

Neologismata

Volume 1

Proofs of New Testament Redactions
between 138 and 249 CE

by

Mark G. BILBY

First Edition

BILBY, Mark G. *Neologismata, Volume 1: Proofs of New Testament Redactions between 138 and 249 CE*. 1st. ed. Kansas City, KS: Clavis Imprints, 2026.

© 2026 by Clavis Imprints, a division of Clavis Consulting, LLC, Kansas.
All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic methods, or used in any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the copyright holder. This includes but is not limited to reproduction or sale of the book, creation of derivative works, or use of content as training or input data for Artificial Intelligence Models, Machine Learning, online videos, podcasts, or any other applications, presentations both private and public, including commercial, academic, and non-profit libraries, archives, or repositories. Violators will be subject to legal action. If you or your organization would like to obtain a license to use this book in your AI or Machine Learning projects or applications, to archive this book in your library, repository, archive, or website, or to make an audio and/or visual presentation, documentary, play, or movie making use of this book, you must reach out to the copyright holder to negotiate license fees and terms.

First Edition paperback ISBN: 979-8257966545
First Edition Zenodo DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19646264

Library of Congress Subject Headings

BIBLE. NEW TESTAMENT—CRITICISM, INTERPRETATION, ETC.
COMPUTATIONAL LINGUISTICS
GREEK LANGUAGE, BIBLICAL
GREEK LANGUAGE—DATA PROCESSING
GREEK LANGUAGE—FOREIGN WORDS AND PHRASES—LATIN
GREEK LANGUAGE, HELLENISTIC (300 B.C.-600 A.D.)
SECOND SOPHISTIC MOVEMENT

Abbreviations

| | |
|------------------|--|
| ActH | <i>Homilies on Acts</i> |
| Athan | Athanasius of Alexandria |
| ANRW | <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt</i> |
| Ap | M. G. Bilby, <i>Apostolos Reader's Edition</i> (2025) |
| BasilC | Basil of Caesarea |
| B | J.D. BeDuhn, <i>The First New Testament</i> (2013) |
| ClemAlex | Clement of Alexandria |
| CPCNT | M. Vinzent, <i>Concordance ... Precanonical NT</i> (2023) |
| DmC | Didymus Caecus (the Blind) |
| EncJud | <i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> , 2nd ed. (2007) |
| Epiph | Epiphanius of Salamis |
| Euseb | Eusebius of Caesarea |
| *Ev | Marcion's <i>Evangelion</i> |
| FNT | J. D. BeDuhn, <i>The First New Testament</i> (2013) |
| GG | <i>Grammatici Graeci</i> (1867–) |
| H | A. Hahn, “ <i>Evangelium Marcionis</i> ” (1823) |
| HThR | <i>Harvard Theological Review</i> |
| IDD | Integrated Data Dictionary, in Bilby, <i>First Gospel</i> , vol. 4 |
| Ign3 | Ignatius of Antioch, 3 letter edition (Syriac) |
| Ign7 | Ignatius of Antioch, 7 letter edition (Greek) |
| Ign13 | Ignatius of Antioch, 13 letter edition (Greek) |
| Iren | Irenaeus of Lyon |
| JChrys | John Chrysostom |
| K | M. Klinghardt, <i>Oldest Gospel</i> (2021) |
| Lampe | P. Lampe, <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| LSJ | Liddell-Scott-Jones, <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> |
| LODLIB | Linked Open Data Living Informational Book |
| ms[s] | manuscript[s] |
| N | A. Nicolotti, <i>Il Vangelo di Marcione</i> |
| NA ²⁸ | Nestle & Aland et al <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> (2013) |
| NT | New Testament |
| Nys | Gregory of Nyssa, or Gregory Nyssen |
| OLD | Oxford Latin Dictionary |
| Orig | Origen of Alexandria |
| OTP1 | <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , vol. 1, Charlesworth |

| | |
|-------|---|
| OTP2 | <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , vol. 2, Charlesworth |
| PLRE | <i>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , 4 vol. |
| QDS | Clement of Alexandria, <i>Quis dives salvetur</i> ; |
| R | D. Roth, <i>Text of Marcion's Gospel</i> (2015) |
| SC | Sources chrétiennes |
| SGC | Synopsis of Gospel Cascades, in Bilby, <i>First Gospel</i> , vol. 2 |
| TLG | Thesaurus Linguae Graecae |
| TPAPA | <i>Transactions & Proceedings ... American Philological Association</i> |
| Ts | K. Tsutsui, "Das Evangelium Marcions" (1992) |
| V | A. von Harnack, <i>Marcion: Das Evangelium</i> (1924) |
| Z | T. Zahn, <i>Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons</i> |
| ZNW | <i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft</i> |

