



The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint

Alison G. Salvesen (ed.), Timothy Michael Law (ed.)

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199665716.001.0001>

Published: 2021

Online ISBN: 9780191833809

Print ISBN: 9780199665716

CHAPTER

26 Deuterocanonical and Apocryphal Books

Alison G. Salvesen

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199665716.013.21> Pages 384–402

Published: 10 February 2021

Abstract

The terms ‘deuterocanonical’ (a later, Catholic, term) or ‘apocryphal’ (used by early Church writers) are popularly used to refer to religious books from the Judeo-Christian tradition perceived as having a lower status than those books regarded as normative for doctrine. Both ‘deuterocanonical’ and ‘apocryphal’ imply the recognition of a contrasting fixed group of authoritative scriptural works, with which the ‘deuterocanonical’ and ‘apocryphal’ books are associated. This chapter focuses on books transmitted in early Greek Christian pandect Bibles and associated with the LXX corpus, but whose status was debated within Christian circles and largely unrecognized by rabbinic Judaism. It explores the original language, date, Greek text form, and witnesses to those complete books most commonly listed in modern times as deuterocanonical, along with some semi-independent works including the Letter of Jeremiah, the Prayer of Manasseh, and Psalm 151. (The additions to Esther, Daniel, and Jeremiah are covered in Chapters 18, 20, and 22 in this volume, on Jeremiah, Daniel, and the Megillot respectively.)

Keywords: [Scripture](#), [canonicity](#), [Apocrypha](#), [pseudepigrapha](#), [deuterocanonical](#)

Subject: [Religious Studies](#), [Philosophy of Religion](#), [Religion](#)

Series: [Oxford Handbooks](#)

Collection: [Oxford Handbooks Online](#)

Introduction

IN recent years books termed in Christian tradition ‘apocryphal’ or ‘deuterocanonical’ have been deemed worthy of academic study in their own right, often with a further group of works, the pseudepigrapha. This trend is partly due to the discovery of parabiblical and sectarian works at Qumran and partly to a growing interest in the reception history of scriptural books.

Jewish Origins

Although deuterocanonical literature relating to the Christian Old Testament was preserved, transmitted, and appreciated by the Church, the origins of all these works lay in Judaism. Most were composed in Greek from the outset (e.g. Wisdom of Solomon, 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees). Others were probably written in Hebrew or Aramaic and translated into Greek but did not form part of the rabbinic canon, so the original texts were lost in whole or in part (e.g. Sirach, Tobit, Psalms of Solomon). In some cases the language of the original is disputed (e.g. Judith, Letter of Jeremiah).

p. 386

The reasons for eventual Jewish rejection of such books may include a recognition of their late date of composition, the lack of a known Semitic text, and obvious historical or legal contradictions. However, for Josephus the main criterion for acceptance was authorship by a prophet (C. Ap. 1:37–43; Mason 2002). Yet their acceptance in the Church suggests that they must at one stage have been esteemed in some Jewish communities. The loss of standing in Judaism of some books accepted by the Church may be linked to the devastation in the early second century CE of the significant Greek-speaking Jewish community in North Africa.

Reception in the Greek and Latin Churches

The status of certain works was apparently not an issue for Christians until the late second and early third centuries CE. At this time it was no doubt stimulated by an awareness, on the one hand, of a restricted corpus of authoritative scriptural books among Jews (e.g. Melito's list of twenty-five books from a Palestinian source: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* IV.26), and on the other hand, of Greek books containing extra material compared with their Hebrew counterparts, such as the additions to Daniel and Esther. (See Junod 1984: 135–51 for a dossier of patristic Greek sources on the canon.)

The first discussion that comes down to us is Origen's lengthy response to the Christian intellectual Julianus Africanus. Africanus had questioned the historicity of the story of Susanna in the Church's book of Daniel on a number of grounds (see Gallagher 2012: 30–7), not least that the wordplay about the two types of tree (Sus. 54; 58) was only possible in Greek. Therefore, Africanus argued, Susanna was an inauthentic Greek composition, along with Bel and the Dragon, since 'all the books of the Old Testament accepted by Jews were translated from Hebrew to Greek' (*Ep. ad Orig.* §5). Origen acknowledges this criterion by claiming that the putative Hebrew original of Susanna must have contained the wordplay, and by noting that for Hebrew-speaking Jews, Tobit and Judith do not exist in Hebrew even in the Apocrypha (*Ep. Afr.* §§18–19). However, Origen believes that Christians should not discard books and texts that in his view have been providentially granted to the Church for its edification, nor turn instead to Jews for 'purer' versions of the scriptures (*Ep. Afr.* §8). Origen's justification for the Christian use of Susanna and of what he terms 'apocrypha' (see Adler 2002: 214–15) is that such works both explain and are supported by allusions in the New Testament, such as the prophets sawn in two (Heb. 11:37, a reference to the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* [*Ep. Afr.* §13]). He even resorts to using information from Tobit to prop up the historicity of Susanna (§19), since Africanus himself had already alluded to Tobit as a reliable source (*Ep. ad Orig.* §6; Gallagher 2012: 31). As for the lack of evidence among Jews for certain passages or for books outside their canon, Origen puts this down to censorship by rascally Jewish authorities who believed that texts such as the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* and Susanna reflected badly on them (§§13 end–14). Yet elsewhere Origen expresses increasing caution about accepting Enoch, noting that it is not recognized by Jews (*Hom. Num.* 28:2; Gallagher 2012: 46–8). Also, in his Prologue to the *Commentary on Song of Songs*, he states that Solomon was responsible only for Proverbs, Song, and Ecclesiastes (Qoheleth), thus excluding Wisdom of Solomon (Junod 1984: 118).

The correspondence between Africanus and Origen reflects tension in Christian antiquity between a more restrictive attitude influenced by an awareness of the limited Jewish canon based on a criterion of a Hebrew

p. 387

original text, and the desire to express a separate Christian identity in the matter of Scripture, based on existing Church tradition. As time went on, a combination of pragmatism and tradition won out over the arguments of Jerome who championed a Hebrew-based canon ('whatever is outside those, is to be placed among the Apocrypha' [*Prol. in Libro Regum*]) or the misgivings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was sceptical about the spiritual value of Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, the originality of Psalm titles, and the Mosaic authorship of Job (Zaharopoulos 1989: 44–55).

