəzrōāʿ*, in Aramaic *dərāʿ*, *ʾədrāʿ*) “arm”, of which it is the standard equivalent. The Hebrew noun may refer to the arm of human beings (e.g. Judg 16:12; 2 Sam 1:10; 2 Sam 22:35; 2 Kgs 9:24; Isa 17:5), of God (e.g. Exod 6:6; 15:16; Deut 4:34; Isa 52:10; Ps 79:11), or to the “shoulder” of slaughtered animals (so called because when one quarters an animal, the foreleg and the shoulder come off in one piece; cf. MILGROM, “Shoulder”, 169–176; see Num 6:19; Deut 18:3). Aramaic *dərāʿ* (Dan 2:32) refers once to the arms of a statue. In all these meanings, βραχίων is a correct rendering (with regard to statues, → 2.). The noun *zərōāʿ* is also frequently used as a metaphor of assistance (Isa 33:2; Ps 82[83]:9), strength (1 Sam 2:31; Isa 53:1; Ps 70[71]:18; 2 Chr 32:8), or violence (Job 22:8, *ʾiš zərōāʿ* “man of the arm” = “violent man”; Job 35:9; cf. Ezra 4:23). In extension of these meanings, the word can also refer to troops (Ezek 17:9; Dan 11:15, 22, 31). In metaphorical usage, *zərōāʿ* is sometimes also rendered with βραχίων. However, the metaphors are not always retained by the translators. In Ps 82[83]:9, *zərōāʿ* is interpreted as ἀντιλημψίς “help”; in Job 22:8 the expression *ʾiš zərōāʿ* is left untranslated; the formal equivalent of *ʾədrāʿ* in Ezra 4:23 is ἵπποις “with horses [i.e. cavalry]” in 2 Esdr 4:23 (cf. 1 Esdr 2:25 μεθ’ ἵππου “with cavalry”), though this may reflect a different Aramaic text (TALSHIR, *I Esdras*, 123). In

1 Kgdms 2:31; Isa 33:2; Ezek 22:6; DanTh 11:31, *zərōāʿ* is read as *zəraʿ* “seed” (a plausible reading at least in the first passage).

Less often, βραχίων renders the Hebrew word *yād* “hand”. This rendering may imply that the “hand” includes the lower arm: e.g. Gen 27:16, Rachel covers Jacob’s “hands/arms” (see also Gen 24:18; Judg^A 15:14). In referring to God’s “uplifted arm (βραχίων ὑψηλός)”, the Greek instead reflects an assimilation to a standing formula: Exod 6:1; 32:11; Isa 26:11; Dan^{LXX} 9:15. In Sir 7:31, the rendering of *tərūmat yād* “offering of the hand” as δόσιν βραχιόνων “gift of arms” appears to reflect a reinterpretation in which the second element is the object given (JOOSTEN, “The Greek Translation of Sir 7:31”; see Lev 7:34 and the other passages discussed in the next paragraph).

In 12 passages, which all deal with the part of a sacrifice that belongs especially to the priest, βραχίων is the formal equivalent of Hebrew *šəq* “leg, hind leg”: Exod 29:22, 27; Lev 7:32, 33, 34; 8:25, 26; 9:21; 10:14, 15; Num 6:20; 18:18. The equivalence is hard to explain (cf. BibAlex 3, 111). In other contexts, Hebrew *šəq* is rendered correctly as κνήμη “lower leg, leg” (e.g. Deut 28:35), σκέλος “leg” (Prov 26:7), or κωλέα “thigh-bone with the flesh on it” (1 Kgdms [1 Sam] 9:24) when referencing a sacrificed animal. The revisions of the LXX, wherever they are attested, correct βραχίων to the expected κνήμη in these passages (e.g. Exod 29:22^{Aq.Th.Sym.}), as does Josephus, *Ant.* 3.229, in his paraphrase of Lev 7:32–34 (→ d).

In a few passages, βραχίων may reflect a different source text. In Isa 15:2, *kol zāqān gērūʿāh* “every beard is cut off” becomes πάντες βραχιόνες κατατετμημένοι “all arms are cut off” (cf. Jer 31[48]:25), and in Jer 28 [51]:14, the Lord’s oath “by his life” *bənapšō* (as in Amos 6:8) is rendered “by his arm” κατὰ τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ (cf. Isa 62:8). Symmachus uses βραχίων in Isa 16:6 for Hebrew *baddīm* “diviner” (but also “limb”, Job 18:13). Aquila has it in Mal 2:3 for Hebrew *zəraʿ* “seed”, read as *zərōāʿ* (cf. ὦμος “shoulder” in the LXX).

c) *LXX use*. Although there are several other Greek words meaning “arm” (see CHANTRAINE), βραχίων is by far the most common in the *LXX*. The rare term ἐπίχειρον “arm” (see PIETERSMA, “Ἐπίχειρον in Greek Jeremiah”) is found in Jer 34[27]:5; 31[48]:25. The noun πῆχυς “forearm” occurs only in Prov 31:19 (elsewhere it is used as a measure of length, “cubit”, e.g. Gen 6:15). As in Greek literature, βραχίων can refer to the entire arm. In a few cases, it appears to designate the forearm specifically, notably where the word renders Hebrew *yād* (Gen 24:18; 27:16; Judg 15:14). Note also Job 31:22 ὁ δὲ βραχίων μου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγκῶνός μου συντριβείη “may my arm be broken off from my elbow”, which is reminiscent of Aristotle, *Mot. an.* 698b2–3, quoted above (→ 1.), although a different word is used for “elbow”. There are no passages where βραχίων refers to the upper arm specifically (but cf. Prov 31:17, 19).

The word is frequent in reference to both human beings and God. The primary, physical meaning, is well represented: human arms are used to carry things (Gen 24:18), to gather the harvest (Isa 17:5), to shoot a bow (2 Kgdms 22:35), in diverse crafts (Isa 44:12; Sir 38:30; Prov 31:17), to wear ornaments (2 Kgdms 1:10; Cant 8:6; Sir 21:21). Arms are covered with clothing (Gen 27:16), and tied with cords (Judg 15:14; 16:12); arms are among the body parts that can be subjected to torture (4 Macc 9:11; 10:6); one hyperbolic passage speaks of a human being eating the flesh of his own arm out of hunger (Isa 9:19). In anthropomorphic discourse, God is said to carry his people in his arms (Hos 11:3) and to gather his flock with his arm (Isa 40:11).

Reference to human arms without further specification, in the singular or plural, connotes strength. The strength of human arms may be attributed to God (Ezek 4:7; 30:24, 25). In one confusing passage, perhaps due to the translator’s insufficient attention to the context, the arm of Jerusalem is mentioned in connection with the exodus

(Isa 51:9; cf. *LXX.D.EK* 2, 2634). Elsewhere strength of human arms is criticized as limited or imaginary. The Assyrians boast “in the arm of their infantry (ἐν βραχίονι πεζῶν)”, but they will not prevail in the end (Jdt 9:7); God doubts whether Job has an arm like that of the Lord (ἢ βραχίων σοί ἐστὶν κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου, Job 40:9); see also Ps 43[44]:4; Job 26:2; 35:9; Hos 7:15. In other passages, human arms are said to be broken or paralyzed (Gen 49:24; Ps 9:36[10:15]; 36[37]:17; Zec 11:17; Jer 17:5; Ezek 30:21).

In reference to God, the arm symbolizing strength – always in the singular – is positive. This motif is particularly frequent in passages recalling the exodus (Exod 15:16; Deut 4:34; Ps 76[77]:16; Wis 11:21; Isa 63:12; Bar 2:11), but it is also frequently used in many other connections: creation (Jer 39[32]:17), the future salvation of Israel (Isa 40:10; Ezek 20:33–34; cf. Sir 33:7[36:5]) or the nations (Isa 51:5), the punishment of the enemies (Ps 88[89]:11; 2 Macc 15:24) or of Israel (Jer 21:5), the preservation of the righteous (Wis 5:16; Ps Sol 13:2). In the Pentateuch, particularly in Deuteronomy, the motif is expressed most often in a formulaic way: God has freed his people from slavery ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ “with a strong hand and a raised arm” (Deut 5:15). This formula is occasionally found elsewhere (Ps 135[136]:12; Ezek 20:33), but other writings mostly use more flexible phraseology. The implications are altogether the same: God’s arm metonymically evokes his powerful action.