Contents

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 3 |
| 2 | Arrian of Nicomedia (108–160 CE) | 17 |
| 3 | Claudius Ptolemy (ca 127–178 CE) | 21 |
| 4 | Apollonius Dyscolus (ca 138–160 CE) | 25 |
| 5 | Aelius Promotus (ca 138–193 CE) | 31 |
| 6 | Favorinus of Arles (ca 117–161 CE) | 39 |
| 7 | Areteaus of Cappadocia (ca 140–160 CE) | 43 |
| 8 | Appian of Alexandria (147–161 CE) | 47 |
| 9 | Aelius Aristides (ca 147–181 CE) | 51 |
| 10 | Lucian of Samosata (145–185 CE) | 55 |
| 11 | Antigonus (ca 150 CE) | 59 |
| 12 | Charax of Pergamum (ca 150–200 CE) | 63 |
| 13 | Vettius Valens (152–165 CE) | 65 |
| 14 | Herodian Gramm. (ca 161–180 CE) | 75 |

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 15 | Galen (ca 168–192 CE) | 101 |
| 16 | Maximus of Tyre (172–192 CE) | 107 |
| 17 | Marcus Aurelius (172–180 CE) | 111 |
| 18 | Julius Pollux (ca 178–192 CE) | 115 |
| 19 | Artemidorus of Daldis (ca 180–200 CE) | 119 |
| 20 | Philumenos (ca 180–220 CE) | 125 |
| 21 | Philostratus II (213–217 CE) | 127 |
| 22 | Herodian Hist. (244–251 CE) | 131 |
| 23 | [Jehudite-]Christian Neologisms | 133 |
| 24 | Conclusion | 155 |
| | Endnotes | 165 |
| | Bibliography | 187 |

Introduction

A NEOLOGISM — a NEW WORD — creates a *rippling* in Time. It splashes forward upon its surface of porous fabric; echoes in waves, spoken and written, until it enters our ears and minds. Neologisms hide in plain sight, embedded among more commonplace words. Words that at first sounded new and creative eventually fade into the background, with origin points and meanings increasingly difficult to pinpoint over time. Massive Corpus Linguistics projects, however, are changing this. As more texts transform into structured data, the temporal topographies of human speech patterns are becoming clearer, easier to map.¹

For ancient Greek in particular, no project is better known or more useful than the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, or the TLG, as it is affectionately called by its user base. Founded and centered at the University of California, Irvine, the TLG now contains well over 125 million Greek words, stretching from the 18th century AD all the way back to Homer and Hesiod. Far and away the largest pre-modern, publicly available digital Greek corpus in existence today, the TLG holds rich treasures of illumination into the history of the Greek language, and the evolution and transmission of human languages more generally. Two particularly powerful features developed by the TLG facilitate the process of uncovering the origin points of neologisms: search by lemma (i.e., the dictionary or root form) and sort by date. Though the TLG first started in 1972, these features were not publically released until late in 2006.

At present the TLG has more than 90,000 different lemmas. Searching and evaluating these one at a time would take years. Deciding which lemmas to query is often a matter of serendipity, dependent on the par-

ticular text or topic being researched. Knowing where to start and how to scope a search for neologisms might feel overwhelming.

The recent release of new, massive Greek corpora as open access data has decisively bent the research arc and lowered the bar to entry, both in terms of cost and technical feasibility. Open science projects such as the Diorisis (10M+ words released in 2018), GLAUx (now 20M+ words, first released in 2021) and Opera Graeca Adnotata or OGA (now 40M+ words, first released in 2024) are available to everyone. As more public domain texts are digitized, more agreements with copyright holders are made, and more new editions are released in born-digital formats, both GLAUx and OGA will continue to grow substantially in future releases.

These openly available Greek corpora provide root word forms, as well as date ranges for the composition of works. These ranges vary considerably in breadth and precision. However, with some scripting and database compiling, along with expert evaluation and refinement of dates, over 2,300 different Greek works and all of their root words are now available to search and to sort by date in a matter of seconds. If one takes a database-driven approach — ingesting, correlating, and querying these corpora —, one can build a magnet to detect potential neologistic needles hiding in these high and heavy lexical haystacks. This book pinpoints these tiny treasures, micro-features, trace elements that together give us our clearest picture yet of the dates when documents in the NT were composed, edited, and/or reached stable form.