For many Christian authorities the criterion for a book's inclusion in the canon depended not on the language of composition, but on whether it was normative and authoritative for doctrine and public reading. Yet books that fell outside this category could still be canonical at a lower level, and used for private reading among Christians (cf. Tertullian, *Cult. fem.* 1.3; Gallagher 2012: 20–1), and so were certainly not banned or ignored. Even Athanasius of Alexandria, whose festal letter of 367 CE is often held to demarcate a Christian canon, notes that though certain books are not canonical (οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν), they were authorized by tradition (τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων) for reading to recent converts. For Athanasius these works included Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and also Esther, while with most other authorities he included both Esdras A and B in the Old Testament canon.

Other early canonical lists of Greek Scripture, and the books included in the great codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus, display a variety of contents and groupings (see Swete 1914: 201–10; 265–88; Junod 1984: 105–6; Tov 2015: 4–5). For instance, the list of books in Pseudo-Chrysostom's *Synopsis of Sacred Scripture* (Migne PG 56: 513, probably prior to 600 CE), includes Sirach among its 'hortatory' (συμβουλευτικόν) category of works such as Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. Yet the list in the *Synopsis* of Pseudo-Athanasius (Migne PG 28: 432), which depends in part on Pseudo-Chrysostom, explicitly states that to the 'disputed' (ἀντιλεγόμενα) books Wisdom, Sirach, Esther, Judith, and Tobit, one should also add Maccabees, 'Ptolemaika' (either *Letter of Aristeas* [Wendland 1900: 133] or 3 Maccabees [Swete 1914: 279; Méléze Modrzejewski 2008: 30]), Psalms of Solomon, Odes of Solomon, and Susanna. Pseudo-Athanasius then categorizes further books as 'apocrypha' (Enoch, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Prayer of Joseph, Assumption of Moses, 'Abraham', and various works attributed to biblical figures). (For the problems associated with the synopses of Ps-Athanasius and Ps-Chrysostom, see Dorival 2005 and Barone 2009: 8–9.)

p. 388

At the other end of the scale, when Epiphanius (d. 403) gives a list of twenty-two books of the LXX according to the number of letters of the Hebrew alphabet, including both books of Esdras and Esther, he also mentions Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon (but no others), describing them as 'useful and profitable' even though they are not included in the twenty-two (*Mens. et Pond.* 4; cf. *Pan.* 8.6.1–4). Yet the three early pandect Bibles Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus all include 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Judith, and Tobit among the 'canonical' books, rather than in a separate category. In addition, Alexandrinus and Vaticanus join Letter of Jeremiah to Jeremiah, Baruch and Lamentations; Sinaiticus has the order Paralipomena–1 Esdras [missing due to lacuna]–2 Esdras–Esther–Tobit–Judith–1 Maccabees–2 Maccabees, before the sixteen Prophetic books; Alexandrinus gives the order Esther–Tobit–Judith–1 and 2 Esdras–1–4 Maccabees between Daniel and the Psalter, and lists Wisdom, Sirach, and Psalms of Solomon [missing] after Song of Songs. Thus the ordering of these pandects does not hint at a difference in status between these and 'canonical' books.

Clearly deuterocanonical works enjoyed sufficient popularity to be regularly copied and studied. By consigning them to an accepted but non-authoritative category, Church authorities could allow their use as edifying literature without having to address questions of inspiration or historicity or textual difficulties.

Individual Books

Wisdom of Solomon

The date of Wisdom of Solomon is much debated. The frequent allusions to Exodus and other themes in the work may reflect persecution of the writer's community in Egypt. However, precise dating is impossible, given that the Egyptian Jewish population experienced such difficulties intermittently from the late third century BCE up to the anti-Jewish riots in Caligula's reign in 38 CE, coupled with the allusive style of the work (see the summary of positions in Grabbe 1997: 87–91).

Jerome states that the book is pseudepigraphical and that from its style Wisdom is a Greek composition which some people attribute to Philo (*Prol. in libris Salomonis*; *Prol. in libro Regum*). This did not prevent some modern scholars arguing for a Hebrew original for at least some of the book, until quite recently. As well as displaying a close connection with LXX books, especially Genesis and Exodus but also Kings (Schwenk-Bressler 1993; McGlynn 2010), Wisdom's vocabulary draws on the LXX lexicon and goes well beyond it too (Larcher 1969: 181–223; Reese 1970: 3–25; Kepper 1999: 51–73). Its author employs Greek stylistic devices, though Hebraisms are also present, and citations and allusions to Scripture in Greek (Reese 1970: 25–31; Winston 1979: 14–18; Kepper 1999: 74–9; Rajak 2009: 181–2; Léonas 2011).

It has been debated whether Wisdom influenced NT writers directly, or whether the writings of the NT merely belong to the same thought world as Wisdom: there are certain parallels of approach between them, and also with the early patristic writers (McGlynn 2001: 235–40).

The book was evidently popular in antiquity, being well-represented in Christian manuscript tradition, and two Byzantine commentaries (Winston 1979: 65; Hanhart 1980²: 7–15).

1 Esdras/Esdras A

p. 389 1 Esdras is important principally for questions of the textual history of the MT book Ezra–Nehemiah, which it greatly resembles. It combines material from 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah (Wooden 2007a: 392–3), plus two passages without a parallel in the ^L canon, one of them the famous story of the Three Youths (1 Esdr. 3:1–5:6; Talshir 1999: 42–110) which Josephus repeats in *Ant.* XI.33–67, and Augustine refers to as a possible prophecy of Christ (*Civ. Dei* 18:36; Bird 2012: 29).

Current opinion differs widely on which version of the narrative came first, Ezra–Nehemiah or 1 Esdras, or whether this is an example of 'rewritten Scripture'. Discussions to the end of the twentieth century are laid out by de Troyer (2002) and there are more recent essays in Fried (2011). Bird (2012: 16) gives a helpful chart of the relationship of the sources.

The question of the original language of 1 Esdras is inextricably linked to the issue of priority vis à vis Ezra–Nehemiah. Torrey (1970), Talshir (1999), and Grabbe (1998: 80) strongly favour a Semitic original. But de Troyer notes the difficulties of retroverting back into Hebrew and Aramaic a text that seems to be a free translation into Greek (2002: 34). Hanhart's comparison of 1 Esdras with that of LXX Ezra–Nehemiah demonstrates that the two Greek texts are translations independent of each other, though there may be a common Hebrew–Aramaic *Vorlage* deviating from MT which was rendered differently by the two different translators (1974: 17). Citations of the book in patristic writers are few (Hanhart 1974: 23–4). For a summary of the textual situation in Greek transmission, see Bird (2012: 3–6).

2 Esdras/Esdras B

2 Esdras overlaps considerably in content with 1 Esdras (see charts in Wooden 2007b: 405; Janz 2010: 33). However, despite the inevitable redundancies, manuscripts and canon lists often include both books (see Swete 1914: 201–9).