Finally, βραχίων is used figuratively for various concrete and abstract notions. In Deut 33:20, συντριψας βραχίονα καὶ ἄρχοντα “having broken arm and ruler”, the juxtaposition of the two nouns appears to indicate that “arm” is used in reference to a strongman. In 2 Chr 32:8, μετ’ αὐτοῦ βραχίονες σάρκινοι “with him are physical arms”, is probably a metaphor for strength. Whether in Ezek 17:9; Dan^{LXX} 11:15, 22, 31 the “arms” are to be understood as troops (as in Hebrew, → b), is hard to say. In Ps 70[71]:18,

the intention of the psalmist to “proclaim God’s arm” must also be metaphorical.

The literary use of βραχίων in the LXX far exceeds what is found in classical literature. In Greek literature, the figurative use is rare, and the word never occurs in theological discourse. This innovative linguistic usage in the LXX originated in literal translation. In Hebrew literature, the “arm” is a frequent figure for strength in its various guises, and almost every case of Hebrew *zərōaʿ/zərōaʿ* was rendered with βραχίων (→ b). From its origins in translated texts, some of the literary usages continued in texts composed in Greek. This can be seen particularly in Wisdom (Wis 5:16; 11:21; 16:16; note also 2 Macc 15:24; Jdt 9:7).

The elaboration of the “arm” motif in the Hebrew Bible has a few parallels in Ancient Near Eastern literature, but its background has not yet been definitively elucidated (see GÖRG, “Der starke Arm Pharaos”; HOFFMEIER, “The Arm of God”; HELFMEYER, *TDOT*, 140).

d) *The foreleg of the priests.* A special problem is presented by the 12 passages where βραχίων formally corresponds to Hebrew *šōq* “leg, hind leg” (→ b). In all these passages, the “shoulder” designates a part of the sacrificial animal assigned specifically to the priest (Lev 7:32, 33, 34). In two of the passages, Exod 29:22 and Lev 8:25–26, the thigh is offered as a burnt offering to God, but this is done in the context of the priestly consecration where the thigh represents the priest’s personal part in the offering. The rule of giving the shoulder to the officiating priest finds a close parallel in inscriptional evidence (→ 2.). It has been proposed, therefore, that the rendering reflects influence from Greek religion (*LXX.D-EK* 1, 361). But the solution is hard to accept. Even if the Mykonian rule were representative for Greek religion in general, which is far from certain, it is hard to understand why Jewish translators would have wanted to conform the biblical text to pagan practice in this way. Perhaps this is a case where the LXX

follows a cultic tradition known among diaspora Jews (cf. Deut 18:3, and see JOOSTEN, “Divergent cultic practices”).

4. Jewish literature in Greek. In reference to physical arms, the use of βραχίων is unproblematic: Potiphar’s wife bares her arms to seduce Joseph (*T. Jos.* 9.5), the sons of Jacob wear shields on their arms (*Jos. Asen.* 26.6[7]).

Theological and symbolic uses of βραχίων are poorly attested. References to the “arm of God” are lacking. Aristobulus, fr. 2.10.1, lists the arm as one of the frequent anthropomorphisms in the text of Scripture posing a problem to the king.

An interesting figurative use occurs in Philo’s paraphrase of Exod 2:17, in a speech where Moses addresses the shepherds who tried to chase Raguel’s daughters. Moses asks: βραχίονας καὶ πῆχεις ἀργούς τρέφοντες οὐκ ἐρυθριάτε; “Are you not ashamed to have such idle arms and hands?” (*Vit Mos.* 1.54). This suggests that the force the shepherds used was at once unlawful and cowardly. The trope does not link with any biblical passage and seems to continue classical models (→ 1.).

In several passages, Philo gives an allegorical meaning to arms mentioned in the text of the Pentateuch. In *Post.* 132–146, he comments on Rachel’s lowering of her vessel on her arm (Gen 24:18): This movement illustrates the practical transmission of wisdom from a teacher to a pupil. In two different passages, Philo explains the portion allocated to the priests from the sacrifices: The “shoulder” of the victim is said to be a symbol of labor and of the endurance of hardship in *Leg. all.* 3.135, an explanation that allows him to distinguish Aaron from Moses. In *Spec. leg.* 1.145, however, the same shoulder is presented as a symbol of strength, manly vigor, and every lawful action in giving, taking, and acting. The gift of the shoulder required in Deut 18:3 is interpreted, in accordance with Jewish halakah (*m. Hull.* 10.1; cf also Josephus, *Ant.* 4.74), as applying to animals butchered away from the altar (Philo *Spec. leg.* 1.147).

Josephus uses the word a few times in his paraphrase of the biblical text, but never in a theological or metaphorical sense. In a paraphrase of Deut 6:8, he uses βραχίων in reference to what the Hebrew text calls *yād* and the LXX χεῖρ: “They are to bear on their [fore]head and their arm (ἐπι τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ τοῦ βραχίονος) those wonders which declare the power of God, and his goodwill toward them” (*Ant.* 4.213). This divergence may reflect the actual practice of wearing phylacteries in his days, but it may also go back to an oral Aramaic translation, for *Targum Neofiti* similarly renders *yād* as *’ædrā’* “arm” (→ 3.b.) in Deut 6:8.

5. New Testament. The noun βραχίων is found only three times in the New Testament. All three occurrences are theological and evidence LXX influence. John 12:38 is a quotation of Isa 53:1, “to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?” Acts 13:17, “The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers, and ... with uplifted arm (μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ) he led them out of [Egypt]”, is formulated in dependence on LXX passages such as Deut 5:15. Luke 1:51 [= Ode 9:51] does not follow a specific scriptural model, but the language is close to that of the LXX: “He has shown strength with his arm, he has scattered the proud in the thoughts of their hearts” (cf. Ps 88[89]:11; 97[98]:1; Wis 11:21).

6. Early Christian literature. Early Christian literature simply continues New Testament usage. *1 Clem.* 16.3 quotes Isa 53:1; *1 Clem.* 60.3 also leans heavily on LXX

language: “May we be sheltered by your mighty hand and delivered from every sin by your uplifted arm (τῷ βραχίονί σου τῷ ὑψηλῷ)”. Justin, *Apol.* 32.12, gives a quotation combined of Num 24:17 and Isa 11:1, 10; 51:5, and explicitly equates the “star” and the “rod” with Christ, but implicitly this seems to be true as well for the “arm [of God]”, on which the nations hope.

Bibliography:

- F. J. HELFMEYER, “*zʿrôa*”, *TDOT* 4 (1980), 131–141. ♦ H. SCHLIER, “βραχίων”, *TDNT* 1 (1964), 639–640.
- M. GÖRG, “Der starke Arm Pharaos: Beobachtungen zum Belegspektrum einer Metapher in Palästina und Ägypten”, *Hommages à François Daumas*, ed. H. Altenmüller, Montpellier: Université de Montpellier, 1986, 323–330. ♦ J. K. HOFFMEIER, “The Arm of God Versus the Arm of Pharaoh in the Exodus Narratives”, *Biblica* 67 (1986), 378–387. ♦ J. JOOSTEN, “Divergent cultic practices in the Septuagint: The ‘shoulder’ (βραχίων) of the priest”, *JSCS* 48 (2015) 27–38. ♦ IDEM, “The Greek Translation of Sir 7:31 and the Interpretive Process Underlying the Septuagint”, *The Faces of Torah: Studies in the Texts and Contexts of Ancient Judaism in Honor of Steven Fraade*, ed. C. Hayes, T. Novick, M. Bar-Asher Siegal (JAJSup 22), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017, 131–138. ♦ J. MILGROM, “A Shoulder for the Levites”, *The Temple Scroll*, ed. Y. Yadin, vol. 1, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society et al., 1977, 169–176. ♦ A. PIETERSMA, “Ἐπίχειρον in Greek Jeremiah”, *JNWSL* 28 (2002), 101–108.