A Sample TLG Search: κατείδωλον

The idea for this book originated from a single search of one notable, quite rare lemma: **κατείδωλος** / *kateidolōs* / “full of idols”. This lemma is commonly recognized as an NT *hapax legomenon* (“stated once”). When

I searched this lemma in the TLG and sorted the results by date, I was surprised to see the following results.

SEARCH THE TLG CORPUS 

SIMPLE | PROXIMITY | ADVANCED PROXIMITY

☐ Word Index ☒ Lemma ☐ Textual Search

κατείδωλος, -ον GO

☐ Substring match ☐ Case sensitive ☐ Diacritics sensitive

Input Greek 

Search count: 71

Lines: 3 Display: Greek Sort: Date (earliest) Links: Active

« RESULTS »

Display results: as a list | per word | by author | grammar |    

Prev | Next

1. NOVUM TESTAMENTUM Relig. *Acta apostolorum* {0031.005} (A.D. 1) Chapter 17 section 16 line 3
Παύλου, παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θεο-
ρουίντος κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν. (17) διελέγετο μὲν
οὖν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις
2. VITAE SANCTI CORNELII CENTURIONIS Haglogr. *Vita brevis et miracula sancti Cornelii centurionis* (BHG 370z) (e cod. Athon. Philoth. gr. 8) {5246.001} (post A.D. 1) Section 2 line 4
λιον τοῦ ἀπελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Σκήψων πόλιν κειμένην πλησίον @1
Ἀβύδου, κατείδωλον οὖσαν. Ὅστις καταλάβῃ τὴν εἰρημένην
Σκήψων πόλιν καὶ κηρύξας τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἤχη πρὸς ἐρώτησιν (5)
3. VITAE SANCTORUM NICANDRI ET HERMAEI Haglogr. *Vita sanctorum Nicandri et Hermaei* (e cod. Vat. gr. 808) {5425.001} (post A.D. 1) Section 3 line 39
προσευχαῖς, καὶ ταῖς παρ' ἐαυτῶν περινοίαις καθαίροντες καὶ γεωργοῦντες καί,
δύναμις γε παρὴν, ἐξομαλίζοντες ταύτην καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι· κὰν γὰρ κατείδωλος
ἡ πόλις καὶ πολλοὶ περὶ τὰ εἶδωλα ἐξεμαίνοντο, ἀλλὰ τῇ αὐτὸν προσεγγίζοντες
4. ACTA JOANNIS Apocryph. et Haglogr. *Acta seu peregrinationes (sub auctore Prochoro)* {0317.003} (A.D. 2) Page 117 line 4
σαν, ἥτις ἀπείχετο τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης τῆς λεγομένης Φορᾶς μί-
λια πεντήκοντα. αὕτη δὲ ἦν πόλις μικρά καὶ κατείδωλος πάν-
του καὶ ἱερὰ πολλὰ ἔχουσα τῶν λεγομένων παρ' αὐτοῖς ψευδονύ- (5)
5. POLYAENUS Rhet. *Excerpta Polyaeni* {0616.002} (A.D. 2) Excerpt 14 section 23 line 1
τρόπῳ προθυμότερους ποιήσας ἐνίκησεν.
(23) Ὅτι ὁ αὐτὸς κατελθὼν εἰς Ἑλλάδα καὶ θεασάμενος κατεί-
δωλον τὴν πόλιν τοὺς ληφθέντας τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ἡρώτα,
εἰ στερεὸν εἶη τὸ τῶν εἰδῶλων χρυσίον· τῶν δὲ φησάντων,

Figure 1.1: TLG Search Results: κατείδωλος

Among dozens of TLG authors and 10,000s of root words from the 8th century BCE through the 1st century CE, this lemma never appears once, including the extensive Greek works of Philo, Josephus, and Plutarch. Queries of GLAUx and OGA confirm the same basic result. That makes it a pretty strong candidate for a neologism, but when exactly was it first coined and put into use? If the traditional 1st century CE date for Acts is to be believed, then at face value, the results suggest that the author/editor of Acts coined this term, or otherwise picked it up from an unknown source or from unattested, broader cultural usage.

