

Lucia Prauscello

THE USE OF ΠΥΡΟΩ IN THE SEPTUAGINT,
AND ITS VALUE FOR *ESTHER*,
ADDITION D 5*

Vetero-testamentary scholarship has long recognised the existence of structural and linguistic affinities between the book of *Esther* and *3 Maccabees* (and, to a lesser degree, *2 Maccabees*). These similarities have usually been deployed to establish some kind of filiation or dependency of one book (or part thereof) from the other.¹ In 2022 Jonathan Thambyrajah has made a strong case for the importance of extending the comparison with *3 Maccabees* to the *Vetus Latina* (*VL*) of *Esther*, rather than to the *Esther* of the LXX. Thambyrajah’s conclusion (mainly based on the plus material shared by the *VL* of *Esther* and the Additions B, C and E) is that “it is probable that the direction of borrowing of the additional material as a whole is from a version of *Esther* – ancestor to the *Vetus Latina*, the Armenian, and the Georgian – into *3 Maccabees*”.² If Thambyrajah’s inference is correct, this has important repercussions on the validity of using linguistic similarities between the Greek extant texts of *Esther* (the LXX and the Alpha Text recensio) and *3 Maccabees* in attempting to determine the direction of the supposed borrowing.³ In what follows linguistic similarities will not be employed to draw inferences on

* Wherever possible I have quoted the text of the Septuagint according to the Göttingen edition. For those books still awaiting publication in the Göttingen series I have used the text by Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹ Cf. e.g. the overview offered by Hacham 2007.

² Thambyrajah 2022, 714.

³ Thambyrajah 2022, 715: “this greatly complicates any approach based on comparison of specific vocabulary, as well as any claims that the exact parallels occur only in the additions; without the Greek *Vorlage* to the *Vetus Latina*, it is impossible to evaluate such claims”. For the Greek *Vorlage* of the *VL*, traceable to a Greek source text (the so-called *La-GrIII*) other than LXX and AT and datable “sometime between 120 and 100 BCE at the latest”, see Haelewyck 2020.

the priority of either book, but to show, via an unnoticed affinity in the use of the verb *πυρόω* with 2 and 3 *Maccabees* (both originally written in Greek, that is, lacking a semitic *Vorlage* not because this is lost but because it never existed), that the semantics and syntax of *πυρόω* in Addition D 5 to *Esther* is compatible with an original Greek composition of that addition. The comparative approach here adopted remains, therefore, methodologically valid.

Before analysing the use of *πυρόω* in *Esther*, namely in the Addition D 5, against the wider background of its Septuagintal context, let us very succinctly sketch the textual transmission of the book of *Esther*, whose translation is usually dated to the late 2nd century or early 1st century BCE.⁴ *Esther* has come down to us in two Greek recensions: the Septuagint (*Esth* LXX: for some scholars preserving the older Greek version), and the so-called Alpha Text (AT), found in only 4 manuscripts of the Septuagint.⁵ Both the LXX and the AT include 6 Additions (A, B, C, D, E, F) which are not present in the Masoretic text and that up to now have not been found in any form in the other semitic transmissions of *Esther* (Talmud, the Targums and the Syriac version).⁶ Scholars debate whether these additions are original Greek compositions or translations of a semitic *Vorlage*; so far, consensus has been reached only for Additions B and E: on lexical and syntactical grounds both are unanimously deemed to be “compositional Greek”.⁷ This paper will argue that in *Esther* Addition D 5 καὶ ἄρας τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένον (ἐν) δόξῃ (i) the metaphorical use of *πυρόω* directly applied to a person experiencing

⁴ The dating is mostly based on “ideological considerations”, since *Esther* shares many themes and structural similarities with 3 *Macc*: see Boyd-Taylor 2015, 205, 213–214. For the general situation of anxiety about the relationship between Jewish people and gentiles common to both *Esther* and 3 *Maccabees*, see Hacham 2007, 781–5.

⁵ The relationship between the two recensions is hotly debated: the predominant view “denies that one version of Greek *Esther* is a straightforward recension of the other” (Boyd-Taylor 2015, 211). On the most complex textual transmission of the book of *Esther*, in Hebrew and Greek, see also De Troyer 2018 and 2020.

⁶ See Jobes 1996, 162–165; Smith – De Troyer 2021.

⁷ On the textual history of the Additions, see the detailed and balanced treatment by Jobes 1996, 25–28 and her ch. 4 (for D esp. 166–170) together with the recent survey by Smith – De Troyer 2021 with further bibliography.

a given emotion represents a marked deviation from the “standard” use of that verb in the Septuagint; (ii) that this usage finds a significant parallel, syntactically and semantically, in 2 and 3 *Maccabees*, that is, in books of the Scriptures which are unanimously considered to have been composed *ab initio* in Greek and that instantiate an examples of high literary koine of the time; (iii) this usage of πυρόω in the passive voice to denote an “incensed” state of mind in relation to a given experience has a distinguished literary pedigree within Greek literature and should be added to the features supporting a possible Greek origin for Addition D.