Unlike 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras follows the Hebrew of Ezra–Nehemiah in its MT form to a slavish degree. Such isomorphism helps identify where the *Vorlage* deviated from MT (Janz 2010: 76–83). Transliterations and homoeophonic renderings abound (Janz 2010: 100–18), implying that the translator valued the source language over the target language (Wooden 2006: 143).

Tobit

The presence at Qumran of four fragments in Aramaic and one in Hebrew indicates that the story of Tobit's family had been popular among Palestinian Jews in the Second Temple period. However, Origen states that Hebrew-speaking Jews of his day did not use the book of Tobit (*Ep. Afr.* §13), and Jerome was also aware of its lack of status for 'Hebrews'. Jerome did not know of a Hebrew form of Tobit, and he claimed that it was under pressure from his patrons that he had agreed to render it into Latin from the 'Chaldean' (i.e. Aramaic) text (*Prol. Tobiae*: Fitzmyer 2003: 20; Skemp 2000: 24).

p. 390 The version of the narrative in the Qumran Semitic fragments has the closest affinity with the text of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus, vindicating the 'long' form of the Greek tradition (see below). However, the book's polyglot and pluriform tradition makes it impossible to reconstruct the original Semitic text (Hallermayer 2008: 20–3; 187). For Greek Tobit alone there are three forms of the textual tradition (Hanhart 1984: 21–48):

- i) GI is the 'short' recension found in the majority of witnesses. It is essentially an abridged version of an originally longer form.
- ii) GII is 'long', even expanded. Its best witnesses are Codex Sinaiticus, and for Tob. 3:6–6:16, the eleventh-century MS 319 (Weeks 2006: 16–18; Weeks 2013; Gathercole 2006).
- iii) GIII is the 'Intermediate Recension' (Fitzmyer 2003: 5). It is another revised text, preserved only in some late Greek manuscripts, for the second part of the book (Tob. 6:8–13:2).

The critical edition of Hanhart (1983) lays out GI above GII for comparison, but it implies that GII is largely identical to a diplomatic edition of Sinaiticus (Weeks 2013: 2 n. 2).

The early loss of unity in the Greek text form may be due to the combination of Tobit's popularity and its lack of canonical authority, with the textual 'instability' among the Greek witnesses caused by dissatisfaction with either the original Greek translation or the narrative (Weeks 2006; 2013). Though there is now no single Greek witness that fully represents an original form, Fitzmyer's work on the Qumran Semitic fragments (1995; 2003: 3) enables scholars to assess the originality of different Greek readings (see Macatangay 2011: 13–23; Weeks 2006: 23; Weeks 2013). The textual affinities of the two fragmentary papyrus witnesses to Tobit from Oxyrhynchus (early third and sixth centuries) are complicated (Tob. 2:2–3 and 12:14–19: Hanhart 1983: 9–10; Wagner and Nicklas 2003: 144, 149).

Unrelated and more minor differences between the various Greek texts include the famous error in Sinaiticus of Tob. 11:4, where κύων 'dog' was misread as the *nomen sacrum*, the reverential abbreviation κ(υριο)ς, thus eliminating the only other mention of Tobias's canine companion (the earlier one is at Tob. 5:17; see Littman 2008:138). Other anomalies include the introduction of Raphael and Ragouel as Tobit's

ancestors in Sinaiticus at Tob. 1:1 (Weeks 2013: 2 n. 3), and the replacement of Nahum in Vaticanus at Tob. 14:4 with Jonah (cf. also 14:8) (Bredin 2006).

The various textual forms of Tobit have recently been brought together synoptically in two different publications: the simpler edition in parallel columns of Wagner (2003), and the much fuller and more complex edition with notes and concordance by Weeks et al. (2004). The two editions are helpfully compared in Lange's review (2006).

Judith

Although the book of Judith is more explicitly religious than Esther, another book featuring a heroine who risks her life to save her people, it was never considered for inclusion in the Jewish canon (for possible explanations see Zeitlin in Enslin and Zeitlin 1972: 24–6 and Gera 2010: 27–8). However, its dramatic narrative was popular with Christians.

- p. 391 Neither Origen nor Jerome know of a Hebrew text of Judith. Origen says that Jews did not use it even as an apocryphal book, whereas Jerome reports that it was included in their Apocrypha (Origen, *Ep. Afr.* 19; Jerome, *Prol. Judith*). Although Jerome claims that the book had been written in Aramaic ('Chaldean') and that this was the basis for his Latin version (*Prol. Judith*: see Ciletti and Lähnemann 2010: 43), Joosten suggests that Jerome saw either the Syriac version or an Aramaic rendering of the Greek text (Joosten 2007: *167–*168). However, both Enslin and Joosten believe Jerome based his translation on LXX manuscripts (Enslin in Enslin and Zeitlin 1972: 44; Joosten 2007: *167–*168).

The original language of Judith is still debated. Those who argue for a Hebrew original point to the 'paratactic' style, the many Hebraisms, and the lack of Greek particles (e.g. Enslin in Enslin and Zeitlin 1972: 40–2; Hanhart 1979b: 9; Moore 1985: 66–67; Otzen 2002: 140). However, there is growing support for an original Greek composition (e.g. Rakel 2003: 33–40; Corley 2008). In Joosten's view, the more Hebraistic locutions could be deliberate attempts on the part of the Greek author to seem more 'biblical'. Citations of LXX in which the point of the allusion is found only in the Greek text (e.g. LXX Exod. 15:3 in Jdt. 9:7) are the likeliest indicators of a Greek composition (Joosten 2007). There are also features specific to Greek such as the future infinitive, and there are unusual words with no obvious counterparts in Hebrew (Joosten 2007: *160–*167): a good example would be *κωνώπιον* 'mosquito net' or 'canopy' (Jdt. 10:21; 13:9, 15; 16:19; Schmitz 2010). Similarities between Judith and Greek historical writing, especially Herodotus (Corley 2015: 228–9; 2012: 25–7, 34–45) and the use of specific 'Septuagintal' descriptions (Corley 2008; 2015: 28–34; also Engel 1992), may also indicate that the author wrote in Greek and depended heavily on LXX.

The date of composition is some time between the Maccabean period and the early first century BCE (Zeitlin in Enslin and Zeitlin 1972: 26–30). Joosten argues for a provenance in the Egyptian Diaspora, which would explain not only its composition in Greek but other features such as the curious geography of the book, the bizarre 'historical' details, Judith's inheritance of her late husband's wealth, and the absence of any awareness of the monarchic period and the splitting of Israel and Judah (Joosten 2007: *169–*175). The lack of references to Judith at Qumran or in the NT, Josephus, and rabbinic literature would be curious if the work originated in Palestine. However, Ilan argues that Judith was a Palestinian work linked with Esther and Susanna as propaganda for the rule of Shelamzion (Alexandra Salome, 141–67 BCE), widow of Alexander Jannaeus (Ilan 1999, following Enslin in Enslin and Zeitlin 1972: 180–1). In contrast, Zeitlin believes that the book was written in Antioch in connection with the book of 2 Maccabees, the narrative reflecting the war of Nicanor against the Judeans under Judas Maccabeus (Zeitlin in Enslin and Zeitlin 1972: 29–32).