JAN JOOSTEN

βωμός

1. Greek literature. *a) The root.* The word βωμός presents the features of a deverbal noun derived from the Indo-European root *g^wōh₂-mo- “step”, “stand”, collectively “steps”, sharing the same stem (g^weh₂) with βαίνω “to walk (proper of motion on foot)”, βάσις “stepping” (CHANTRAINE; BEEKES). In this pattern, however, the vocalism -ō- has been regarded as awkward to explain (cf. KURYŁOWICZ, *Apophonie en indo-européen*, 186). For this reason, some scholars have suggested alternative hypotheses (see ASPESI, “Semitico B.M.T e gr. βωμός”, 184–185) by comparing the Greek noun with the Semitic stem *bm, *bm.t (attested in Ugaritic *bm.t* with the anatomic meaning “back of an animal or a person”; and then in Hebrew *bāmāh*, *bāmôt* with a topographic/architectural extension “height”, “altar”). Following this reasoning, the Greek βωμός has been explained as a loan word (with the Canaanite shift *ā* > *ō*), located in the context of the convergence between the North-West Semitic languages and Greek dialects, which results from geographic contact and intense cultural exchanges in the Mediterranean during the second millennium B.C.E. It must be said, however, that BEEKES has not found this account convincing enough to discard the word from its Indo-European etymology.

b) Meaning. The term is attested in Homer with the meaning “raised platform”, referring to a step or stand for a chariot (*Il.* 8.441), to a base for a statue (*Od.* 7.100), but mostly with the meaning “raised altar with a base pertaining to the cult of a deity”. Each Olympic god is said to have his or her altar: Zeus (*Il.* 8.249), Poseidon (*Od.* 13.187), Apollo (*Od.* 6.162), Athena (Pindar, *Ol.*

13.75), and Aphrodite (Homer, *Od.* 8.363); an altar can be also dedicated to the Nymphs (Homer, *Od.* 17.210).

From Homer onward, in tragedy and lyric poetry, the polysemy of the term runs out. The noun is always attested with the meaning “altar”, in connection with the worship of the deities. The implication in the religious sphere is so inherently present in the semantics of βωμός, that its use just evokes, metonymically, all the sacred duties of worship (cf. Aristophanes, *Ach.* 308 οἷσιν οὔτε βωμὸς οὔτε πίστις οὔθ’ ὄρκος μένει “people who do not know how to respect no altar, nor faith, nor oaths”, said about the Spartans).

c) Reference. The altar, which was the place of offerings, represents the most essential element of any Greek cultic area, which is distinguished, from the 8th century B.C.E. onward, by the demarcation of a *temenos*, the altar for burnt offerings, and usually, though not always, by the temple (cf. BURKERT, *Greek Religion*, 87–88; RAJA, “Complex Sanctuaries”, 308–309). The altar is first and foremost the place on which the fire is kindled: “*temenos* and fragrant altar” is already a Homeric formula (ἐνθά τέ οἱ τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις, Homer, *Il.* 8.48; *Od.* 8.363; cf. *Hymn. Hom.* 5.59). Natural rock may function as a monolithic altar (YAVIS, *Greek Altars*, 127; cf. Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.34.2); a few stones set together to form a heap may also serve (YAVIS, *Greek Altars*, 214; cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 1.53), as well as the mound of remains of ash and bone from previous sacrifices (as in the case of the Altar of Zeus at Olympia described in Pausanias, *Descr.* 5.13.8; see also SFAMENI, “Ὁ βωμός μαντείος”, 38–39). Such artifacts can as-

sume a very rudimentary and improvised shape (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 1.40.2). Nevertheless, in particular after the monumentalization of Greek sanctuaries, the typical altar is well built, constructed of bricks and white-washed with lime, or else fitted together from hewn stone blocks. Large altars have one or more steps on one side, which the priest mounts to perform his offices (cf. YAVIS, *Greek Altars*, 115).

The altar is *par excellence* the place on which the blood of the victims is shed, to the point that it becomes bloody; the word is often found in combination with the verbs αἰμάσσω/αἰμάσσομαι “to make/to become bloody” (e.g. Theophrastus, fr. 584A Fortenbaugh [as attested by Porphyry, *Abst.* 2.7]; Theocritus, *Epigr.* 1.5); and αἰματώ “to stain with blood” (Aristophanes, *Pax* 1020; Euripides, *Andr.* 260).

The sanctity of the altar makes it the place (Ps.-Demosthenes, *Neaer.* 78) or the object of solemn oaths (see μέχρι τοῦ βωμοῦ φίλος εἶναι in Plutarch, *Vit. pud.* 531C, Ps.-Plutarch, *Reg. imp. apophth.* 186C: “as far as the altar I am your friend, i.e. I will not swear a false oath even in your favor”), and the scene of public actions such as individual or collective asylum claims. The expressions καταφυγεῖν ἐπὶ βωμόν/πρὸς τοὺς βωμούς/περὶ τὸν βωμόν/εἰς τὸν βωμόν “to flee to the altar” (e.g. Herodotus, *Hist.* 5.46; Thucydides, *Hist.* 5.60.6; Euripides, *Iph. Aul.* 911; Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1412a14; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 11.29; 13.67.6–7), and κάθημαι/καθίζω ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ/ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν/ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς “to be seated/to sit at the altar(s)” (Lysias, *Agorat.* 52; Aeschines, *Tim.* 60; Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.126.11) stereotype the figure of the ἰκέτης “suppliant”; in this case, the petition addressed to the people and its political institutions merges with the prayer to the gods (cf. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 12.57.3 ἰκέται τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἐγένοντο).

The function of its referent, rather than its *Gestalt*, is central to the meaning of the

noun. Since the burnt offering is a shared practice within the West-Semitic and Mediterranean area and far beyond (cf. BROWN, “The sacrificial cult and its critique I”, 159–163; IDEM, “The sacrificial cult and its critique II”, 1–4), it is no wonder that the Greek authors unhesitatingly use the term to refer to altars of many different shapes, belonging to foreign cults, such as the Babylonian altars (e.g. the golden altar placed outside the temple of Marduk/Zeus in Babylon, Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.183), the Egyptian altars (Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.4; 2.39; 2.156), the altar located on the east coast of the Arabian Gulf (βωμός ἐκ στερεοῦ λίθου παλαιὸς τοῖς χρόνοις, Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 3.42.4), the Phrygian altars (the altar to Cybele in Pessinus, Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 3.59.8), the Scythian altars (Herodotus, *Hist.* 4.59, described in 4.62 as made of “a pile of bundles of sticks”), and Roman altars (from the underground altar, erected near the Circus Maximus in honor of Consus/Poseidon Seisichthon, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 2.31.2–3, to the altars built for the worship of the emperors on the Capitolium, Cassius Dio, *Hist. Rom.* 8.1.2 Zonaras [p. 105, 11 Boissevain], and elsewhere), and, of course, the Jewish altar in the temple of Jerusalem (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 34/35.1.4; Posidonius, fr. 253.175 Edelstein/Kidd).

The altar has its proper place in the funerary architecture as well (cf. ΚΥΒΙΝΣΚΑ, *Les monuments funéraires dans les inscriptions grecques*, 68, 73). The funerary altar, as a monumental artifact (μνήμα, or σῆμα), is erected above the tomb itself and is often associated with an inscription (cf. *Anth. Gr. App. Epigr. sepulcr.* 329; 439; 460; 477; 563; 582; 590; 592; 626).

Strictly speaking, the noun βωμός is never used to refer to the “tomb” *tout court* (designated on the other hand by the words τάφος and τύμβος; for a more detailed discussion see DREW-BEAR, “Some Greek Words”, 65); on the contrary, to call an altar a “tomb” is explicitly considered a blasphemy (see

Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 888). In special cases, however, this becomes admissible: Diodorus Siculus quotes the lyrical poet Simonides, who calls the tomb of the heroes of Thermopylae “an altar” (βωμός δ’ ὁ τάφος, see Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.* 11.11.6; Simonides, fr. 26.1 *PMG*). We are clearly facing a metaphor: those who fell are the victims, and their shedding of blood a sacrifice (the same holds true in Duris, fr. 73 *FHG*, and Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 5.53; 5.215b).

A metaphor of this kind might have given rise to the toponym οἱ Φιλαίωνου βωμοί “The Altars of Philaeni” (Polybius, *Hist.* 3.39.2; 10.40.7; Posidonius, fr. 26.42 Theiler; Scylax, *Peripl.* 109; Strabo, *Geogr.* 3.5.5; 17.3.20). Strabo locates this place on the coast of the Greater Syrtis, i.e. on the Gulf of Sidra. These altars were said to have been erected by the Carthaginians in honor of the two Philaeni brothers, who, in order to settle the boundary favorably for Carthage, had given themselves up to be buried alive in the sand at the boundary (Sallust, *Bell. Jug.* 79). Pliny (*Nat. hist.* 5.4) says that the altars were of sand, implying, thus, that they were merely the sand-heaps over the two bodies.