The next three hits in the TLG results all appear in lives/acts of Christian saints (Cornelius Centurion, Nicander and Hermaeus, and John by Prochorus). Though the TLG metadata assigns all of these to the 1st century CE, this dating is unsupported by any evidence, not maintained by any current scholar, and almost certainly incorrect. But if we look outside the NT, the first use of the lemma κατείδωλος / “full of idols” appears in the military strategies (*Strategemata*) composed by Polyaeus. The *Oxford Classical Dictionary* says Polyaeus was a “Macedonian rhetorician” who composed the *Strategemata* in the 160s CE, dedicating it personally to the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.

Polyaeus uses the term when describing Brennus, king of the Gauls, who famously led a successful sack of Rome around 387 BCE. At the start of the second part devoted to Brennus’ exploits, Polyaeus narrates:²

“Ὅτι ὁ αὐτὸς κατελθὼν εἰς Ἑλλάδα καὶ θεασάμενος κατείδωλον τὴν πόλιν τοὺς ληφθέντας τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ἡρώτα, εἰ στερεὸν εἴη τὸ τῶν εἰδώλων χρυσίον·

He himself, after descending into Greece and observing the city [i.e., Athens] was **full of idols**, asked those of the captives being held, if the gold of the idols was solid.

The usage proves quite poignant and meaningful in context, framing Brennus' strategy of motivating his soldiers with deception and promises of great wealth in gold. The adjective κατείδωλος / "full of idols" evokes an image of an abundance of riches to be pillaged as the spoils of war.

So did the editor of Acts invent the term? Borrow it from some unknown source? Or was it coined by Polyaeus, or at least first popularized by him? If we are open to the third explanation, then the usage in Acts, characterizing the Apostle Paul's reaction when he enters Athens, suddenly feels far more provocative than we might have imagined.

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐκδεχομένου αὐτοῦ τοῦ Παύλου παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦντος **κατείδωλον** οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν.

Now when Paul was received by them in Athens, the spirit of his in him was provoked when he was spectating the city being **full of idols**.

A close comparison of the two texts shows a similarity beyond one extremely rare word. Both passages associate the term with a "city", indeed the same city, Athens, the capital of Achaea and center of Hellenistic culture and learning. Even more strikingly, the word form (accusative singular), syntactical parent (πόλιν / "city"), and trailing neighbors are identical, except for one intervening word (οὖσαν / "being"): "full of idols [...] the city" / κατείδωλον [...] τὴν πόλιν. Both passages use the word κατείδωλος to describe the main character as a figure from the past who observes the city he visits, apparently for the first time. Though the verbs of seeing differ, both happen to be participles with identical opening and closing letters (cp. θεασάμενος and θεωροῦντος).

If scholars of the NT and early Christianity did not start from the assumption of a late 1st or even early 2nd century date for the Acts of the Apostles, they might be inclined to think that the usage in Acts clearly

echoes that of Polyaeus. Paul's iconoclastic itch recalls Brennus' plundering pitch. Though fun to consider, as a single example, this finding might not hold much weight on its own. Are there other examples that point in a similar direction?

Scope, Sources, and Challenges

Establishing an initial chronological line of demarcation proved tremendously helpful to decide what is more and less relevant to such an endeavor. For this volume, the end of Emperor Hadrian's reign (138 CE) supplies that line. So, if a Greek lemma is securely attested before or even during Hadrian's reign, then it is disqualified as a neologism in the main analysis of this book. This provides focus and clarity for all that follows. But it also squarely confronts the *status quo* scholarly dates assumed and/or argued for New Testament texts, dates ranging from the mid-1st to early 2nd century CE. If our most reliable chronological witnesses point to new Greek words being coined and/or first popularized after Hadrian, and these words are found throughout the books of the canonical New Testament, then this should move the needle decisively on the outer bound dates of NT documents.

Even with this initial line of demarcation in place, sifting through primary sources outside the NT to separate pre-138 CE lemmas from exclusively post-138 CE lemmas is still often quite challenging. An enormous diversity of texts by authors both known and unknown present myriad obstacles for scholars to navigate over, through, and around on their respective quests for scientific clarity. Many 2nd century CE Greek texts have survived in their original language, yet their stable and corroborated textual forms date to the 4th or 5th century. What may have originally been 2nd century Greek works are sometimes only pre-

served in Syriac, Coptic, or Latin translations in manuscripts dated several centuries later. Christian martyr Acts, for example, started to appear around the mid- to late-2nd century, but the versions preserved for posterity often reflect 3rd, 4th, or 5th century editions.³ In practice, the imprisonment of Origen during the Decian persecution supplies a *terminus ante quem* for works considered relevant to this project. When martyr stories with neologism candidates may have originated before Decius, they were considered in the analysis, but otherwise were ignored.