Contrary to what one might think, πυρόω is not a very common verb.⁸ A quick comparison via a *TLG* online search makes clear that, at least in literary texts of the archaic and classical period, the frequency of the verb πυρόω in all its semantic nuances is significantly lower than that of some of its synonyms (e.g. καίω, ἐμπύρημι). Down to the 5th and early 4th century BCE πυρόω is mainly, but not uniquely, attested in poetic texts (4x in Aeschylus [including *PV*], 1x in Sophocles, 12x in Euripides; 1x in Astydamas, 4th BCE),⁹ 10x in the Hippocratic writings,¹⁰ 2x in Herodotus (Hdt. 7. 8. 27 and 8. 102. 3) and 3x in the Platonic corpus (Pl. *Tim.* 51 b 4, 52 d 5, [*Axioch.*] 372 a 2). These early attestations cover a wide gamut of semantic possibilities, such as the burning of sacrificial offerings, the incinerating of buildings and cities, the warming up of liquids, the cooking of food, the burning alive of persons, the cremation of dead bodies, the stirring up of emotions, or the process known in metallurgy as cupellation (fire-refining). The earliest extant example, for us, of the figurative use of πυρόω directly applied to a person experiencing an overwhelming emotion is Aesch. *Ag.* 481. The chorus’ rhetorical question at Aesch. *Ag.* 479–483 “Who is so childish or so stricken out of his senses as to have his heart fired up by the message of the

⁸ This section relies on Prauscello 2026 a (forthcoming).

⁹ Aesch. *Ag.* 440, 480, fr. **281. 4 Radt, [*PV*] 497; Eur. *Cyc.* 594, 600, *Med.* 1190, *Andr.* 400, *Tr.* 1283, *IT* 685, *Hel.* 1354, *Phoe.* 575, *Or.* 1543, [*Rh.*] 61, fr. 223. 111, 781. 261 K; Soph. *Ant.* 286; Astydamas fr. **1 h. 2 Snell.

¹⁰ *De diaet. morb. acut.* 17. 12, *De mul. aff.* ii 206. 39, *Epid.* 7. 1. 3. 4, *De diaet.* i 20. 3 and i 40. 4, *De diaet.* ii 42. 10, 56. 10 and 56. 15, *De corde* 1. 6, *De flat.* 8. 24 v. 1. (all texts are cited according to Littré’s edition and numeration).

flame when it was fresh, and then to wilt when the talk changes?”¹¹ is used as a foil to indirectly censure Clytaemestra’s unbridled mental excitement caused by the beacon-signals. At 480–481 Clytaemestra’s state of mind is compared to that of a person φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν | νέοις πυρωθέντα καρδίαν: this emotional “fire” is qualified by both the accusative of relation καρδίαν and by the source triggering that emotion, the recent tidings by fire-messages sent from Troy, thus extending and enriching the fire imagery that plays such an important role in the first part of the drama.¹² In the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE we have a surge of occurrences of πυρόω in prose, especially in technical writings (41x in the Aristotelian corpus; 41x in Theophrastus), with some instances continuing to appear in poetic texts.¹³

The Septuagint, with its 28 occurrences (if we include the apocrypha and deuterocanonical writings), clearly shares in this trend but it does so very much on its own terms. In 20 cases out of 28 πυρόω carries the specific meaning of ‘refining / testing through fire’, either in a literal way (cupellation: 5x) or figuratively in the sense of ‘refining’ > ‘proving true’ (be it of individuals, Israel as the god-chosen nation, or the Lord’s ‘tested’ and thus unerring word: 15x).¹⁴

¹¹ τίς ὄδε παιδὸν ἢ φρενῶν κεκομμένος | φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν | νέοις πυρωθέντα καρδίαν ἔπειτ’ | ἀλλαγῆ λόγου καμειῖν; (text and translation after Sommerstein 2009, 56–57).

¹² See Medda 2018 ii, 293 with bibliography, who rightly defends the appropriateness of the metaphor of the inflamed heart against the scepticism of some scholars who would prefer to emend the text.

¹³ Theoc. *Id.* 24. 96, Leonidas *AP* 7. 466 = 71. 2 *HE*, and *AP* 7. 408 = 58. 5–6 *HE*, Eratosth. *Hermes* fr. 16. 8 *CA*, Parthenius fr. 27. 6 Lightfoot, Lycophr. 52 and 1371, Augustus’ *ex tempore* iambic trimeter in Suet. *Vit. Aug.* 98, and *PMG* adesp. 989, where πεπυρωμένον is Bergk’s correction for the *voces nihili* transmitted by the mss (ΠΥΩΜΕΝΟΝ in cod. A and ΠΥΟ^ΩΜΕΝΟ^Ω in cod. B). *PMG* adesp. 989 is of uncertain date, but the metre may suggest a Hellenistic date, as indirectly hinted by Davies 2021, 331.

¹⁴ 2 *Regn* 22. 31 (= *MT* 2 *Sam* 22. 31) τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου ... πεπυρωμένον, *Jdt* 8:27 ἐπύρωσεν εἰς ἔτασμον τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, *Ps* 11. 7 τὰ λόγια κυρίου ... ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον, *Ps* 16. 3 ἐπύρωσάς με, *Ps* 17. 31 τὰ λόγια κυρίου πεπυρωμένα, *Ps* 25. 2 πύρωσον τοὺς νεφροὺς μου καὶ τὴν καρδίαν μου, *Ps* 65. 10 (2x) ἐπύρωσας (sc. ἡμᾶς) ὡς πυροῦται τὸ ἀργύριον, *Ps* 104. 19 τὸ λόγιον κυρίου ἐπύρωσεν αὐτόν, *Ps* 118. 140 πεπυρωμένον τὸ λόγιόν σου, *Pron* 10. 20 ἄργυρος πεπυρωμένος, *Pron* 30. 5 πάντες λόγοι θεοῦ πεπυρωμένοι, *Job* 22. 25 ὡς πεπυρωμένον, *Ps. Sal* 17. 43 τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένα, *Is* 1. 25 πυρώσω σε εἰς καθαρὸν, *Zach* 13. 9 (2x) πυρώσω αὐτούς, ὡς πυροῦται τὸ