Moreover, it should be mentioned that altars are scattered all over the living space of the *polis* (cf. SOURVINOY-INWOOD, “Early sanctuaries”, 9), fit to be placed in the streets, in public buildings, in gymnasia, in marketplaces and even in private courtyards and houses (cf. BOWES, “At Home”, 211–212), attesting to a private worship, alongside the public cult, strongly condemned as impious in Plato, *Leg.* 910b. This phenomenon is a form of personal piety that would considerably increase in the Hellenistic period, both in Asia Minor and in Egypt (cf. DUNAND, “Traditional Religion in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt”, 173); however, we do not know of Jewish private altars (cf. VAN DER HORST, “Judaism in Asia Minor”, 330).

Departing from the *temenos*, its prototypical location, and penetrating the spaces of civil and private life, the altar operates as a

movable device of sanctity: The more a space is characterized by the presence of altars, the more that space will be regarded and experienced as a sacred place; at the same time, its association with the sacrificial cult becomes gradually weaker.

2. Papyri and inscriptions. The term βωμός is widely and extensively documented in inscriptions and papyri. The noun occurs in the context of dedications and consecrations of altars (as part of *temena*) by private individuals (*SB* 8.9950a, 3rd/2nd cent. B.C.E.; *IGFay* 3.196.11, Arsinoite Nome, Fayum, early 2nd cent. B.C.E.; *OGIS* 103.7, Ptolemaïs Hermiou, El Manshāh, 2nd cent. B.C.E.), by families (*OGIS* 175.11, 104 B.C.E., Soknopaiou Nesos, Dimai), or by groups and categories, such as priests (*OGIS* 65.8, 245 B.C.E., Alexandria), leaders of communities (see *OGIS* 97.9, 205/181 B.C.E., Taposiris Parva, El Mandara, in which the leaders of the κῶμος, together with the initiates to the *thiasus*, are said to dedicate an altar and some trees, precisely *perseas*, to Osiris, Serapis, Isis and Anubides), or officers and military forces (*SEG* 54.1742.4, 182/116 B.C.E., Ombos, according to BERNAND, *Thèbes à Syène*, no. 190). Finally, the case of a “speaking” inscription of the Roman period deserves a mention (*IMEGR* 107.3, 1st/2nd cent. C.E., Kafr el-Zaiyat, Delta): The βωμός “in person” presents “itself”, the gods to whom it is dedicated (Isis, Amun and Carpocrates) and those who offer it.

The term is also found in documents concerning temple administration, in lists of properties (*OGIS* 52.3, 253 B.C.E., Ptolemaïs Hermiou, El Manshah) or lists of donations (*P.Cair.Zen.* 4.59693.2, 3rd cent. B.C.E., unknown provenance).

From the 3rd century B.C.E. onward, the formula ἐξω/ἐκτὸς ἱεροῦ βωμοῦ “outside the protection of sacred precincts of the temple and the altar” is widely attested in declarations on oath in case of offices, contracts and payments. By using this formula, the contractor agrees to comply with its obliga-

tions, and adds the pledge to refrain from the not uncommon practice of seeking sanctuary from justice at the altar in a sacred area (ἀσυλός); we find an example of this use in a commitment to the threshing (*PSI* 5.515.15, 251 B.C.E., Philadelphia [Arsinoites]) in the paper of the banker Nicanor (*P.Grad.* 4.18, 229 B.C.E., Heracleopolis), in a promise of attendance (*P.Oxy.* 10.1258.8–9, 44/45 C.E., Oxyrhynchus) and other obligations of various kinds (*P.Grad.* 3.12, ca. 227/226 B.C.E., Heracleopolis).

The expression καταφεύγειν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν, known from literature, is also found in documentary sources (*P.Entreux.* 80.11, 217 B.C.E., Arsinoe [Arsinoites]), as is ἀποχωρεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν “to have recourse to the altar” (*P.Cair.Zen.* 3.59466.12–14, 3rd cent. B.C.E., unknown provenance; *P.Lond.* 7.2007.2–3, 248/247 B.C.E., unknown provenance).

Furthermore, the word is attested in certificates of payment of taxes. Mention is made of a φόρος βωμῶν (*BGU* 1.292.1, 2nd/3rd cent. C.E., Arsinoites), which is probably a tax paid by priests, as the ἐπιστατικὸν ἱερέων occurring in similar documents (*P.Lond.* 3.1235.7, 175/176 C.E., Theadelphia [Arsinoites]).

Beyond the Egyptian milieu, a Phoenician bilingual inscription dating from the 4th century B.C.E. (*CIS* 1.95 = *KAI* 42) is quite significant. It is the dedication of an altar to Athena Soteira Nike (*l'nt m'z hym*). In this document, the Greek word βωμός corresponds to Phoenician *mzbh* “altar”, parallel to the Hebrew *mizbēah* (one of its correspondents in the LXX, → 3.b). This is a testimony of how the equivalence between the two terms was already ascertained among the Hellenized Semitic peoples of the Near East.

Moreover, particularly fascinating is the epigraphic evidence that attests to the worship of a deity called “Zeus Altar” in the northern area of Syria. On the lintel of the *temenos*’ gate at Borg one could find a dedication to Ζεὺς-Βωμός (Διὶ Βωμῶ μεγάλῳ

ἐπηκόῳ “to the great Zeus-altar, who listens to prayers [great and attentive]”, *IGLS* 2.569.1, 161 C.E., Borg). This inscription has parallels from the Antiochian area. In this case, the dedication is to Ζεὺς Μαδβάρχος (*IGLS* 2.465.1, 86 C.E., Koryphe); the second term has been read as the transcription of Aramaic *madbah* “altar” (absolute state) (cf. TROMBLEY, *Hellenic Religion*, 254–255). Other epigraphical material can be mentioned which bears witness to the persistence of a kind of “empty space ancestral aniconism” in this area (METTINGER, *No Graven Image?*, 19): on the one hand the dedication to Ζεὺς Κορυφῆος (*IGLS* 2.652.3, 367/368 C.E., El-Ḥoṣn), and on the other the dedication to Ναὸς Αεχάλας (*CIG* 4516.5–6, 3rd cent. C.E., Damas). In this latter example, Waddington reads the second word as Αεχάλας, explaining the form as a transliteration of Aramaic *hēkālā* “temple”; the temple would then be dedicated to the divinization of the temple itself (*ISyriaW* 2562g). It is known that the Syro-Phoenician religions for the most part did not use images; the divinity was represented instead by a rock or a wooden pole. During the Greco-Roman period, although divine images found wide-spread acceptance, numerous anthropomorphic representations of such rocks still survived as cult objects (cf. MILLAR, *The Roman Near East*, 254–255). A particular kind of litholatry was *bomolatry*: “in this case the cult of the altar, where the stone upon which the sacrificial animal is slaughtered appears at the same time as the object and as the place of veneration” (GAIFMAN, “The aniconic image of the Roman Near East”, 37).

3. Septuagint. The term occurs 46 times in the LXX. Among the translations, βωμός is found 33 times in the books that came to be included in the Hebrew canon (Exod 34:13; Num 3:10; 23:1, 2, 4[*bis*], 14[*bis*], 29, 30; Deut 7:5; 12:3; Josh 22:10[*bis*], 11, 16, 19, 23, 26, 34; 2 Chr 31:1; Hos 10:8; Amos 7:9; Isa 15:2; 16:12; 17:8; 27:9; Jer 7:31, 32; 11:13; 30:18[49:2]; 31[48]:35; 39[32]:35); twice in

Sirach (Sir 50:12, 14), and eight times in 1 Maccabees (1 Macc 1:47, 54, 59; 2:23, 24, 25, 45; 5:68). In the original Greek compositions, the term is found three times (2 Macc 2:19; 10:2; 13:8).

a) *Translated book usage*: βωμός as an equivalent of *mizbēah*. The word βωμός is used primarily to translate the Hebrew noun *mizbēah* “altar”, which is to be expected based on the semantic values of the Greek term.