Other works, particularly those that later became collectively known as the Apostolic Fathers, were often re-written and expanded, making precise dating of their earliest textual strata fraught.⁴ Citations to such texts often appear in the analysis or notes, but they were usually found unreliable candidates for the earliest chronological hits of a lemma.⁵ Pseudonymous works attributed to 2nd and early-3rd century authors — Aristides, Euodius, Hippolytus of Rome, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and others,— were deemed unreliable as providing secure samples of neologisms between 138 and 249 CE, and were thus generally ignored.

Works labeled as Old Testament Apocrypha or Greek Pseudepigrapha are handled cautiously on a case by case basis. These include texts such as *2-4 Maccabees*, *1st-4th Enoch*, the *Testament of Abraham*, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the *Sibylline Oracles*, the *Apocalypse of Moses*, and others. Some of these texts have clear Greek witnesses and corroboration, but others have large lacunae in Greek manuscripts and are only well-attested in Ge'ez (Ethiopic), Latin, or other languages. Sometimes TLG results for these texts are judged as providing secure pre-138 CE attestations of Greek lemmas (often in conjunction with more secure authors such as Philo or Josephus), but at other times the results are determined to be unreliable, chronologically dubious, and/or the product of later Christian redaction. Still others,

such as the 4th century CE *Testament of Solomon*, mislabeled as 1st century in the TLG, are ignored altogether.

Early Christian Apocrypha often appear in the main analysis or end-notes, but they rarely provide chronologically secure points of origin. These texts call for caution in regard to possible mid- to late-2nd century provenance, but they can be almost entirely dismissed as providing 1st century attestations, despite these inaccurate labels in the TLG. Whether they are considered Christian Apocrypha or pre-canonical versions of Luke and the Pauline letters, Marcion's *Evangelion* and *Apostle* have their own complexities. Though they are noted in the following analysis, the findings do not hinge on them. That is to say, one could ignore Marcion's scriptures entirely and still observe the patterns documented regarding the emergence of new words and their earliest appropriations after 138 CE. The vast majority of neologisms documented here are not found in wording attested for Marcion's scriptures, even when attested for their canonical counterparts, a consistent pattern that is highly unlikely to be mere coincidence.

Even well-known Christian authors before Irenaeus present challenges and confounding factors. Justin Martyr, for example, provided many of our earliest clear quotations of and citations to the canonical Gospels, and yet Justin may also have had a hand in editing those Gospels. Tatian, Justin's student and a slightly older contemporary of Irenaeus, also presents problems, not least because of his own heavy-handed editing of the four canonical Gospels into a single Gospel Harmony.

The potential for cross-contaminations across canonical NT texts is also a major confounding factor. Numerous terms that could be viable neologisms in one Gospel could have spilled over into the others, in any number of possible directions of dependence. Terms that first appeared in one Pauline epistle could echo in another Pauline epistle, or

in a Petrine epistle, whether written by the same author or a different one. For this reason, this book brackets the question of relationships of sequence and dependency among canonical NT texts. In essence, we treat all NT books as a single group or document class. Though we cite specific chapter and verse locations for words within these texts, when doing so we do not insist on any particular model of interdependence among them on the whole. To get our bearings on the overall shape of the maze of NT relationships, we need to set ourselves outside and above the maze, even while zooming in on micro-features made possible by today's rigorously-annotated large data corpora.

Loanwords present yet another methodological consideration. Numerous Hebrew, Aramaic, and Latin words apparently find their first known appearance in the TLG within canonical NT texts.⁶ From a cross-cultural point of view, these could be dismissed as mere transliterations (i.e., sounding out a word from one language using the alphabet of another). But relative to the particular history of the Greek language, these loanwords sometimes become neologisms, taking on a life of their own in the target language. For a whole host of reasons, Latin loanwords generally provide clearer points of Greek origin than Hebrew and Aramaic loanwords do. Thus Latin loanwords are typically included in the following analysis, while Hebrew and Aramaic loanwords are not.