Of these 20 occurrences of πύρω meaning ‘refining / testing through fire’, we can check the Hebrew equivalent in the Masoretic text for 18 of them.¹⁵ In the overwhelming majority of cases (16 out of the 18 above mentioned),¹⁶ the Hebrew corresponding verb is always צָרַף (*tsāraph*: Strong’s H6884) ‘to smelt, refine, test’, a verb frequently used to specifically indicate either God’s trusted word or the testing of his own people’s faith.¹⁷ Such a level of lexical correspondence between Hebrew צָרַף and Greek πύρω is remarkable, especially if one keeps in mind the different translation styles of the various books of the Septuagint. Therefore, if the Septuagint almost uniformly translates צָרַף with πύρω, it is not because, as Fraenkel and others thought, this rendition is a Hebraism, but because πύρω was already the *vox propria* in Greek for ‘testing / refining through fire’.¹⁸ What is distinctive of the Septuagint is not the use of πύρω in the sense ‘to test / refine through fire’ *per se*, but its extension, no doubt favoured by close association between God and fire in Judaism, to indicate God’s trusted, proven word and the testing of his people’s faith. This Septuagintal nuance draws on the Greek technical meaning of πύρω in metallurgy and inflects it with Jewish overtones: a Greek word with Jewish connotations.

In these 16 occurrences of the term for which we have a Hebrew *Vorlage* πύρω is never employed with reference to the burning of emotions. This is not because the Hebrew Bible did not associate

ἀργύριον, *Jer* 9. 6 ἐγὼ πύρωσω αὐτούς, *Dan* 11. 35 τοῦ πύρωσαι αὐτούς, *Dan* 12. 10 (Theodotion version) ἐκλεγῶσιν καὶ ἐκλευκανθῶσιν καὶ πύρωθῶσιν.

¹⁵ For *Ps.Sal* 17.43 no Hebrew *Vorlage* survives, cf. Salvesen 2021, 395. Possibly no original Hebrew text ever existed for *Jdt* 8. 27; contemporary scholarship seems to incline for Greek as the language of composition around the 1st half of the 1st century BCE: see Salvesen 2021, 391.

¹⁶ The two exceptions are *Prov* 10. 20 (where we find the root בָּחַר *bāḥar* ‘to try, to select’, cf. Strong’s H977) and *Job* 22. 25 (where the fem. noun כֶּסֶף is used for silver: cf. Strong’s H8443).

¹⁷ In the Hebrew bible fire imagery represents the norm through which God’s epiphany actively manifests itself. In this sense, fire can be a means both of destruction / punishment and of purification / testing. Hence, πύρω in the LXX and New Testament is an umbrella term covering both the ‘fire of judgement’ (like the refiner’s fire), by which all are presumably tested, and the fire which awaits those who do not pass the test (they are not ‘refined’ but completely burnt away): see Elms 2014 and Hollander 1994.

¹⁸ See Prauscello 2026 b (forthcoming).

certain emotions (above all wrath, outrage, humiliation, suffering) with an inner burning, quite the contrary. In ancient Hebrew emotions are often described in terms of physical sensations or actions: emotion as an autonomous conceptual category is in fact almost non-existent in ancient Judaism.¹⁹ In fact, it is often pointed out that the Hebrew Bible has an extremely rich and diversified lexicon of grief and anger, based on various semitic roots meaning ‘to get hot, to burn’:

1) בָּעַר (*bā’ar*: Strong’s H1197), ‘to burn up, to kindle’, often used intransitively with reference to the out-bursting of emotions (e.g. anger, wrath, but also religious zeal). The Septuagint most regularly translates בָּעַר with *καίω* (‘to burn’) and its derivatives (*ἐκκαίω*, *κατακαίω*),²⁰ except for *Ps* 18. 8 where we have *ἀνάπτομαι* (‘to kindle’); it is never translated with *πυρόω*.

2) הָרָה (*hārāh*: Strong’s H2374), ‘to be hot, to burn’. The important study by Seri-Levi 2024 shows that the lexeme is not limited to anger (divine and human) but covers a broader semantic field: for example, the idiom הָרָה לְ, imperfectly rendered at times in the Septuagint by the Greek *λυπέω* (‘to distress’),²¹ is used to describe ‘the experience of being insulted, or humiliated’ or ‘unjustly treated’.²²

3) קָמַר (*kāmar*: Strong’s H3648) ‘to be or grow warm’, figuratively used 3x in the MT in the sense of ‘to be deeply moved by a passion’ (love, anger, compassion), and 1x in the literal sense (at *Lam* 5. 10, said of the skin growing hot and parched because of a famine). There is no fixed rendition of it in the Septuagint: at *Gen.* 43. 30 the Niphal perfect נִקְמְרוּ is translated with *συνεστρέφετο* (Joseph’s gut ‘were twisted’); at 1 Kings 3. 26 of the MT (= LXX 3 *Regn* 3. 26) the rendition is *ἐταράχθη* (‘was stirred’), just as at *Hos* 11. 8 *συνεταράχθη*.

4) הָמַם (*hāmam*: Strong’s H2552), ‘to be hot’, used figuratively for a state of intense emotion, e.g. of spiritual fervour at *Ps* 39. 3, rendered in LXX *Ps* 38. 4 with *ἐθερμάνθη* (‘was warmed’). Other Greek renditions involve the verb *θάλπω* (‘to heat’): *πυρόω* is never used.

¹⁹ See above all Milstein 2024 and Mirguet 2016 and 2019.

²⁰ See Margolis 1906.

²¹ Seri-Levi 2024, 259 n. 17 with further bibliography for this rare rendering.

²² On the verb *hārāh* and the noun *hāron* to denote ‘the heat of God’s wrath’, and more generally on the Greek words employed in the Septuagint for God’s wrath, see especially Rajak 2009, 191–192.