This equivalence, however, is far from being obvious; as it is actually very sporadic (21 times on more than 400 occurrences of the Hebrew word) and limited to a small group of books (Exod 34:13; Num 23:1–30; Deut 7:5; 12:3; Josh 22:10–34; 2 Chr 31:1; Jer 11:13; Sir 50:14; omitting, for the moment, the case of 1 Maccabees, as the original Hebrew source-text is not preserved). According to the majority of translators, the new formation θυσιαστήριον (a noun derived from the verb θυσιάζω “to sacrifice”, as its Hebrew counterpart is derived from the root *zbh* “to slaughter for sacrifice”) was far more suitable than the already available Greek word.

This raises at least two questions: (1) Why did the translators deem the Greek word wrong, or unfitting, or discordant as an equivalent of *mizbēah*? (2) In the case of books familiar with both words, did the translators introduce some sort of semantic variation between them, independent of the Hebrew Bible?

According to DANIEL, *Vocabulaire du culte*, 16–17, a paradigmatic relation of evaluative polarity can be drawn between the two words, in such a way that βωμός (the negatively evaluated term, i.e. the “bad” altar) is used “lorsqu’il est question des autels cananéens, qu’on ordonne aux Israélites de détruire, afin de ne pas se laisser contaminer par les pratiques abominables de ces populations”, whereas θυσιαστήριον (the positively evaluated term, i.e. the “good” altar) is used “quand un autel est mentionné à propos du culte rendu par tel personnage ex-

emplaire, comme Noé, les Patriarches ou Moïse, ou bien prescrit par le code mosaïque”.

Following her argument, the main instance of the “bad” altar is the one that belongs to those dwelling in the land that into which the Israelites are entering (cf. Exod 34:12). This is the case in Exod 34:13, Deut 7:5, Deut 12:3, 2 Chr 31:1, where βωμός is mentioned among other types of installation such as στήλαι “steles”, ἄλση “groves” and γλυπτά “carved images”, which characterize the sites of the Canaanite cult. The condemnation of these altars is peremptory: They must be torn down (καθαίρω) or chopped down (κατασκάπω).

Together with this “prime example”, we find βωμός in the Greek version every time there is something wrong with or questionable about a specific altar and its cultic function.

According to Numbers, Balak, the king of Moab, has several altars (βωμοί) built by the diviner Balaam, at different Moabite sites by the Arnon, namely at *bāmôt bāʿal* (Num 22:41, LXX: ἐπὶ τὴν στήλην τοῦ Βααλ “up to the stele of Baal”); at *šēdēh šōpimʿel-rōʿš happisgāh* (Num 23:14, LXX: εἰς ἀγροῦ σκοπιᾶν ἐπὶ κορυφὴν λελαξευμένου “to a lookout place of a field, on the top of Hewn”) and at *rōʿš happēʿōr* (Num 23:28, LXX: ἐπὶ κορυφὴν τοῦ Φογορ “on the top of Phogor”). Such sites are to be regarded as vantage points from which the God of Israel, appeased through blood-sacrifices, would permit effective execrations against the ranks of Israel. Since Balaam cautions Balak that he may speak only the words that God (^ʿ*lōhīm*) puts into his mouth (Num 22:38), the sacrifices officiated on these altars (the word *ʿōlāh* is used to refer to such sacrifices alongside the pericope) are meant to be offered to the God of Israel. They are offered, however, by the enemies of Israel (Moab and its court), in places most likely compromised by unlawful cults, and they are performed by somebody whose intentions are at least questionable (although in the end

Balaam pronounces blessings upon Israel instead of curses, the assessment of him remains hesitant if not overtly negative, both in the bible as in the later Jewish tradition, cf. Deut 23:6; *b. Ber.* 7a, where Balaam's epithet is "the wicked", or the Midrashic exegesis in *Bamidbar Rabbah*), to the point that Balaam is considered to be implicated in the Baal Peor affair, which took place, most likely, at the same Moabite shrine (cf. Num 31:16).

The term is still found in the book of Joshua, in the account of the construction of an impressive altar by Transjordan tribes, at the boundaries of the land of Canaan. The altar looks like an exact copy (ὁμοίωμα, Josh 22:28) of the one placed in front of the tent (settled at that time at the west-bank of the Jordan, in Shiloh), upon which the Levite priests perform the "legitimate" sacrificial cult. The construction of an altar other than the altar of "the Lord our God" (cf. Josh 22:19 τὸ οἰκοδομήσαι ὑμᾶς βωμὸν ἔξω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν), is regarded by the western tribes as an apostasy comparable to the one that took place at Baal Peor, in addition to being a serious threat to peace. Since the Transjordanian tribes give assurance that the artifact shall be "just" a monument (a μαρτύριον, cf. Josh 22:34), and that they will refrain from using it for burnt offerings, the presence of the βωμός becomes acceptable for both parties. Thus, the agreement is reached by pointing out the function of the βωμός. By his careful lexical choices, the translator seems to suggest that while different Israelite βωμοί may coexist in the land of Canaan, two θυσιαστήρια may not.

The semantic pattern suggested by the Greek usage thus envisages an *inclusive* opposition between the nouns, as if the meaning of βωμός was entailed in the meaning of θυσιαστήριον. The first word, which should be taken as neutral with regard to polarity, turns out to be a generic term (cf. DANIEL, *Vocabulaire du culte*, 21; VAN DER KOOIJ, "On the Use of βωμός in the Septuagint",

603), whereas the latter is rather a specific term of the Israelite religious jargon for the legitimate altar of burnt offerings (as its etymology and its *ad hoc* introduction seemingly suggest). In such a way, the translator makes evident the positive value that he ascribes to the centralization of the sacrificial cult.

It should be emphasized, however, that this phenomenon is very limited in the translated books. As mentioned, it is a Pentateuch-owned feature, which will be exploited later on only in 1 Maccabees (see below). Besides the aforementioned examples, such a distinction is scarcely traceable. All the *mizbēhōt* built by Noah, Abraham (including the one of the binding of Isaac) and Jacob mentioned in Genesis are θυσιαστήρια. This is equivalent to saying that they all are meant to be legitimate. Leviticus speaks only about the two altars built by Moses for the tent.

In the Historical Books, the issue of the altar's legitimacy comes to the fore. After the building of the temple by King Solomon, the historical and moral judgment on the kings is based on the fact that they build or tear down the idolatrous altars and the pagan sites of worship. In spite of this, the evaluative polarity, lexically expressed by the opposition between βωμός and θυσιαστήριον, does not play any role, since the translators extend the use of the latter to all the occurrences of *mizbēah*, applying the principle of the single equivalent (this will be the stance of the revisions as well). Although many times altars bearing a heavy condemnation from the religious leadership stand on the scene (e.g. those built by the kings Asa, Achaz and Manasse), the word βωμός is found only in 2 Chr 31:1, and, taking into account the Antiochene tradition, which is regarded as particularly significant in retrieving the Old Greek version, in 2 Chr 34:3 (see *IGTA*).

As previously mentioned, the term returns to prominence in 1 Maccabees. In fact, this book stands as a bulwark in distinguish-

ing between the unique “good” altar, the θυσιαστήριον of the Jerusalem temple, and the aberrant ones: the βωμός at Modein (1 Macc 2:23); all the altars scattered throughout the city of Jerusalem and the surrounding regions (1 Macc 1:47; 1:54; 2:45); the foreign altars of Azoton (1 Macc 5:68; for archaeological evidence of polytheistic cults in this area see STERN, *Archaeology*, 490–505); and the extreme example of the execrable altar, the one put by Antiochus Epiphanes on the very place of the temple’s θυσιαστήριον (1 Macc 1:59), upon which to immolate pigs: an unbearable desecration stigmatized as βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως “abomination of desolation” (1 Macc 1:54).

Finally, the word βωμός is found once in Sirach in correspondence with *mzbh* (Sir 50:14). Two verses before, in Sir 50:12 βωμός is found in the same context, corresponding to *m^crkwt* (plural form of *ma^carakāh*). This word basically means “rows” and is used in Jdg 6:26 to describe the altar (*mizbēah*) of God (“and build an altar ... in proper order”). The translator’s use of βωμός in Sir 50:12, 14, however, moves decisively away from the pattern described thus far. These occurrences are found in the poetic account of Simon II as high priest officiating in the Jerusalem temple, with reference to the altar of burnt offerings. Moreover, in this very context, the term alternates with θυσιαστήριον (Sir 50:15). The terms are considered here as full synonyms, available to be used according to a taste for variation alien to the Hebrew counterpart. Accordingly, the term βωμός must have been doubtless devoid of any derogatory sense in the view of the translator.

b) *Translated book usage: βωμός as an equivalent of bāmāh/bāmôt.* The use of the term in the Prophetic Books is significantly different from that observed so far, making the picture yet more complicated.