Generally speaking, non-Christian Greek authors of the 2nd century CE provide far clearer historical-chronological data than New Testament texts. These authors were often well-known, public figures, considered in their own time as political, military, scientific, philosophical and/or religious authorities. To be sure, there were quite popular exceptions that were largely if not entirely pseudonymous, such as the *Fables* of Aesop, the *Life* or *Romance* of Alexander the Great, the *Corpus Hermeticum*, or the works of Ps-Arrian. These exceptions present confounding factors,

i.e., uncertain dates of origin and/or versional fluidity. Words that appear in the *Fables* of Aesop and *Alexander Romance* are excluded as neologism candidates, because the content does not lend itself to a secure date exclusively after 138 CE. Other works that are obviously, fully, and clearly pseudonymous are often taken to be post-138 CE, but they are never used as providing secure chronological basis for a neologism. Among Greek novels, Chariton is taken as pre-138 CE, Achilles Tatius as dubious, and Xenophon of Ephesus as post-138 CE, yet none of these ever provide the basis for securely dating the emergence of a neologism. We also exclude words attested securely by a variety of late 1st and early 2nd century CE authors such as Josephus, Dio Chrysostom, and Plutarch, for though their influence on NT texts is more or less well-documented,⁷ they all sit within the range of dates considered acceptable in NT scholarship today.

Exclusions also apply at the morphological level, particularly for named entities (personal names and placenames). Prosopography (the study of personal identities, names, and family relationships) has additional layers of complexity to consider. They often appear in inscriptions (letters carved in stone), which are both numerous and diffuse. These data are more prone to ambiguity, not only in spelling variations but also frequent abbreviations in the material record. They are also strewn across many print volumes and various databases, so navigating them *en masse* can be challenging. My initial queries turned up some 240 total named entities in the New Testament that are possible candidates as post-Hadrianic neologisms. But sifting carefully through all of these names is a massive and complex undertaking. Perhaps that will be the topic of a later, collaborative volume or project.

Spelling variations for common nouns are sometimes included and sometimes not, depending on whether the root words have separate entries in the LSJ lexicon, whether the words are morphologically distinct

(e.g., follow different noun or adjective declensions), and/or whether the variations exhibit significant temporal divergence.⁸

Organization, Approach, and Caveats

Thus, in what follows, we take a chronological, author-by-author approach to map neologism candidates strictly by limiting ourselves to clear, historically well-anchored, non-Christian uses of terms. Essentially, we query the literary-historical record by making no assumptions about when the canonical Gospels and Acts came into existence, treating these documents as non-factors when identifying and isolating neologisms in the diachronic flow of time. To put it differently, the starting assumption is that the Gospels and Acts, however creative they were literarily and theologically, in terms of the specific vocabulary they were using, were seldom inventing completely new terms and introducing them into mainstream Greek usage. In other words, we start from the assumption that influential Greek-writing cultural elites were more likely than Christian authors to pioneer neologisms, and that their precedents were more likely to seep into the relatively meager literary production of Christians in the 2nd century than for Christian authors to invent neologisms that were then appropriated in non-Christian elite literature.

Let's put it in more pragmatic terms. After building a custom database using the OGA and GLAUx data, we queried that database for words that 1) appear in the NT, 2) do not appear in Philo, Josephus, and Plutarch, and 3) do not appear in any other Greek works prior to the 2nd century CE. That left us with about 750 words to examine more closely. About 240 of these were named entities that could be filtered quickly. We then ran TLG lemma searches on the remaining 500 words, sorted the results by date, and analyzed the first several hits outside of the NT. This

often led down scholarly rabbit-holes about the date and authorship of a wide variety of texts that are not typically a part of NT and early Christian studies. But these explorations, as well as fresh close readings of neologism candidates, turned up many original and fascinating insights into the intricacies of the intertextual webs produced in the initial emergence of new lemmas. This approach may not have caught every possible neologism coined after 138 CE that appears in the New Testament, but it likely caught most of them.

We must also acknowledge the inherent limitations of this approach. The Greek literary record, even with modern corpora, is far from complete. Tens of millions of word tokens, while numerous, still only capture a small fraction of the entirety of Greek oral and written communication between 138 and 249 CE. Many texts are fragmentary, many more entirely lost. Many neologisms may have started out as oral custom before being written down. Many works that may be relevant (such as the Greek loanwords found in Coptic Nag Hammadi Codices) are not yet available as a digital corpus to search. We must acknowledge the limitations, arbitrariness, and survival biases inherent in the data that have been preserved, digitized, and made available to query. Be that as it may, such limitations are endemic to all scholarship on the NT and early Christianity, including scholarly research that does not make use of computational queries of big data. Progress demands that we search as much data as are available, while also curating new data resources, as we have done by compiling a private index of Greek lemmas found in the Nag Hammadi Codices.