5) חָמַד (yāham: Strong's H3179), 'to be hot, to conceive'; used metaphorically of passions (love, anger), cf. e.g. MT *Deut* 19. 6 = LXX παρατεθερμάνονται τῇ καρδίᾳ ('they were warmed in their heart'). Once again, yāham is never translated with πυρόω.

The Septuagint's books for which a Hebrew *Vorlage* is extant, then, do know the metaphorical use of burning with reference to emotions, but avoid employing Greek πυρόω for it (πυρόω being the standard LXX equivalent for Hebrew חָמַד) with absolute lexical consistency, and this across different books translated at different times and by different interpreters.

So far, we saw that in the Septuagint πυρόω, in 20 cases out of 28, means 'to refine / test through fire'. What does happen in the remaining 8 occurrences? These eight occurrences are thus distributed: 4x in 2 *Macc* (4. 38 πυρωθεὶς τοῖς θυμοῖς 'inflamed with rage', 10. 3 καὶ πυρώσαντες λίθους 'having made stones red hot', 10. 35 πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυμοῖς 'inflamed with rage', 14. 45 πεπυρωμένος τοῖς θυμοῖς 'inflamed with rage'), 1x in 3 *Macc* (4. 2 στεναγμοῖς πεπυρωμένης πάντοθεν αὐτῶν τῆς καρδίας 'their heart being utterly inflamed by their lamentations'), 2x in 4 *Macc* (9. 17 πυροῦτέ μου τὰς σάρκας 'burn my flesh' and 11. 19 ὀβελίσκους ὀξεῖς πυρώσαντες 'having made the sharp spits red hot'),²³ and 1x in the book of *Esther*, in what is known as the Addition D, preserved in two different recensions, *Esth* LXX D 5. 7 καὶ ἄρας τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένον δόξῃ and the so-called Alpha Text (AT) D 5. 5 καὶ ἄρας τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένον ἐν δόξῃ ('and having raised his face inflamed by / in glory').²⁴ If we omit the two passages in 4 *Macc* and 2 *Macc* 10. 3, where πυρόω is active and used in the concrete sense of 'setting to fire', we remain with 5 passages where the voice of πυρόω is always passive and is used figuratively to express emotions.

2 *Maccabees*, from which come 3 of the 5 passages with πυρόω employed figuratively to indicate an emotion of overwhelming intensity, is made, in its transmitted form, of several documents of different origin: the two prefatory letters are generally considered by scholars to derive from (lost) Hebrew originals, whereas the main narrative

²³ In both cases πυρόω refers to the penalty (burning alive) commonly applied to rebels.

²⁴ The subject is king Ahasuerus receiving Esther. See below.

part (2. 19 – 15. 39) represents an abridgment of a lost 5-book long history written in Greek by a certain Jason of Cyrene, otherwise unknown.²⁵ The question of which parts of the précis come from the ‘epitomator’ and which from the alleged author (Jason) is a debated issue, as also is the possible presence of additional sources used by the epitomator himself for some of the episodes.²⁶ As to its date, scholars have generally accepted a dating in the late second or first century BCE, but Schwartz has recently favoured a date closer to the real events narrated (185–161 BCE).²⁷ The Greek of *2 Maccabees*, at least for the passages that concern us (that is, *not* the two prefatory epistles), be it that of the epitomator or of Jason of Cyrene, is, to use the terminology of Septuagintal scholars, “compositional Greek”: that is, a Hebrew *Vorlage* never existed, an impression corroborated also by the high level of linguistic and stylistic attainment of *2 Maccabees* as a whole.²⁸ Its rich lexicon (with many neologisms), its penchant for syntactical variation and its rhetorical resourcefulness have attracted critical attention:²⁹ scholars have especially focused on how style and lexical choices are used to involve the reader at a deep emotional level (the book has long been considered a pristine example of the so-called “pathetic Hellenistic historiography”). Outrage and wrath, in particular, are important themes in the book:³⁰ they serve to highlight both the savage nature of Antiochus IV (cf. *2 Macc* 4. 38 *πυρωθεῖς τοῖς θυμοῖς*)³¹

²⁵ For a concise but highly informative survey of the question, see Shaw 2015.

²⁶ See the thorough treatment by Schwartz 2008, 16–37.

²⁷ For the traditional date see Shaw 2015, 275–277; for a composition in the second quarter of the second century BCE, see Schwartz 2008, 11–15 with the relevant comments by Shaw 2009.

²⁸ See Shaw 2015, 277–280, and 2016, Schwartz 2008, 67–84: both Shaw and Schwartz consider the Greek of *2 Maccabees* as a high instantiation of literary koine; in this direction see now also Cerroni 2024.

²⁹ On neologisms, see Domazakis 2018. On rhetorical devices, esp. metaphors, see Nicklas 2015.

³⁰ In his study of *1* and *4 Maccabees* Mermelstein 2021 has shown how Jewish authors troped emotions of anger and outrage as a form of resistance against the dominant political power of the time, thus empowering the Jewish community through a sense of identity formation and belonging.

³¹ What is described here is Antiochus IV’s reaction against Andronicus at the news of Onias’ death. Cf. also *2 Macc* 9. 7 *πῦρ πνέων τοῖς θυμοῖς* (again Antiochus IV).

and the valiant character of the Hasmonean resistance (2 *Macc* 10. 35 πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυμοῖς³² and 2 *Macc* 14. 45 πεπυρωμένος τοῖς θυμοῖς³³). For our purposes, let us observe that in all these three passages we find πυρόω in the passive voice and the verb is qualified by a dative (τοῖς θυμοῖς)³⁴ indicating the cause of the ‘fire within’, just as in Aesch. *Ag.* 481.