The earliest textual witness to the book is Cairo Ostrakon 215 from the Fayum, dated to the late third century CE (Jdt. 15:1–7: Schwartz 1946). Next come the fourth-century Oxyrhynchus papyrus (P.Oxy 75.5020, Jdt.

6:16–17, 7:1–2: Lubitz 2010), and Codex Vaticanus (Corley 2015: 224; for the other uncials, see Craven 2003: 199–200).

p. 392 **Sirach**

Sirach was widely appreciated in Greek Christianity. Despite its non-canonical status in Judaism, it was also cited in its Hebrew form by the rabbis (Schechter 1890–1).

The original Hebrew book of Ben Sira was probably written some time between the death in 196 BCE of the high priest Simon b. Onias (eulogized in Sirach ch. 50) and the Maccabean period. It was translated into Greek by the author's grandson, who in his valuable prologue to the translation tells us that he came to Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes (Ptolemy VIII) and made the translation there. This suggests a date between 132 and Euergetes's death in 116 BCE.

Apart from citations in rabbinic literature, the Hebrew version was lost until the end of the nineteenth century when fragmentary manuscripts of the work were discovered among the Cairo Geniza documents. Further, earlier, texts emerged from among the Dead Sea Scrolls: a first-century BCE text from Masada, fragments from Cave 2 (2Q18), and part of Sirach ch. 51 in the Psalm scroll 11QPs^a. The recovery of approximately 68 per cent of the Hebrew text has enabled a comparison with the Greek text. Reiterer produced a study of a single chapter, the Praise of the Ancestors (1980). Wright's computer-based study concludes that Sirach was closest in approach to LXX Isaiah in terms of general technique. This means that it is difficult to use the Greek to reconstruct missing portions of the Hebrew text (Wright 1989: 51, 115; 249–50). Aitken's examination of the rendering from a literary point of view concludes that the translator in fact continued 'the pretensions of the prologue', and despite the limitations imposed by translation technique, he achieved a level similar to popular literary compositions of the general period (Aitken 2011: 123–6).

Since Sirach exists in two text forms, GrI and GrII, and also two recensions (Lucianic and Origenic), it presents the most text-critical difficulties of any LXX book (Ziegler 1980²: 5, 24–9; 57–69). Ziegler's studies of the lexical choices of GrI (1958) and the phenomenon of variant wording and doublets in the Hexaplaric tradition of Sirach (1963: 186) reveal affinities with the vocabulary of the later Jewish translators, especially Symmachus.

1–4 Maccabees: Overview

The four books traditionally named 'Maccabees' are narratives of the persecutions and divine vindication of Jews in the second century BCE. The four books were associated from the time of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, as τὰ Μακκαβαῖκα (Goldstein 1976: 3).

1 Maccabees is the Greek translation of a lost Hebrew work describing the war fought by Judas Maccabeus and others against the attempt to Hellenize Judea by Antiochus IV Epiphanes; 2 Maccabees is a Greek composition that overlaps with some of these events; 4 Maccabees is another Greek work focusing on the martyrdoms described in 2 Maccabees. 3 Maccabees, a story written in Greek, pre-dates the events of the other books, has nothing to do with the family of the Maccabees, and is mostly set in Alexandria. However, it does resemble themes in the other books such as the hubris of a non-Jewish king, his designs on Jerusalem and the Temple, the threat he presents to his Jewish subjects and their way of life, and the problem of apostasy (Alexander 2001; Méléze Modrzejewski 2008: 31–2).

1 Maccabees

The style of the Greek suggests a Hebrew original, which Jerome claims to have seen (*Prol. libro Regum*), and the alternative name that Origen uses for it, *Sarbêthsabanaïel*, implies that 1 Maccabees existed in a Semitic form in his own day (Eusebius, *Eccl. hist.* VI.25.1–2, see Goldstein 1976: 15–16 and n. 28). The original Hebrew work may be dated to c.100 BCE, since the reference to John Hyrcanus (d. 104 BCE) in 1 Macc. 16: 23–4 suggests he was already dead (Goldstein 1976: 62). The date of the Greek translation is uncertain, though Josephus evidently depended on it and on 2 Maccabees for his historical narrative of the period in *Jewish War* and *Antiquities* (Goldstein 1976: 176). However, he modified 1 Maccabees's pro-Hasmonean stance (Goldstein 1976: 26, 55–61). Williams has investigated the literary structure of the book (1999).

2 Maccabees

The book tells the story of Jerusalem from 175 BCE to the victory of Judas Maccabaeus in 161 BCE, but is prefaced by an introduction and two letters. It is an original Greek composition employing unusual words and rhetoric (Doran 2012: 4–6). Apart from some deliberate biblicalisms it is markedly different from the language of translated books in the LXX corpus (Schwartz 2008: 67–76).

The date of the work is much debated (see summary by Doran 2012: 14–15). The first of the two letters prefixed to the narrative and addressed from Jerusalem to the Egyptian Jewish community (2 Macc. 1:1–10a; 1:10b–2:18) is dated either 124 BCE or 143 BCE. However, the following narrative, an epitome of the much longer history of Jason of Cyrene (2 Macc. 2:23), may be separate and in theory could belong to any period between 150 BCE and 70 CE. It may have been written in Alexandria, Antioch, or Judea.

Apart from the author of 4 Maccabees (see below), Jewish writers show no interest in the book. This contrasts with its enthusiastic reception by Christian authors, starting with the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 11:35–6, 38; Schwartz 2008: 87–8).

3 Maccabees

Among the uncial manuscripts, 3 Maccabees is found only in Alexandrinus and Venetus. This suggests that it lacked the popularity enjoyed by the other 'Maccabean' books among Christian readers. Since the narrative begins somewhat abruptly, the first part of the work may be missing (Croy 2006: xvii–xviii).

p. 394 The book is set in the late third century BCE. After being repulsed from the Jerusalem Temple, Ptolemy Philopator brings captured Judeans to Egypt. There both they and the Alexandrian Jewish community resist compulsion to make pagan sacrifices. Gathered in vast numbers in the hippodrome, the Jews are to be trampled by enraged elephants, but the prayer of the elderly priest Eleazar is answered by the appearance of two angels. The assembled Jews are delivered and the animals attack the army instead.