In these books, the word is mainly used as an equivalent of *bāmāh/bāmôt*. This Hebrew word (on the common root → 1.a) is particularly difficult to define, given its poly-

semy and vagueness. Alongside a topological meaning, “physical relief”, which is considered by scholars etymologically primary (see VAUGHAN, *The Meaning of “bāmā”,* 3–9), a metaphorical nuance arises, connected to an idea of excellence as power and supremacy (e.g. Deut 32:13; 33:29; Hab 3:19). Moreover, the term is stably associated with sites of worship located within the boundaries of the land of Canaan and beyond. The significance, the environment, the size and the architectural complexity of these “high place(s)” have been the focus of a lively debate among scholars (see VAUGHAN, *The Meaning of “bāmā”,* 37, and *passim*; GLEIS, *Die Bamah*, 2, and *passim*). The different stances on the *bāmāh* can be roughly summarized as follows: It was an open-air place of worship; it was a temple; it was a shrine; it was a stele or cairn (for the latter interpretation see ALBRIGHT, “The High Place in Ancient Palestine”).

What is certain is that, according to the lexical choices of the Hebrew Bible, these sites are represented not only as widespread, but also as familiar places of worship. The term *bāmāh*, just as *mizbēah*, is used regardless of the exact function of these places. In such a way, one can come across *bāmôt* depicted as “ours” (i.e. Israelite places of worship), as well as “theirs” (i.e. belonging to other peoples, or dedicated to deities other than YHWH).

To the first group belong the *bāmāh* of Zuph associated with the activity of Samuel (cf. 1 Sam 9) and the largest *bāmāh* at Gibeon, where the tent and its external altar built by Moses is located (1 Chr 21:29) and to which king Solomon usually goes up for worship (e.g. 1 Kgs 3:4); in both cases, these installations are described as specifically suitable for animal sacrifices and ritual meals, suggesting the structure of roofed temple buildings (cf. FRIED, “The High Places”, 440). On the other hand, the Moabite shrines belong prototypically to the group of foreign sites (cf. Isa 16:12; Jer 31 [48]:35).

The construction of the Jerusalem temple (and its altar of sacrifice) discredits all the other places of worship. The presence of *bāmôt* will no longer be tolerated (at least in theory). The “high places” thus become the target of condemnation by the prophets, and their systematic destruction will be part of the programme of the reformatory kings Hezekiah and Josiah.

In the cases of *mizbēah* and *bāmāh*, many translators try to introduce some lexical distinction between legitimate and execrable sites, applying different strategies and achieving different effects.

As for the Historical Books, a polar opposition can be traced between the transliterations βαμα (cf. 1 Kgdms [1 Sam] 9:12–14, 19, 25; 1 Chr 16:39; 21:29) and βαμωθ (Num 21:19–20), regarded as positive equivalents, and the nominalization τὰ ὑψηλά (e.g. 3 Kgdms [1 Kgs] 3:2–3; 12:31–32; 13:2, 32–33; 14:23; 4 Kgdms [2 Kgs] 12:4; 2 Chr 11:15; 14:2), conceivable conversely as a derogatory expression (cf. DANIEL, *Vocabulaire du culte*, 51).

Within the Prophetic Books, it is rather the term βωμός that takes on this negative nuance, marking the presence of the sites doomed to destruction due to having been accused of being idolatrous. The βωμοὶ τοῦ γέλωτος (Amos 7:9) and the βωμοὶ Ων (Hos 10:8) pertaining to the northern kingdom, the abovementioned *bāmāh* of Dibon and the related Moabite sites (Isa 15:2; 16:12; Jer 31[48]:35), the βωμός τοῦ Ταφεθ, and the βωμοὶ built to Βααλ, at the southern kingdom, scene of abhorrent human sacrifices (Jer 7:31; Jer 39[32]:35): all these places share the same fate of condemnation.

Moreover, the choice of βωμός, distinguishing the translation of the Prophetic Books from that of the Pentateuch (where we instead find στήλη) and that of the Historical Books (where the expression τὰ ὑψηλά occurs, as already pointed out), seemingly conveys a special conceptualization of the *bāmāh* focused on the sacrificial altar (cf. DANIEL, *Vocabulaire du culte*, 43).

These translators would have drawn upon formulations of cult which derived from familiar prototypes, such as the Jerusalem temple. According to a conceptualization of the temple as “the place where the sacrifice is held” (this representation comes out into the open in the wording *bêt zābah* “house of sacrifice”, to refer to the Jerusalem temple found in 2 Chr 7:12; beyond the biblical tradition, the same expression is evident in an Aramaic inscription from Mount Gerizim, in which the temple is called *byt dbh'*, MGI 199), the translator would have focused on the altar as the most salient and prominent symbol of the sacrificial service. Accordingly, the altar may have operated in the translator’s imagery as a cognitive device particularly suited for understanding and mapping unknown cultic spaces, such as the “high places” (cf. BRANHAM, “Mapping Sacrifice”, 201–202).

c) *Translated book usage: colliding patterns.* In the particular case of the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the systems sketched so far seem to collide. The term βωμός is actually found both as an equivalent of *bāmāh* and of *mizbēah* (e.g. Isa 17:8; Isa 27:9; Jer 11:13). In these cases, the negative value is fully lexicalized, and the noun is clearly associated with the idea of unlawful sites, in the context of reproaches addressed to the people for its compromises with the idolatrous worship. The dynamics of evaluative polarity between βωμός and θυσιαστήριον are once again overtly observable in Isaiah (cf. the usage of θυσιαστήριον in Isa 6:6; 19:19; 56:7; 60:7). The Greek text of Jeremiah, on the other hand, does not provide us with further evidence for this usage, as the term θυσιαστήριον is not attested. Moreover, in this book *mizbēah* occurs only three times, always in connection with idol-worship, and the Greek text is lacking in the only passage in which the term θυσιαστήριον would possibly have fit (i.e. Jer 17:1).

d) *Greek compositions usage.* The derogatory connotation of the term βωμός blurs in the Greek original compositions. Although

it is still used for pagan altars, e.g. those erected in the public squares according to the Hellenistic custom (2 Macc 10:2), the word is employed, without any polemical intent, even for the altar of burnt offerings of the temple of Jerusalem (2 Macc 2:19; 13:8) – this is according to a usage parallel to that highlighted in Sirach (→ 3.a). The Greek plus in Num 3:10, displaying the same phenomenon, has been regarded as an interpolation; this late gloss may have been produced within the same *milieu* as these writings (cf. DANIEL, *Vocabulaire du culte*, 25–26; VAN DER KOOIJ, “On the use of βωμός in the Septuagint”, 604–605).

e) *Realia in translation: cultural and semantic implications.* Let us return to the first question raised: Why did the translators find the Greek word unfitting as an equivalent of *mizbēah*?

The issue seems inextricably linked to the translators’ concern for the purity of sacrificial cult, exhibited by using the word βωμός whenever an illegitimate sacrificial cult actually takes place, or just possibly can (arguably, the same holds true for the equivalence with *bāmāh*). In fact, the spectrum of lexical features observed so far may reveal some special understanding of the temple service that the translators seemingly felt compelled to transmit, alongside those already underlined (e.g. in HAYWARD, “Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch”).

First and foremost purity means unity, and the uniqueness and centrality of the Jerusalem temple seems to be a belief shared by both diaspora Jews and those in Judea (cf. ESHEL/STONE, “Judaism in Palestine in the Hellenistic-Roman Periods”, 95). Nevertheless, performing the sacrificial cult was possible not only outside the Jerusalem temple, but also outside the land of Israel; namely in Egypt, where two Jewish temples, at two different times, were in operation. Papyri and documents from the rabbinic tradition bear witness to the fact that the authorities of Palestinian Judaism were not

only aware of such cult, but also did not regard its practice as schismatic (see the Passover Papyrus from Elephantine, TAD A4.1 [419 B.C.E.]; cf. also A4.9; A4.10 [after 407 B.C.E.]; for the rabbinic discussion about such temples see *b. Menah.* 109b; *b. Abod. Zar.* 52b).