As for 3 *Maccabees*, its composition is widely regarded to have taken place between the end of the 2nd century BCE and the early Roman rule in Egypt, with a narrower time-window of ca. 100–30 BCE preferred by some.³⁵ It is also unanimously considered an original Greek composition, authored by a Greek-speaking Jew, possibly from Alexandria. Its language and style suggest that 3 *Maccabees* belongs to the high end of the literary koine of the time.³⁶ Its author shows a marked preference for “elaborately constructed sentences, in which a relatively spare structure with a small number of finite verbs is expanded upon by piling up participial clauses, prepositional phrases, and literary epithets”.³⁷ A direct instantiation of this style is the very passage that concerns us, 3 *Macc* 4. 2, portraying the Jews’ desperate reaction to Ptolemy Philopator’s letter ordering their extermination:

³² The subjects are twenty Maccabean youths enraged at the blasphemies thrown at them by the besieged troops of Timothy.

³³ Razis, one of the elders of Jerusalem and a martyr to the cause of the Maccabees, commits a pre-emptive suicide rather than surrender to Nicanor: “still alive and burning with rage” (ἔτι δὲ ἔμπνοος ὑπάρχων καὶ πεπυρωμένος (a minority of MSS of the Lucianic text read πεπυρωμένοις) τοῖς θυμοῖς, he bares his innards and distributes them to the mob.

³⁴ The use of the plural θυμοί (possibly to indicate distinct fits of anger) instead of the singular θυμός is not earlier than Plato (the plural in *Soph. Aj.* 718 is rightly rejected by Finglass 2011, 351, who defends Hermann’s θυμοῦ). For the post-classical use of θυμοί in the plural, see Thayer 1889, s.v. 1 plural θυμοί. Outside these passages in the *Maccabees*, the syntagm πυροῦμαι (passive) + θυμῶ or a preposition + θυμός occurs only 3 times: 1x in Isaac of Niniveh (7th century CE) in the Greek translation of his *Ascetic homilies* (the original is in Syriac), *Hom.* 5. 483 μὴ πυρωθῆς τῷ θυμῷ κατ’ αὐτοῦ, 1x in the *Synodicon vetus* (written after 886/7 CE) 102. 6 θυμῶ ἐκ φθόνου μεγίστῳ πυροῦμενοι, and 1x in the 12th century Byzantine theologian Euthymius Zigabenus, *Comm. in psalt.* col. 441l. 6 ὑβριζόμενος, ἐπυρώθη ὑπὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ.

³⁵ See Salvesen 2021, 394 and Johnson 2015, 294–295.

³⁶ See Johnson 2015, 297 and Orth 2016.

³⁷ Johnson 2015, 298.

τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις ἄληκτον πένθος ἦν καὶ πανόδυρτος μετὰ δακρύων βοή στεναγμοῖς πεπυρωμένης³⁸ πάντοθεν αὐτῶν τῆς καρδίας ὀλοφυρομένων τὴν ἀπροσδόκητον ἐξαίφνης αὐτοῖς ἐπικριθεῖσαν ὀλεθρίαν.³⁹ As observed by N. C. Croy, “here and in the following verses, the author ransacks the thesaurus of grief”.⁴⁰ One tessera of this “tableau of unmitigated anguish” (Croy) is the description of “their heart utterly inflamed by wailing”: quite independently from whether we take τῆς καρδίας as the anatomical organ and understand πεπυρωμένης in its technical medical meaning,⁴¹ or interpret both in a looser way, here too the passive participle πεπυρωμένης is qualified by the dative στεναγμοῖς.

This takes us to the last of our five passages, the Addition D to the book of *Esther*. Addition D relates Esther’s audience with the king Ahasuerus: what in the Hebrew Bible are two verses (*Esther* MT 5. 1–2: the appearance of Esther before the king sitting on his throne in the inner court of the palace), in D becomes a 16 verse-long narrative expansion dramatising Esther’s fear before the sovereign. At the sight of Ahasuerus, who, sitting on the throne clad in royal garbs interwoven with gold and precious stones, looks fiercely at her because of her unexpected entrance, Esther faints away. The section of the text that concerns us (the king’s reaction at Esther unannounced appearance)⁴² is the following.

³⁸ MS 62 erroneously reads πεπυρωμένοις, by attraction to the preceding word στεναγμοῖς.

³⁹ “Yet among the Judeans there was indescribable grief and a mournful outburst of tears, their hearts altogether inflamed from groaning, as they bewailed the unforeseen destruction suddenly decreed for them” (*NETS* transl.)

⁴⁰ Croy 2006, 73.

⁴¹ Cf. e.g. Grimm 1857, 250: “durch die Anstrengung, die das Herz (im physischen Sinne) in unaufhörlichen Seufzern machte, war dasselbe ganz und gar entzündet”.

⁴² Ahasuerus had given order that whoever approached him unsummoned, should perish, except for those towards whom he would hold his sceptre. Moore’s statement (Moore 1977, 218) that “the reason for the king’s anger is expressly given only in the O(ld)L(atin)” is correct, yet the broader context (both in the MT at *Esther* 4:11 and in the Greek versions D 6 and 10) is in itself sufficient to make clear to the reader the reason for Esther’s fear. The *VL* includes the rage of the king, the simile to a bull (as in AT) and the explicit reference to the reason for his rage (*et iratus cogitabat iam p(er)dere eam. Et erat suspensa clamans. Et dix(it) rex: Quis ausus est introire in aula(m) non uocatus?*).

Esther LXX D 5. 7:

καὶ ἄρας τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένον δόξῃ ἐν ἀκμῇ θυμοῦ
ἔβλεψεν καὶ ἔπεσεν ἡ βασίλισσα

and when he raised his face inflamed with glory he looked [at her]
in the full blaze of his anger and the queen fainted.