The work was almost certainly written in Alexandria, in Greek, by a well-educated author. However, in view of the vocabulary used and the allusions to persecution of the Jews of Alexandria, the date of composition could be anywhere between the very end of the second century BCE and the reign of Caligula, though a narrower timeframe of c.100–30 BCE may fit best (Mélèze Modrzejewski 2008: 114–23; cf. Alexander 2001: 339). Tromp (1995) suggests that two main sources have been combined in the composition: the tradition behind a festival celebrated by Jews in Alexandria (known to Josephus: c. *Ap.* II.53–5), plus the story of Heliodorus (2 Maccabees ch. 3).

4 Maccabees

The title ‘4 Maccabees’ is misleading, since no Maccabees feature in it and the events described take place prior to the Maccabean revolt (deSilva 1998: 14). Eusebius of Caesarea referred to the book as ‘The Supremacy of Reason’, and attributed it to Josephus (*Eccl. hist.* 3.10.6; Klauck 1989: 647). Origen almost certainly refers to both 2 and 4 Maccabees in his *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, written in 235 CE (deSilva 1998: 152–3).

The excellent Greek of the work shows that the Jewish writer had some training in rhetoric and philosophy, as well as familiarity with translated scriptures in Greek, and reworked 2 Maccabees (Klauck 1989: 654; 665–6; Klauck 2011: 1448). However, current estimates of the date of composition vary, from c.35 CE (Bickerman 1976) to c.100 CE (Breitenstein 1976: 174; van Henten 1986: 142–5; Klauck 1989: 669), and even 117/18 CE and the Trajanic revolt (Dupont–Sommer 1939: 75–85). Most recently Schwemer has argued for a date of c.30 CE, on the basis of the positive use of the term ζηλωτής (4 Macc. 18:12) for Phineas, the exemplar for the Maccabean martyrs. This would indicate a date well before the Jewish War (Schwemer 2017: 270).

The book’s provenance in Antioch is very likely since this was the location of the relics of the martyrs whose witness 4 Maccabees describes (deSilva 1998:19). 4 Macc. 17:8–10 itself speaks of the propriety of engraving an inscription (ἐπιτάφιος) on their tomb (Dupont–Sommer 1939: 67–8; cf. Lebram 1974, who argues that the whole work is an *epitaphios logos*, or funerary inscription). Van Henten (1994: 67–8) notes the Jewish funerary inscriptions from Asia Minor resembling this passage. However, deSilva (1998: 99–126) would sum the work up as a ‘proptreptic discourse’, mingling philosophy with examples of the outworkings of that philosophy.

p. 395 Letter of Jeremiah

The writer of the Letter of Jeremiah may have noted the prophet Jeremiah’s failure to address the issue of idolatry in his letter to the exiles (Jeremiah ch. 36 LXX/29 MT), and so supplied the warning himself in this brief work (Moatti–Fine 2005: 289–90). Alternatively, the inspiration may have been the diatribe against idols in Jer. 10:2–15, as found in the ‘shorter’ edition of Hebrew Jeremiah (Thomas 2008). 2 Macc. 2:1–4 may allude to Letter of Jeremiah (Moatti–Fine 2005: 297). Oddities in the Greek suggest to some that it is a translation of an imperfectly understood Hebrew original (Moatti–Fine 2005: 296–8, 329). However, Wright notes that since the Greek used is nothing like the translations of the LXX, it may reflect an original composition (Wright 2010). In response to the work’s many detractors, Brooke argues persuasively that the work displays a chiasmic literary structure and has appealing elements (Brooke 2007).

A small Greek fragment from Qumran, 7Q2, dated to c.100 BCE, may contain EpJer 43–4 (Baillet, Milik, and de Vaux 1962: 143).

Psalms of Solomon

The Psalms of Solomon are a collection of eighteen non-canonical psalms, preserved in Greek and Syriac. The poems’ references to attacks on Jerusalem and the Temple are too allusive to allow precise dating. The original language is probably Hebrew: if this is so, the Psalms may date to the second half of the first century BCE and their Greek translation a few decades later (Wright 2007: 7).

According to the list of contents in Codex Alexandrinus, they originally appeared at the very end of that manuscript after the NT and Clementine Epistles and were subsequently lost, but they have been transmitted in twelve other manuscripts (Wright 2007: 1, 13, 25). Various later catalogues of scriptural works (e.g. Ps–Athanasius, Nicephorus) list them among the ‘disputed’ works or those ‘external’ to the

canon (Wright 2007: 2–3). Wright provides a critical edition of the Greek with a translation (2007), and Trafton gives a comparative edition of the Greek and Syriac texts (1985). The Göttingen edition of the book has now appeared (Albrecht 2018), and a volume of essays (Bons and Pouchelle 2015) addresses aspects of this somewhat neglected work.

Odes

p. 396

The various collections of ‘Odes’ found in certain manuscripts of the LXX and other versions do not constitute a book in themselves. Rabbinic Judaism sometimes lists poetic passages from the biblical canon to form a kind of narrative of God’s relationship with his people (Harl 2014: 177–83). This practice of associating exemplary figures and their prayers may have influenced the early Church from Origen onwards (*Hom. Cant.* 1; and see Coogan 2019). However, the tradition of Odes as a *physical* collection of liturgical poems is essentially a Christian and anthological phenomenon first attested in Codex Alexandrinus (fifth century) (Miller 2006; Coogan 2019). They are normally excerpted from the continuous biblical text, but there is a complex relationship between the Odes text and its reference text, implying a degree of separate transmission and/or textual interference between them (Coogan 2019).

The number of odes in the manuscripts varies between nine and fourteen, including some from the New Testament. The collection in Alexandrinus comprises the Song of the Sea (Exod. 15:1–19); Song of Moses (Deut. 32:1–43), Prayer of Hannah (1 Kgdms 2:1–10); Song of Isaiah (26:9–20); Prayer of Jonah (Jonah 2:3–10); Prayer of Habakkuk (Hab. 3: 2–19); Prayer of Hezekiah (Isa. 38:10–20); Prayer of Manasseh (2 Par. 33:12/13, 18/19); Prayer of Azariah (Dan. 3:26–45, Theod.); Song of the Three Youths (Dan. 3:52–88), and prayers from Luke including the Magnificat. Rahlfs’s edition of Psalms and Odes (1979³) also includes the Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 5:1–9).