The first temple was built at Elephantine, in the time of the Persian kings (destroyed by a surge in Egyptian nationalism in 410 B.C.E.). From the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E. up to the rebuilding of the Second Temple, Elephantine was actually the sole location where the sacrificial Jewish cult was maintained. A second Jewish temple in Egypt was in operation at Leontopolis, from the middle of the 2nd century B.C.E. up to the year 73 C.E. (cf. Josephus, *Bell.* 7.420–436), which owes its origin to the high priest Onias IV, a refugee in the court of Alexandria during the Maccabean crisis. Rabbinic sources inform us that not only did the sages of the Talmud not condemn this temple as “schismatic”, but also allowed the sacrificial cult to take place there, just as in Jerusalem (cf. MÉLÈZE MODRZEJEWSKI, “Judaism in Egypt”, 203).

Noteworthy is the fact that the LXX translation of the Pentateuch was probably undertaken during the period in which Elephantine was no longer in operation, and Leontopolis was not yet built. While the worship of the Jews was marked by this painful absence, on the other hand, the space around them was punctuated by an incredible number of altars, temples and small shrines widespread throughout Egypt; in addition to this, displays of personal piety were ubiquitous as well. In particular, Alexandria, the largest city of the ancient world, knew the accumulation of cults and religions, to the point that it has been qualified as a “factory of the gods” (cf. DUNAND, “Traditional Religion in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt”, 176). It is not far-fetched to think that such a massive presence of pagan cultic apparatus was possibly perceived and experienced as offensive from a Jewish point

of view. This tension between absence and overexposure may have favored the idealization of the sacrificial cult and its most salient symbol, the altar.

When some change in the surrounding world or the way of experiencing it arises, new concepts consequently arise (cf. BLANK, “Why do new meanings occur?”, 71); once these concepts have been produced, the language has a range of different strategies available to name them, including the semantic shift of an “old” word (in this case the deprecatory nuance in βωμός), and the creation of a “new” word (in this case θυσιαστήριον); both have to be regarded as innovations produced *ad hoc*. By introducing these innovations, the translators of the Pentateuch possibly did not want to change their language (even if, ultimately, they may have contributed to a change), but they wanted only to communicate in a convenient or efficient manner about the entities and the values to which they were referring (cf. KOCH, “Metonymy between pragmatics, reference, and diachrony”, 9).

4. Jewish literature in Greek. In the writings of the historian Eupolemus, the noun βωμός is a normal, non-marked, term for “altar” (fr. 2b.30.5; 34.15). The author uses βωμός and θυσιαστήριον (fr. 2b.30.5; 34.9, 10, 14) probably according to the logic of variation. The same is true for the Greek version of the *Aramaic Levi Document*, which refers to the Jewish altar of all burnt offerings by using βωμός (*Aram. Levi Ath.* 20, 21, 23, 31, 37) and θυσιαστήριον (25, 53) without distinction as a counterpart to the Aramaic *madbah* (as far as extant). The noun is found also in the *Sibylline Oracles*, where it represents the only word for “altar” (*Sib.* 3.273, etc.).

In the writings of Philo and Josephus, the term βωμός is the habitual and, semantically speaking, generic word for each instance of the class “altar”, freely used in the productive discourse of these authors without any evaluative concern. As such, it can refer to any altar that finds its place in the space of a

temenos, beside the other structures belonging to the Greek sacred architecture (Philo, *Decal.* 7; *Spec. leg.* 1.21; *Legat.* 12, 139), or the Roman (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.258), upon which ritual immolations are held (Philo, *Virt.* 135; *Agr.* 130), and where one seeks asylum (Philo, *Fug.* 80) or pleads for pardon (*Somm.* 2.299). It refers to Canaanite altars placed in sacred spaces across the Jordan (Josephus, *Ant.* 4.192), and other altars erected by Jewish people but considered illegitimate in the context of YHWH worship (e.g. the altar built by Solomon ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρῶν and called δειγμάτια τῆς ἀσεβείας “demonstrations of impiety” in Josephus, *Ant.* 8.279, and the altars built by Achaz in Jerusalem, cf. *Ant.* 9.243).

The un-markedness of the term is particularly evident when structures considered appropriate to a legitimate Jewish worship are at stake. The noun βωμός is used for any altar erected for the worship of YHWH. It is used in the context of the sacrifices offered by Cain and Abel (Philo, *Sacr.* 137), for the altars erected by Abraham in the land of Canaan (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.157) and for the altar of the binding of Isaac (Philo, *Somm.* 1.195; *Abr.* 173; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.224, 227), for the altars built by Moses (Josephus, *Ant.* 3.60), by Joshua (Josephus, *Ant.* 5.69), and by Saul (Josephus, *Ant.* 6.121). The practice of engraving words of the Law upon the altar (Josephus, *Ant.* 4.308) also makes it a *monumentum*, which was the case for the one built by the Rubenites beyond the Jordan (see above Josh 22:26–27) and specifically called μνημεῖον (Josephus, *Ant.* 5.100).

With regard to the altars of the Jerusalem temple, it can be argued that βωμός maintains its non-marked meaning. This is confirmed by a gloss provided by Philo, who uses the term βωμός in order to explain the meaning θυσιαστήριον. The latter is certainly understood as a technical term, the use of which is limited to a particular discourse tradition: τὸν δ' ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ βωμὸν εἴωθε καλεῖν θυσιαστήριον, ὡσανεὶ τηρητικὸν καὶ φυλακτικὸν ὄντα θυσίων “it became usual

to call the altar which was in the open air the altar of sacrifice, as being that which preserved and took care of the sacrifices" (Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2.106). In other cases, a further technical term is introduced to indicate the golden altar for incense inside the temple: θυμιατήριον (cf. 2 Chr 26:19; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2.105; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.198). Nevertheless, this pattern of use barely holds up in the writings of Josephus, as the following passage clearly shows: "they lit the lamps that were on the lampstand, and offered incense upon the altar (ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ), and laid the loaves upon the table (ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν), and offered burnt offerings upon the new altar (ἐπὶ τοῦ καινοῦ θυσιαστηρίου)" (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.319).

In fact, the pattern formed by the use of βωμός as a generic term for "altar", θυσιαστήριον for an "altar for burnt offerings" and θυμιατήριον for an "altar for incense" almost never works in discourse production in Jewish literature. The noun βωμός is used for: the incense altar (e.g. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2.94; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.243; 8.104); the altar of sacrifices (e.g. Philo, *Spec. leg.* 1.21; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.207); the impious sacrifice of Antiochus Epiphanes (Josephus, *Ant.* 13.243; *Bell.* 1.34); within descriptions of Jerusalem (Josephus, *Bell.* 5.225); and even for referring to both together without distinction (Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2.94; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.191). In fact, the occurrences of θυσιαστήριον are almost entirely confined to quotations from the LXX; moreover, when the biblical text containing the word is the object of commentaries or allusions, in several cases the term is replaced by βωμός (in a comment on Lev 2:11–12 in Philo, *Congr.* 169; in a comment of Lev 1:5 in Philo, *Spec. leg.* 1.199). The term θυμιατήριον, attested in the LXX and in the epigraphic documentation with the additional meaning of "censer" (cf. Ezek 8:11; 4 Macc 7:11), remains very marginal and polysemic in the writings of Josephus (e.g. *Ant.* 4.32).

5. New Testament. In the NT, the usage of βωμός is very marginal, but still quite sig-

nificant. The word occurs only in Acts 17:23, in the context of Paul's speech at the Areopagus in Athens. He begins with an apparently ostensible compliment, praising the piety of the Greeks (Acts 17:22); nevertheless each term used has the potential for a double meaning, so it may not be a pure *captatio benevolentiae* (cf. БОСК, *Acts*, 564). Firstly, the noun is meant to refer to an instance of the class defined by the generic σεβάσματα "objects of worship". This term occurs twice in the LXX, and in both cases with a critical sense (Wis 14:20; 15:17), in the broader context of the repudiation of fine arts as an invitation to idolatry. Namely, in Wis 14:20 the graven image is meant to be an ἐνεδρον "trap", since people bestow on objects of stone and wood the incommunicable name (cf. Wis 14:21 τὸ ἀκοινώνητον ὄνομα λίθοις καὶ ξύλοις περιέθεσαν).