Esther AT D 5. 5:

καὶ ἄρας τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένον ἐν δόξῃ ἐνέβλεψεν
αὐτῇ ὡς ταῦρος ἐν ἀκμῇ θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐφοβήθη ἡ βασίλισσα

and when he raised his face inflamed in glory, he looked at her
like a bull in the full blaze of his anger and the queen was taken
by fear.

The semantics of the expression πρόσωπον πεπυρωμένον δόξῃ / ἐν δόξῃ is not immediately transparent. C. Cavalier⁴³ has perceptively observed that it is not only δόξα (‘glory’, ‘majesty’, often with reference to its external manifestation, clothes included) that motivates the flushing of the king’s face but “possibly also the proximity of the notion of anger” (ἐν ἀκμῇ θυμοῦ), a remark which brings the *Esther* passage quite close to those of 2 and 3 *Maccabees* quoted above.

The variation between the two recensions of the Addition D for the portion which interests us is very limited:⁴⁴ in AT we have the participle πεπυρωμένον qualified by a prepositional construal (ἐν δόξῃ), whereas in LXX we read πεπυρωμένον δόξῃ (simple dative).⁴⁵ K. Jobes⁴⁶ already observed, correctly in my view, that this difference is most likely to be traced back to scribal mistakes: “Some dative phrases differ between the texts only because of the presence or absence of the preposition ἐν (e.g. AT:5:5 c [that is our passage]). These types of differences show no deliberate Tendenz, reflect no

⁴³ Cavalier 2012, 188.

⁴⁴ Among the Additions, D is the one showing the least degree of redactional activity between the LXX and the AT texts: see Jobes 1996, 165, 167.

⁴⁵ The corrector of MS 392 adds ἐν before δόξῃ in the LXX recension.

⁴⁶ Jobes 1996, 167.

variant Vorlage, and probably originated with scribes during the transmission of the Greek texts after addition D was copied from one version to the other”.⁴⁷

Once again, the passive perfect participle *πεπυρωμένον* is qualified (by the dative *δόξῃ* in LXX; by the prepositional construal *ἐν δόξῃ* in AT; but see above on the likelihood that *ἐν* in AT is an error of the transmission). In Addition D of *Esther* we thus have the same syntactical construction that we found in 2 and 3 *Maccabees*, that is, books that have been originally composed in Greek. To my mind, the metaphorical use of *πυρόω* referring to emotions and its syntax, so consistently divergent from the Septuagintal use of the same verb in the books for which we have a Hebrew *Vorlage*,⁴⁸ should be added to the linguistic markers suggesting that the Greek of Addition D is “compositional Greek” too. This, of course, does not mean to deny that the Greek of *Esther* D 5 is steeped in Jewish culture and resorts to what are considered standard lexical Hebraisms: a case in point is its use of *δόξα* as ‘glory’, the Septuagintal most frequent rendition for *כְּבוֹד* (‘glory’, ‘majesty’: Strong’s H3513) and its synonyms *הוֹד* (‘honour’, ‘splendour’: Strong’s H1935) and *רְדָה* (‘adornment’, ‘splendour’: Strong’s H1925). Likewise, just a few verses before, that is, at D 5. 1, we are told that Esther, in order to appear before the king in all her splendour, “put on her glory” (*Esther*

⁴⁷ This is even more likely if one considers that in the AT we have *ἐνέβλεψεν* and not *ἔβλεψεν*: the scribe, either under dictation or reading from his antigraph, might simply have anticipated *ἐν*. That is, *ἐν* + dative of the AT at D 5. 7 must not be understood as a Hebraising rendering of the preposition *בְּ* by which Hebrew and Aramaic usually express the locative and instrumental value that in Greek is more often represented by the simple dative.

⁴⁸ De Troyer 2019 dwells on the external appearance of the king in the Greek versions of *Esther* (terrible to behold, glaring in his glory) and sees in it an allusion to his almost-divine stature. This may well be, but De Troyer is unconvincing when she states that the use of the participle *πεπυρωμένον* is an explicit marker of this divine status: “When he lifts his face, he is flushed with splendor. In Kaige 2 Sam 22:31, the same attribute is used to describe God (*πεπυρωμένον*). Similarly, in OGP 11:7; 18:30; 119: 140; OGProv 30:5—again said of God, albeit that his true followers can also receive the same characteristic (e.g. OGZach 13:8; OGDan 11:35)” (De Troyer 2019, 74). De Troyer fails to notice that the use of *πεπυρωμένον* in *Esther* Addition D, as in 2 and 3 *Maccabees*, is alien, linguistically, to the *συνήθεια* of the Septuagintal books for which we have a Hebrew *Vorlage*.

LXX D 5. 1 περιβάλετο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῆς) or, in the AT version, “put on the garments of glory” (*Esther* AT D 5.1 περιβάλετο τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης). As observed by Cavalier,⁴⁹ the expression clearly draws from the common biblical image “clothed in splendour”: the AT text is either “glossing” the inner working of this Hebrew metaphor (τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης) or alluding to the apocryphal *Psalms of Solomon* 11:7 ἔνδυσαι, Ἱερουσαλημ, τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης σου, the only other occurrence in the Septuagint of this expression,⁵⁰ yet the syntax is entirely Greek. In Addition D 5 too, δόξα, a clear Hebraism from the point of view of the lexicon, is embedded within a metaphor and a syntactical construal (πυροῦμαι + dative or + prepositional construction) that is not otherwise attested in the Septuagint, which, as we have seen, has a very specific use of metaphorical πυρόω.