So, though postclassical Greek linguistic data is limited and often fragmentary, it is nevertheless massive and growing. Modern computational resources and methods allow us to query that data at a scale and speed that was simply impossible for previous generations. When

we attempt to pinpoint a neologism to a specific author, document, and date (or date range) of composition, we are not claiming that these are absolutely certain and precise conclusions. Some of our examples may be true neologisms, root words invented and first used precisely in the examples we have isolated. Others may only get us relatively close (temporally and/or prosopographically) to when and in which literary circles a lemma first emerged. The identification of the earliest reliable appearances of a lemma in effect draws a line of temporal demarcation indicating the current limit of our scientific knowledge. These neologistic anchors are currently as far back as we can trace the specific echoes cascading to us through our materiality and across time.

Caution is warranted, and yet in the pursuit of science, open-mindedness and probabilistic logic must remain paramount. We have uncovered just over forty different NT lemmas that apparently first emerged or were first popularized after Hadrian in texts outside of the NT. Even if many of these are flawed and inaccurate attempts to establish origin points, if even half of them are accurate, then that on its own should shift the Overton window of date ranges scholars typically hold as reasonable for the composition, or at least the textual stabilization, of these documents. To us it seems far more likely that a clear majority of the neologism candidates we surfaced actually did precede the corresponding NT texts, which could establish a very high baseline of confidence for correspondingly late, outer bound date ranges for many NT works. We leave it to more capable statisticians to challenge, confirm, correct, and concretize our preliminary probabilistic assessments.

The main chapters typically cover one non-Christian Greek author at a time, particularly any of their works likely composed after 138 CE. Each chapter runs through all neologism candidates for that author and presents them in alphabetical order by Greek spelling.

Arrian of Nicomedia (108–160 CE)

The introduction stated that the death of Hadrian would be the chronological point of departure of our neologistic exploration. Easier said than done. The adult life and writing career of our first author spanned the reigns of three emperors, Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius. So while some of his works may be post-Hadrianic, many of them are not. The sorting out of the two requires careful consideration.

Born in Nicomedia in Bithynia, Arrian traveled as a young man to Nicopolis of Epirus and became a student of Epictetus. While the *Discourses* or *Dissertations* of Epictetus are based on Arrian's notes from this time (107–108 CE), he did not publish this collection until after the death of Hadrian.⁹ A given quotation from the *Dissertationes*, then, could be considered as possibly reflective of Epictetus himself (in which case we plan to treat it in the second volume, currently in progress),¹⁰ or as the product of Arrian's work as editor and publisher of the collection, in which case it appears in this chapter. Another possibly post-Hadrianic work by Arrian, written after his six year term as legate and governor of Cappadocia (131–137 CE), is the *Alexandri anabasis*, also treated in this chapter. Arrian was elected an archon of Athens circa 145–147 CE,¹¹ and in the capital of Hellenistic culture he also died.

οὐά / oua / “wah!” has 93 hits in the entire TLG. Some of these are inaccurate, textual corruptions, including the topmost TLG hit: Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*.¹² Greek papyri and inscriptions have numerous matches for the three-letter string, but none appear to reflect the standalone exclamation. The lemma does appear three times in the *Dissertationes* of Epicte-

tus (3.22.34, 3.23.24, 3.23.32). It could thus be said to enter the literary record first either when Arrian took notes of Epictetus' dialogues ca 108 CE, or in the reign of Antoninus Pius when Arrian published them.

In the NT, the lemma happens to be *hapax legomenon*, occurring only in Mark 15:29, which recounts passersby during the crucifixion of Jesus who say, **Οὐὰ** ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, / “**Wah**, the one who destroys the temple and builds [it] in three days!” In my view, this unique saying was likely inspired in part by Arrian:

εἰ γὰρ κακὸν ἐστὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, ἅν τε ὁμοῦ ἅν τε καθ' ἓνα ὁμοίως κακὸν ἐστίν. μή τι ἄλλο τι μέλλει γίνεσθαι ἢ τὸ σωματίον χωρίζεσθαι καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ; οὐδέν. (34) σοὶ δὲ ἀπολλυμένων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἡ θύρα κέκλεισται; οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποθανεῖν; ‘ἔξεστιν.’ τί οὖν πενθεῖς; ‘οὐὰ, βασιλεὺς καὶ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς σκῆπτρον ἔχων.’ ἀτυχῆς βασιλεὺς οὐ γίνεται· οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀτυχῆς θεός. (Diss 3.22.34)

For if dying is evil, then it is evil whether it is collective or individual. Is anything else bound to happen than that the meager body and the soul are separated? Nothing. (34) Has the door of the Greeks who died been shut to you? Is it not permissible to die? It is permissible. So why do you mourn? **Wah**, a king and one who holds the scepter of Zeus! A king does not become unfortunate, no more than a God [becomes] unfortunate.