Psalms 151

Psalms 151, a pseudonymous composition of David (ιδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυιδ) referring to themes in 1 Samuel ch. 16, is found at the end of the LXX Psalter. It corresponds to two short and partially preserved Hebrew psalms found consecutively in the Qumran Psalms Scroll 11QPs^a (Pss. 151A and 151B). The text of LXX Ps. 151:1–5 is shorter than the Hebrew of Psalm 151A, and the two versions evidently reflect different literary editions (Haran 1988). On the basis of his reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek text, Segal argues that the Qumran Ps. 151A reflects a later and more religious expansion of an older poem, and that what corresponds to LXX vv. 6–7 was added as a supplement, suggested by words similar to those found in Ps. 151B (Segal 2002).

Suggested Reading

The first part of the volume edited by Macdonald and Sanders (2002: 21–263) is a useful resource on issues of both Jewish and Christian canonicity. Holmes (2008: 406–14) and Hengel (2002: 57–74) are helpful on early Christian notions of canon, and Joosten (2016) on the Septuagint canon specifically. Gallagher (2012) discusses the evidence for the centrality of Hebrew text and language for Christian conceptions of the canon; see also Gallagher (2013) on the canon and apocryphal works among Latin Christians at the end of the fourth century. Adler (2002) surveys Christian attitudes to pseudepigraphical works.

For greater detail and further bibliography on individual books mentioned above, see *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (Aitken 2015). For commentary, see volumes in the series *La Bible d’Alexandrie*, the *Septuagint Commentary Series*, and the two volumes of *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare* (Karrer and Kraus 2011). ↵

p. 397

Bibliography

Editions and Textual Studies

Albrecht, Felix (2018). *Psalmi Solomonis*. VTG 12.3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1961). *Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches: Probleme der Überlieferung, der Auslegung und der Ausgabe*. NAWG. Phil.-hist. Klassen 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1974). *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches*. AAWG 92. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1979a). *Iudith*. VTG 8.4 Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1979b). *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Iudith*. AAWG Philologisch-Historische Klasse 109; MSU 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1980²). *Maccabaeorum Liber III*. VTG 9.3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1983). *Tobit*. VTG 8/5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1984). *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit*. AAWG Phil.-Hist. Klassen, III.130; MSU 17. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1991²). *Esdrae liber I*. VTG 8.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hanhart, Robert (1993). *Esdrae liber II*. VTG 8.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Kappler, Werner (1967²). *Maccabaeorum liber I*. VTG 9.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Kappler, W., and R. Hanhart, ed. (1976²). *Maccabaeorum Liber II*. VTG 9.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Rahlfs, Alfred (1935). *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Rahlfs, Alfred (1979³). *Psalmi cum Odis*. VTG 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ziegler, Josef (1957). *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae*. VTG 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 4th edn. 2013.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ziegler, Josef (1980^{2a}). *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. VTG 12/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ziegler, Josef (1980^{2b}). *Sapientia Salomonis*. VTG 12.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

References

Adams, Sean A. (2014). *Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah: A Commentary Based on the Texts in Codex Vaticanus*. SCS. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill, 147–204.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Adler, William (2002). 'The Pseudepigrapha in the Early Church', in L. M. Macdonald and J. A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate: On the Origins and Formation of the Bible*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, pp. 211–28.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Aitken, James K. (2011). 'The Literary Attainment of the Translator of Greek Sirach', in J.-S. Rey and J. Joosten, eds., *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill, pp. 95–126.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Aitken, James K. (2015). *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. London etc.: Bloomsbury and T&T Clark.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Alexander, Philip S. (2001). '3 Maccabees, Hanukkah and Purim', in A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg, eds., *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*. JSOTSS. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, pp. 321–39.

p. 398 Atkinson, Kenneth (2000). *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon: Pseudepigrapha*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49. Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Baillet, M., J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux (1962). *Les 'Petites grottes' de Qumrân*. DJD 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Barone, F. P. (2009). 'Pour une édition critique de la *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* du Pseudo-Jean Chrysostome'. *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 83.1: 7–19.

Bickerman, Elias (1976). 'The Date of Fourth Maccabees', repr. in E. Bickerman, ed., *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. Leiden: Brill, 2007, I.266–71.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bird, Michael F. (2012). *1 Esdras: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Vaticanus*. SCS. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bons, Eberhard, and Patrick Pouchelle (2015). *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bredin, Mark (2006). 'The Significance of Jonah in Vaticanus (B) Tobit 14:4 and 8', in M. Bredin, ed., *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Library of Second Temple Studies 55. London and New York, NY: T&T Clark, pp. 43–58.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Breitenstein, U. (1976). *Beobachtungen zu Sprache, Stil und Gedankengut des Vierten Makkabäerbuchs*. Basel and Stuttgart:

Schwabe.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Brooke, George J. (2007). 'Structure of the Poem against Idolatry in the *Epistle of Jeremiah* (1 Baruch 6)', in A. Frey and R. Gounelle, eds., *Poussières de christianisme et de judaïsme antiques: Études réunies en l'honneur de Jean-Daniel Kaestli et Éric Junod*. PIRSB 5. Lausanne: Editions du Zèbre, pp. 107–28.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ciletti, E., and H. Lähnemann (2010). 'Judith in the Christian Tradition', in K. R. Brine, E. Ciletti, and H. Lähnemann, eds., *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies across the Disciplines*. Cambridge: OpenBook Publishers, pp. 41–65.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Coogan, Jeremiah (2019). 'Biblical Odes', in Matthias Henze and Frank Feder, eds., *Textual History of the Bible*, Vol. 2C: *Deuterocanonical Scriptures*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 533–66.

Corley, Jeremy (2008). 'Septuagintalism, Semitic Interference and the Original Language of the Book of Judith', in J. Corley and V. Skemp, eds., *Studies in the Greek Bible: Essays in Honor of Francis T. Gignac, S.J.* CBQMS 44. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, pp. 65–96.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Corley, Jeremy (2012). 'Imitation of Septuagintal Narrative and Greek Historiography in the Portrait of Holofernes', in G. G. Xeravits, ed., *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*. DCLS 14. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 22–54.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Corley, J. (2015). 'Judith', in James K. Aitken, ed., *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. London: Bloomsbury and T&T Clark, pp. 222–36.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Craven, Toni (2003). 'The Book of Judith in the Context of Twentieth Century Studies of the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books'. *CBR* 1.2: 187–229.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Croy, N. Clayton (2006). *3 Maccabees*. SCS. Leiden: Brill.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

deSilva, David A. (1998). *4 Maccabees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

deSilva, David A. (2006). *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus*. SCS. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