To sum up, we have seen that among the 5 occurrences of πυρόω, in the Septuagint, that are *not* modelled on the metal-working metaphor (‘to smelt’ > ‘to test by fire’ > ‘to refine’) and that do *not* employ the verb in its literal sense, that is, LXX *Esth* D 5. 7 / AT D 5. 5, 2 *Macc* 4. 38, 10. 35, 14. 45, and 3 *Macc* 4. 2, (i) the voice of the verb is always passive; (ii) πυροῦμαι is always syntactically qualified by either a dative or a prepositional construction: (ἐν) δόξῃ, τοῖς θυμοῖς, στεναγμοῖς; (iii) this use is attested in compositions or portion of texts for which there is no extant Hebrew original since they were in origin Greek compositions (this is certain for 2 and 3 *Maccabees*); (iv) these texts, with the exception of *Esther*, were *not* part of the Hebrew canon; (v) they are all nearly coeval and clearly influenced ideologically by the spirit of the Maccabean revolt. This seems to me to be, both singularly and cumulatively, evidence enough to justify the assertion that the metaphorical use of πυροῦμαι + dative or prepositional construction with reference to an emotional state of mind that we find in these texts represents a clear semantic and syntactical divergence from the overwhelming use of πυρόω in the sense of ‘testing / refining through fire’, the sense otherwise attested in the other books of the Septuagint. The fact that in Addition D 5 both extant versions of the Greek texts (LXX and AT) align, as

⁴⁹ Cavalier 2012, 187.

⁵⁰ See Jobs 1996, 168.

far as the semantics and syntax of $\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\omega$ is concerned, with 2 and 3 *Maccabees*, strengthen the case in favour of an originally Greek composition for Addition D.

Lucia Prauscello

All Souls College, Oxford

lucia.prauscello@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

Bibliography

- J. Aitken (ed.), *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (London – New York 2015).
- C. Boyd-Taylor, “Esther and Additions to Esther”, in: Aitken 2015, 203–221.
- M. E. Burton, “Robed in Majesty: Clothing as a Metaphor for the Classical Hebrew Semantic Domain of כְּבוֹד”, in: C. Berner, M. Schäfer, M. Schott, S. Schulz, M. Weingärtner (eds.), *Clothing and Nudity in the Hebrew Bible* (London 2009) 289–300.
- C. Cavalier, *Esther*, La Bible d’Alexandrie XII (Paris 2012).
- E. Cerroni, “Searching for Linguistic Standards in 2 *Maccabees*”, in: R. Machado, C. Monaco, E. Bozia (eds.), *Redefining the Standards in Attic, Koine, and Atticism* (Berlin – New York 2024) 187–211.
- J. Charteris-Black, *Fire Metaphors. Discourses of Awe and Authority* (London – New York 2017).
- N. C. Croy, *3 Maccabees* (Leiden 2006).
- M. Davies, *Lesser and Anonymous Fragments of Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford 2021).
- K. De Troyer, “17. 1 Textual History of Esther”, in: A. Lange (ed.), *Textual History of the Bible Online II*, https://doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_0017010000 (Leiden 2018).
- K. De Troyer, “Divine Kingdom in the Book of Esther, addition D”, in: G. Dafni (ed.), *Divine Kingdom and Kingdoms of Men / Gottesreich und Reiche der Menschen*, Studies on the Theology of the Septuagint / Studien zur Theologie der Septuaginta II (Tübingen 2019) 69–76.
- K. De Troyer, “13–17. 1. 1. 5 Esther”, in: A. Lange (ed.), *Textual History of the Bible Online*, https://doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_1317010105. (Leiden 2020).
- N. Domazakis, *The Neologisms in 2 Maccabees*, *Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia* 23 (Lund 2018).
- K. Elms, “Fire. II. Hebrew Bible / Old Testament”, *EBR* 9 (2014) 68–69.
- P. J. Finglass, *Sophocles. Ajax* (Cambridge 2011).
- D. Frayer-Griggs, “Fire. III. New Testament”, *EBR* 9 (2014) 69–71.
- C. L. W. Grimm, *Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig 1857).

- N. Hacham, “3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity”, *JBL* 126 (2007) 765–785.
- J.-C. Haelewyck, “The Relevance of the Old Latin Version for the Septuagint, with Special Emphasis on the Book of Esther”, *JTS* 57 (2006) 439–473.
- J.-C. Haelewyck, *Vetus latina. Esther* 7/3 fasc. 4 (Freiburg 2008).
- J.-C. Haelewyck, “13–17. 2. 1. 5 Esther”, in: A. Lange (ed.), *Textual History of the Bible Online II*, https://doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_1317020105. (Leiden 2020).
- H. W. Hollander, “The Testing by Fire of the Builders’ Works: 1 Corinthians 3: 10–15”, *NTS* 40 (1994) 89–104.
- K. Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther. Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (Atlanta 1996).
- S. R. Johnson, “3 Maccabees”, in: Aitkin 2015, 292–305.
- T. Knöppler, *3. Makkabäerbuch* (Gütersloh 2019).
- M. L. Margolis, “Καίειν (einschliesslich der Composita und Derivata) und seine hebräisch-aramäischen Äquivalente im Gräzismus des A.T.”, *ZAW* 26 (1906) 85–90.
- A. Mermelstein, *Power and Emotion in Ancient Judaism. Community and Identity in Formation* (Cambridge 2021).
- S. Milstein, “Translating Emotions”, *HeBAI* 13 (2024) 175–182.
- F. Mirguet, “What is an ‘Emotion’ in the Hebrew Bible? An Experience That Exceeds Most Contemporary Concepts”, *BibInt* 24 (2016) 442–465.
- F. Mirguet, “The Study of Emotions in Early Jewish Texts: Review and Perspectives”, *JSJ* 50 (2019) 1–47.
- C. A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah. The Additions* (Garden City, NY 1977).
- NETS = A. Pietersma, B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford 2007).
- T. Nicklas, “Metaphern im 2. Makkabäerbuch”, in: M. Witte, S. Behnke (eds.), *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature. The Metaphorical Use of Language in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* (Berlin – New York 2015) 173–184.
- W. Orth, “Die Sprache des 3. Makkabäerbuches”, in: E. Bons, J. Joosten (eds.), *Die Sprache der Septuagint / The Language of the Septuagint* (Gütersloh 2016) 416–420.
- L. Prauscello, “‘Fiery Grief’? A Reassessment of the Semantics of πυρόω in *JIGRE* 32, 37 and 83 (Leontopolis), the Septuagint and Paul (1 Cor 7:9 and 2 Cor 11:29)”, *Glotta* (2026 a) forthcoming.
- L. Prauscello, “Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 440 πυρωθὲν ψῆγμα: πυρόω, Fire-testing / Refining and Greek Lexicography”, *CP* (2026 b) forthcoming.
- T. Rajak, *Translation and Survival. The Greek Bible and the Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford 2009).
- A. G. Salvesen, “Deuterocanonical and Apocryphal Books”, in: A. G. Salvesen, T. M. Law (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint* (Oxford 2021) 384–402.