In the account of Acts 17, Paul addresses the Athenians, saying that he saw an abundance of statues and altars devoted to the worship of many gods, even coming across "an altar with the inscription: 'to an unknown god'" (Acts 17:23; mention of dedications of this type can be found e.g. in Pausanias, *Descr.* 1.1.4; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 6.3). In Paul's (i.e. Luke's) view, such altars end up being an emblem of polytheism, against which he means to address his confrontational speech. All this leads one to think that the term might have been used by the Lukan Paul with a pejorative nuance (possibly concealed for his audience). By assuming a pejorative sense embedded in the words βωμός and σεβάσματα, their usage may produce here an ironic, or even sarcastic, effect.

6. Early Christian literature. In early Christian literature, the presence of the word βωμός is limited to a single occurrence in *1 Clem.* 25.4. First of all, it is worth noting that in this text the expression θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (*1 Clem.* 32.2) expressly refers to the altar of the Levitical priesthood. Nevertheless, the author uses the term βωμός when he describes the myth of the Phoenix;

more precisely, when the young Phoenix is said to leave the land of Arabia and place the remains of its old body (precisely, its father's body) ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ ἡλίου βωμόν "onto the altar of the sun" (1 Clem. 25.4), at Heliopolis. Namely, when Clement comes across monuments of Egyptian worship, the term θυσιαστήριον seems to be simply unsuitable. In any case, the intent of the story is anything but polemic; on the contrary, Clement means to offer evidence (a παράδοξον σημεῖον "wonderful sign", 1 Clem. 25.1) of the possibility of the final resurrection (cf. VAN DEN BROEK, *The Myth of the Phoenix*, 194).

The derogatory sense of βωμός, clear in 1 Maccabees, and plausible in the Acts of the Apostles can be hardly admitted in the case of 1 Clement. Once again it is θυσιαστήριον that presents the features of a marked word, still felt as an *ad hoc* innovation, associated with the discourse tradition which ideally gathers together the translators of the Pentateuch, the author of 1 Maccabees, and the New Testament and early Christian literature. This tradition shares an idealized vision of worship, focused on the uniqueness of the sacrificial altar.

Bibliography:

- W. F. ALBRIGHT, "The High Place in Ancient Palestine", *Volume du Congrès International pour l'étude de l'Ancien Testament, Strasbourg 1956*, ed. G. W. Anderson (VTSup 4), Leiden, 1957, 242–258. ♦ F. ASPESI, "Semitico BM.T e gr. βωμός", *Linguistica e filologia*. Atti del VII Congresso internazionale di linguisti, tenuto a Milano nei giorni 12–14 settembre 1984, ed. G. Bolognesi, V. Pisani, Brescia: Paideia, 1987, 179–186. ♦ A. BERNARD, *De Thèbes à Syène*, Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1989. ♦ A. BLANK, "Why do new meanings occur? A cognitive typology of the motivations for lexical semantic change", *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, ed. A. Blank, P. Koch (CLR 13), Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999, 61–89. ♦ D. BOCK, *Acts* (BECNT), Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007. ♦ K. BOWES, "At Home", *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World*, ed. R. Raja, J. Rüpke (BCAW), Malden, Mass.: Wiley Blackwell, 2015, 209–219. ♦ J. R. BRANHAM, "Mapping Sacrifice on Bodies and Spaces in Late-Antique Judaism and Early Christianity", *Architecture of the Sacred: Space, Ritual, and Experience from Classical Greece to Byzantium*, ed. B. D. Wescoat, R. G. Ousterhout, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 201–230. ♦ R. VAN DEN BROEK, *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (EPRO 24), Leiden: Brill, 1972. ♦ J. P. BROWN, "The Sacrificial Cult and its Critique in Greek and Hebrew (I)", *JSS* 24 (1979), 159–173. ♦ IDEM, "The Sacrificial Cult and its Critique in Greek and Hebrew (II)", *JSS* 25 (1980), 1–21. ♦ W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1985. ♦ T. DREW-BEAR, "Some Greek Words: Part I", *Glotta* 50 (1972), 61–96. ♦ F. DUNAND, "Traditional Religion in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt", *CHRAW* 2 (2013), 165–188. ♦ G. EKROTH, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods* (Kernos.S 12), Liège: Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique, 2002. ♦ E. ESHEL/M. E. STONE, "Judaism in Palestine in the Hellenistic-Roman Periods", *CHRAW* 2 (2013), 87–115. ♦ L. S. FRIED, "The High Places (*bāmôt*) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation", *JAOS* 122 (2002), 437–465. ♦ M. GAIFMAN, "The aniconic image of the Roman Near East", *The Variety of Local Religious Life in the Near East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, ed. T. Kaizer (RGRW 164), Leiden: Brill, 2008, 37–72. ♦ M. GLEIS, *Die Bamah* (BZAW 251), Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1997. ♦ C. T. R. HAYWARD, "Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch", *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. J. Day, London: T & T Clark, 2005, 385–400. ♦ P. W. VAN DER HORST, "Judaism in Asia Minor", *CHRAW* 2 (2013), 321–340. ♦ P. KOCH, "Metonymy between pragmatics, reference, and diachrony", *metaphorik.de* 7 (2004), 6–54. ♦ A. VAN DER KOOIJ, "On the Use of βωμός in the Septuagint", *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. F. J. Baasten, W. T. van Peursen (OLA 118), Leuven: 2003, 601–607. ♦ J. KURYŁOWICZ, *L'apophonie en indo-européen*, Wrocław: Zakład imienia Ossolińskich wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk, 1956. ♦ J. KUBIŃSKA, *Les monuments funéraires dans les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure* (EtTrav 5), Warsaw: PWN Éditions scientifiques

de Pologne, 1968. ♦ J. MÉLÈZE MODRZEJEWSKI, "Judaism in Egypt", *CHRAW* 2 (2013), 189–210. ♦ T. METTINGER, *No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context* (CB.OT 42), Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995. ♦ F. MILLAR, *The Roman Near East: 31 BC–AD 337*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993. ♦ R. RAJA, "Complex Sanctuaries in the Roman Period", *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World*, ed. R. Raja, J. Rüpke (BCAW), Malden: Wiley Blackwell, 2015, 307–319. ♦ C. SFAMENI, "Ὁ βωμὸς μαντείος: altari 'di cenere' e prassi oracolare nei santuari greci", *SMSR* 26 (2002), 5–41. ♦ C. SOURVINOU-INWOOD, "Early sanctuaries,

the eighth century and ritual space: fragments of a discourse", *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, ed. N. Marinatos, R. Hägg, London/New York: Routledge, 1993, 1–17. ♦ E. STERN, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible, Vol. 2: The Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian Periods (732–332 B.C.E.)* (ABRL), New York: Doubleday, 2001. ♦ F. R. TROMBLEY, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370–529*, Vol. 2, Leiden: Brill, 1994. ♦ P. H. VAUGHAN, *The Meaning of "bāmā" in the Old Testament* (SOTSMS 3), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974. ♦ C. G. YAVIS, *Greek Altars: Origins and Typology*, St. Louis: St. Louis University Press, 1949.

ROMINA VERGARI

Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint (HTLS)

Edited by
Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten

This large-scale collective and interdisciplinary project aims to produce a new research tool: a multi-volume dictionary providing an article of between two and ten pages (around 600 articles in all) for each important word or word group of the Septuagint. Filling an important gap in the fields of ancient philology and religious studies, the dictionary is based on original research of the highest scientific level.

The dictionary will consist of four volumes and all articles are written in English. The first volume is to be published in 2018; three volumes of the same size are scheduled to follow between 2020 and 2028.

Each volume will be available at a single volume's price. The subscription price on the four volumes will be approx. 15 percent below the single volume's price.

Volume 1

2018. Ca. 700 pages

ISBN 978-3-16-150747-2 cloth ca. € 225.00;

subscription price: ISBN 978-3-16-150748-9 cloth ca. € 190.00

(November 2018)

Mohr Siebeck

P.O. Box 2040

72074 Tübingen/Germany

E-mail: info@mohr.de

www.mohr.de/htls