De Troyer, Kristin (2002). 'Zerubbabel and Ezra: A Revived and Revised Solomon and Josiah? A Survey of Current 1 Esdras Research'. *CBR* 1.1: 30–60.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Dogniez, Cécile (2013). 'Les Odes ajoutées au Psautier dans la Septante comme actes de langage', in M. K. Peters, ed., *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, pp. 645–62.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 399 Doran, Robert (2012). *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Dorival, Gilles (2005). 'L'Apport des *Synopses* transmises sous le nom d'Athanase et de Jean Chrysostome à la question du corpus littéraire de la Bible', in G. Dorival et al., eds., *Qu'est-ce qu'un corpus littéraire? Recherches sur le corpus biblique et le corpus patristiques*. Collection de la Revue des études juives 35. Paris and Louvain: Peeters, pp. 53–93.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Dupont-Sommer, A. (1939). *Le Quatrième Livre des Machabées*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Engel, Helmut (1992). “‘Der Herr ist ein Gott, der Kriege zerschlägt’”: Zur Frage der griechischen Originalsprache und der struktur des Buches Judit’, in K. D. Schunk and M. Augustin, eds., *Goldene Äpfel in silbernen Schalen*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 155–68.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Enslin, M. S., and S. Zeitlin (1972). *The Book of Judith: Greek Text with an English Translation, Commentary and Critical Notes*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature 7. Leiden and Philadelphia, PA: E. J. Brill and Dropsie University.

Fitzmyer, Joseph (1995). ‘Tobit’, in M. Broshi et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4: XIV. Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 1–76.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Fitzmyer, Joseph (2003). *Tobit*. CEJL. Berlin and New York, NY: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Fried, Lisbeth S., ed. (2011). *Was First Esdras First? An Investigation into the Nature and Priority of First Esdras*. SBL Symposium Series. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gallagher, Edmon (2012). *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae. Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language 114. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gallagher, Edmon (2013). ‘Jerome’s Prologus Galeatus and the OT Canon of North Africa’, in Markus Vincent, ed., *Studia Patristica 69: Papers Presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2011*, Vol. 17: *Latin Writers: Nachleben*. Leuven, Paris, and Walpole, MA: Peeters, pp. 99–106.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gathercole, Simon (2006). ‘Some Preliminary Comments on the Relations between the Old Latin Witnesses’, in M. Bredin, ed., *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Library of Second Temple Studies 55. London and New York, NY: T&T Clark, pp. 5–11.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gera, D. Levine (2010). ‘The Jewish Textual Traditions’, in K. R. Brine, E. Ciletti, and H. Lähnemann, eds., *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies across the Disciplines*. Cambridge: OpenBook Publishers, pp. 23–39.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goldstein, Jonathan A. (1976). *1 Maccabees*. AB 41. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goldstein, Jonathan A. (1983). *2 Maccabees*. AB 41A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Grabbe, Lester J. (1997). *Wisdom of Solomon*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Grabbe, Lester J. (1998). *Ezra-Nehemiah*. OTR. London: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hallermayer, Michaela (2008). *Text und Überlieferung des Buches Tobit*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 3. Berlin and New York, NY: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Haran, M. (1988). 'The Two Text Forms of Ps 151'. *JJS* 39: 171–82.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Harl, Marguerite (2014). *Voix de louange: Les Cantiques bibliques dans la liturgie chrétienne*, with B. Meynadier and A. Pietrobelli. Anagôgê 8. Paris: Les belles lettres.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hengel, Martin (2002). *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, pp. 105–27.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Holmes, Michael E. (2008). 'The Biblical Canon', in S. Ashbrook Harvey and D. G. Hunter, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 406–26.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ilán, Tal (1999). 'And Who Knows Whether You Have Not Come to Dominion for a Time Like This?' (Esth 4.14): Esther, Judith and Susanna as Propaganda for Shelamzion's Queenship', in T. Ilán, ed., *Integrating Women into Second Temple History*. TSAJ 76. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 127–53.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 400 Janz, Timothy (2010). *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Vol. XII.2: *Deuxième Livre d'Esdras*. Paris: Cerf.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Joosten, Jan (2007). 'The Original Language and Historical Milieu of the Book of Judith', in *Megillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls 5–6: A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, pp. 159–76. Repr. in J. Joosten, ed., *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*. FzAT 83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, pp. 195–209.

Joosten, Jan (2016). 'The Origin of the Septuagint Canon', in S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser, and M. Sigismund, eds., *Die Septuaginta: Orte und Intentionen*. WUNT 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 688–99.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Junod, E. (1984). 'La Formation et la composition de l'Ancient Testament dans l'Église grecque des quatre premiers siècles', in J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger, eds., *Le Canon de l'ancien Testament: Sa formation et son histoire*. Labor et Fides. Geneva: Le Monde de la Bible, pp. 105–51.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Karrer, Martin, and Wolfgang Kraus (2011). *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Kepper, Martina (1999). *Hellenistische Bildung im Buch der Weisheit: Studien zur Sprachgestalt und Theologie der Sapientia Salomonis*. BZAW 280. Berlin and New York, NY: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Klauck, Hans-Josef (1989). *4. Makkabäerbuch*. JSHRZ 3.6. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Klauck, Hans-Josef (2011). 'Makkabaion IV: Das Vierte Buch der Makkabäer', in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare* I.1443–75.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Lange, Armin (2006). Review of Weeks et al., *The Book of Tobit* (2004) and Wagner, *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse* (2003). *DSD* 13.2: 256–62.

Larcher, C. (1969). *Études sur le livre de la Sagesse*. Études Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Lebram, J. C. H. (1974). 'Die literarische Form des vierten Makkabäerbuches'. VC 28: 81–96.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Léonas, Alexis (2011). 'The Poetics of Wisdom: Language and Style in the Wisdom of Solomon', in E. Bons and T. Kraus, eds., *Et Sapienter et Eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint*. FRLANT 241. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 99–126.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Littman, Robert J. (2008). *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*. SCS 9. Leiden: Brill.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Lubitz, K. (2010). '5020. LXX, Judith 6:16–17, 7:1–2', in H. Maehler et al., eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 75. London: Egypt Exploration Society, pp. 1–2.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Macatangay, Francis M. (2011). *The Wisdom Instructions in the Book of Tobit*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 12. Berlin: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Macdonald, Lee Martin, and James A. Sanders, eds. (2002). *The Canon Debate: On the Origins and Formation of the Bible*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Mason, Steve (2002). 'Josephus and His Twenty Two Book Canon', in Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, pp. 110–27.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

McGlynn, Moyna (2001). *Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom*. WUNT 2, Reihe 139. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

McGlynn, Moyna (2010). 'Solomon, Wisdom and the Philosopher-Kings', in G. G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér, eds., *Studies in the Book of Wisdom*. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill, pp. 61–82.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Mélèze Modrzejewski, Joseph (2008). *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Vol. XV.3: *Troisième Livre des Maccabées*. Paris: Cerf.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Miller, J. A. (2006). "'Let Us Sing to the Lord": The Biblical Odes in the Codex Alexandrinus'. PhD diss., Marquette University, Milwaukee.