- A. Seri-Levi, “My Wrath Will Burn You: The Terminology of Biblical Emotions”, *HeBAI* 13 (2024) 254–280.
- F. Shaw, “Review of Schwartz 2008”, *BMCR* at www.bmcreview.org/2009/05/20090551.html (2009).
- F. Shaw, “2 *Maccabees*”, in: Aitken 2015, 273–291.
- F. Shaw, “The Language of *Second Maccabees*”, in: E. Bons, J. Joosten (eds.), *Die Sprache der Septuagint / The Language of the Septuagint* (Gütersloh 2016) 407–415.
- T. Smith, K. de Troyer, “The Additions of the Greek Book(s) of *Esther*”, in: G. S. Oegema (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Apokrypha* (Oxford 2021) 387–396.
- A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus. Oresteia. Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, Eumenides* (Cambridge, MA – London 2008).
- J. A. Thambyrajah, “The Relationship between 3 *Maccabees* and the *Vetus Latina* of *Esther*”, *JBL* 141 (2022) 699–715.
- J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, corrected edition (New York – Cincinnati – Chicago 1889).

A careful analysis of the semantics and syntax of the verb $\pi\rho\acute{o}\omega$ in the *Septuagint* helps to identify a hitherto unrecognised element of linguistic similarity between Addition D to *Esther* and 3 *Maccabees* (books originally written in Greek *ab initio*, that is, without a semitic *Vorlage*). This similarity, namely the metaphorical use of $\pi\rho\acute{o}\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ (passive) directly predicated of the person experiencing an intense emotion, followed by a dative denoting the trigger of fire ‘within’, should be added to those features supporting the hypothesis that Addition D to *Esther*, like most probably also Additions B and E, was originally written in what Septuagintal studies call “compositional Greek”.

Семантический и синтаксический анализ глагола $\pi\rho\acute{o}\omega$ в Септуагинте позволяет выявить не замеченное ранее сходство между его употреблением в дополнении А к *Книге Есфири* и в *Третьей Маккавейской* книге (обе эти книги были изначально написаны по-гречески, то есть не имеют семитского оригинала). Это сходство – а именно, употребление $\pi\rho\acute{o}\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ (pass.) применительно к человеку, охваченному сильной эмоцией, причем тут же в dat. указан источник “внутреннего огня”, – следует добавить к аргументам в поддержку гипотезы, что дополнение А (как, видимо, и В, и D) к *Книге Есфири* было изначально написано на греческом языке (который исследователи Септуагинты в таких случаях называют “compositional Greek”).

CONSPECTUS

Carolo Lucarini quinquagenario	5
P. J. FINGLASS	
Poem-Division in Sappho's Papyrus Fragments	9
TATIANA KOSTYLEVA	
Eur. <i>IT</i> 288: Why Not the Lungs?	32
FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI	
Allusions in Euripides' <i>Electra</i>	36
GAUTHIER LIBERMAN	
<i>De Bucolicorum Theocriteorum et Maronianorum aliquot</i> <i>locis disputatur</i>	46
LUCIA PRAUSCELLO	
The Use of <i>πυρόω</i> in the Septuagint, and its Value for <i>Esther</i> , Addition D 5	67
ROBERT A. KASTER	
A New Edition of Cicero's <i>Tusculanae Disputationes</i>	83
MIKHAIL SHUMILIN	
In orationes Ciceronis emendatiunculae	98
GIOVANNI ZAGO	
Arte allusiva in Tibullo, 2. 2. Un esercizio di lettura	106
ANTONIO STRAMAGLIA	
... in <i>alium orbem terrarum delatos</i> (Petron. 1. 2)	113
WALTER LAPINI	
Come farsi amico il giudice (nota a Caritone VI, 7, 11)	119

DENIS KEYER	
Juvenal 6. 422–423: Female Genital Massage?	128
TIZIANO DORANDI	
Gli <i>Excerpta</i> della <i>Classis C</i> dell' <i>Ad se ipsum</i> di Marco Aurelio ...	136
MICHAEL D. REEVE	
Editing Porphyrio: A Cautionary Tale	150
THOMAS RIESENWEBER	
Zu einigen Stellen in der <i>Ars Rhetorica</i> des Consultus Fortunatianus	169
Keywords	200