Moatti-Fine, Jacqueline (with Isabelle Assan-Dhôte) (2005). *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, Vol. XXV.2: *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie*. Paris: Cerf.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Moore, Carey A. (1985). *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 40. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 401 Otzen, Benedikt (2002). *Tobit and Judith*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Rajak, Tessa (2009). *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Rakel, Claudia (2003). *Judit: Über Schönheit, Macht und Widerstand im Krieg: Eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre*. BZAW 334. Berlin and New York, NY: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Reese, James M. (1970). *Hellenistic Influence in the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*. Analecta Biblica 41. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Reiterer, F. V. (1980). 'Urtext' und Übersetzungen: Sprachstudie über Sir 44, 16–45, 26 als Beitrag zur Siraforschung. Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 12. St. Ottilien: EOS.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Schechter, Solomon (1890–1). 'The Quotations for Ecclesiasticus in Rabbinic Literature'. *JQR* 3: 682–706.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Schmitz, Barbara (2010). 'Holofernes's Canopy in the Septuagint', in K. R. Brine, E. Ciletti, and H. Lähnemann, eds., *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies across the Disciplines*. Cambridge: OpenBook Publishers, pp. 71–80.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Schwartz, Daniel R. (2008). *2 Maccabees*. CEJL. Berlin and New York, NY: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Schwartz, J. (1946). 'Un Fragment grec du livre de Judith (sur ostrakon)'. *RB* 53: 534–7.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Schwemer, A.-M. (2017). 'Zu Entstehungszeit und -ort des 4. Makkabäerbuchs', in F. Avemarie, P. Bukovec, S. Krauter, and M. Tilly, eds., *Die Makkabäer*. WUNT 382. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 245–74.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Schwenk-Bressler, Udo (1993). *Sapientia Salomonis als ein Beispiel frühjüdischer Textauslegung: Die Auslegung des Buches Genesis, Exodus 1–15 und Teilen der Wüstentradition in Sap 10–19*. BEATAJ 32. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Segal, Michael (2002). 'Literary Development of Psalm 151: A New Look at the Septuagint Version'. *Textus* 21: 1–20.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Skemp, Vincent (2000). *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses*. SBLDS 180. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Swete, Henry B. (1914). *Introduction to the OT in Greek*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Talshir, Zipora (1999). *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation*. SBLSCS 47. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Thomas, B. D. (2008). 'Reevaluating the Influence of Jeremiah 10 upon the Apocryphal Epistle of Jeremiah: A Case for the Short Edition'. *ZAW* 120: 547–62.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Torrey, C. C. (1970). *Ezra Studies*. Repr. Library of Biblical Studies. New York, NY: Ktav.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Tov, Emanuel (2015). 'Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations', in E. Tov, ed., *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, Vol. 3. VTSup 167. Leiden: Brill, pp. 429–48.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Trafton, Joseph (1985). *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation*. ABLSCS11. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Tromp, Johannes (1995). 'The Formation of the Third Book of Maccabees'. *Henoch* 17: 311–28.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

van der Horst, P. W., and J. H. Newman (2008). 'The Prayer of Azariah' and 'The Prayer of Manasseh', in P. van der Horst and J. Newman, eds., *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 183–214; 147–80.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Van Henten, Jan Willem (1986). 'Datierung und Herkunft des vierten Makkabäerbuches', in J. W. van Henten, H. J. de Jonge, et al., eds., *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C. H. Lebram*. StPB 36. Brill: Leiden, pp. 136–49.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 402 Van Henten, Jan Willem (1994). 'A Jewish Epitaph in a Literary Text: 4 Macc 17:8–10', in J. W. Van Henten and P. van der Horst, eds., *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*. AGJU 21. Leiden: Brill, pp. 44–69.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Van Henten, Jan Willem (1997). *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. Leiden, New York, NY, and Cologne: Brill.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wagner, Christian J. (2003). *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse: Griechisch–Lateinisch–Syrisch–Hebräisch–Aramäisch*. AAWG Phil.-Hist. Klasse, III.258; MSU 28. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wagner, C. J., and T. Nicklas (2003). 'Thesen zur textlichen Vielfalt im Tobitbuch'. *JSJ* 34: 141–59.

[WorldCat](#)

Weeks, Stuart (2006). 'Some Neglected Texts of Tobit: The Third Greek Version', in M. Bredin, ed., *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Library of Second Temple Studies 55. London and New York, NY: T&T Clark, pp. 12–42.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Weeks, Stuart (2013). 'Restoring the Greek Tobit'. *JSJ* 44.1: 1–15.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Weeks, S., S. Gathercole, and L. Stuckenbruck (2004). *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions. With Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac*. Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam Pertinentes 3. Berlin and New York, NY: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wendland, P. (1900). *Aristeae ad Philocratem epistula: Cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretvm testimoniis*. Leipzig: Teubner.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Williams, David S. (1999). *The Structure of 1 Maccabees*. CBQMS 31. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Winston, David W. (1979). *The Wisdom of Solomon*. AB 43. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wooden, R. Glenn (2006). 'Interlinearity in 2 Esdras: A Test Case', in W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden, *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges*. SBLSCS 53. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, pp. 119–44.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wooden, R. Glenn (2007a). '1 Esdras', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 392–404.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wooden, R. Glenn (2007b). '2 Esdras', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York, NY and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 405–23.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wright, Benjamin G. (1989). *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text*. SBLSCS 26. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wright, Benjamin G. (2010). 'The Epistle of Jeremiah: Translation or Composition?', in G. G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér, eds., *Deuterocanonical Additions of the Old Testament Books: Selected Studies*. DCLS 5. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 126–42.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wright, Robert B. (2007). *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. New York, NY: T&T Clark.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Zaharopoulos, D. Z. (1989). *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible: A Study of His Old Testament Exegesis*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ziegler, Josef (1958). 'Zum Wortschatz des griechischen Sirach', in J. Hempel and L. Rost, eds., *Von Ugarit nach Qumran: Festschrift O. Eissfeldt*. BZAW 77. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, pp. 274–87.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ziegler, Josef (1960). 'Die hexaplarische Bearbeitung des griech. Sirach'. *BZ n.f.* 4: 174–85.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Ziegler, Josef (1963). 'Die Vokabel-Varianten der O-Rezension im griechischen Sirach', in D. Winton Thomas, ed., *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 172–90.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)