The parallels go beyond the new, rare lemma, to include the foci of death, afterlife, monarchy, and divinity. This likely places the Gospel of Mark (at least in its canonical form) well after 108 CE, and more likely late within, or subsequent to, the reign of Antoninus Pius, when Arrian published the *Dissertationes*. That the next two usages are by Irenaeus (AH 1.13.2) and Cassius Dio (H.R. 63.20.5) favor the latter time frame.

προεπαγγέλλω / *proepangellō* / “to pre-promise”|“pre-announce” appears some 93 times in total in the TLG, but did not turn up in searches of major databases of Greek papyri or inscriptions. Its first hit in a non-Christian text is found within the *Alexandri anabasis* of Arrian.

Scholars debate the date of this composition, not least because of the ambiguity of Arrian’s “second preface” to the work. Syme favored an early or late Antonine date, after Arrian’s time as legate and governor of Cappadocia.¹³ Stadler situated the *Anabasis* as either late Hadrianic (Cappadocian) or early post-Hadrianic (Athenian).¹⁴ Moles was more confident about its post-Hadrianic composition in Athens.¹⁵ Other scholars have argued for an early Hadrianic date,¹⁶ or maintained that the date puzzle is unsolvable.¹⁷ Alexander the Great was conspicuously missing from several of Arrian’s earlier writings, and it may have been his military leadership in Cappadocia to repel the Alani and subsequent composition of the *Tactica* late in his governorship that inspired him to take a keen interest in Alexander’s military tactics and career.

The relevant lemma appears amidst Alexander’s exploits *en route* to India, specifically in Gadrosia, what is modern day Balochistan.

Ὡς δὲ ἀφίκετο ἐς τῶν Γαδρωσίων τὰ βασίλεια, ἀναπαύει ἐνταῦθα τὴν στρατιάν. καὶ Ἀπολλοφάνην μὲν παύει τῆς σατραπείας, ὅτι οὐδενὸς ἔγνω ἐπιμεληθέντα τῶν **προεπηγγελημένων**, Θόαντα δὲ σατραπεύειν τῶν ταύτῃ ἔταξε· τούτου δὲ νόσω τελευτήσαντος Σιβύρτιος τὴν σατραπείαν ἐκδέχεται (*Alex.anab.* 6.27.1)

But as he arrived at the royal courts of the Gadrosians, he was resting the army there. And he fired Apollophanes from the satrapy, because he knew nothing of managerial duties of those **pre-promised**. He stationed Thoas to be satrap of things there. But when he perished by sickness, Sibyrtios received the satrapy.

In later non-Christian writings, the lemma appears once in a word list of Julius Pollux (*Onomast.* 5.105), and became more popular with Cassius Dio, who used it no less than seven times.¹⁸

In the NT, the lemma appears twice, both in canonical Pauline verses likely missing from Marcion's *Apostolos* (2Cor 9:5, Rom 1:2):

ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἡγησάμην παρακαλέσαι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἵνα προέλθωσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ προκαταρτίσωσιν τὴν **προεπηγγελμένην** εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν, ταύτην ἐτοίμην εἶναι οὕτως ὡς εὐλογίαν καὶ μὴ ὡς πλεονεξίαν.

So I considered it necessary to exhort the brothers, so that they might pre-arrive to you and pre-furnish the **pre-promised** blessing of yours, this prepared so as to be a blessing and not as greediness.

Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ, ² ὃ **προεπηγγείλατο** διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις (Rom 1:1–2)

Paul, a slave of Christ Jesus, called apostle, having been separated for the evangelion of God, ² which was **pre-promised** through his prophets in holy scriptures.

With Arrian's usage as background, canonical Paul enacts an antithesis to Apollophanes. Whereas Alexander ended the political career of the former, Paul himself, and those under his charge, are fully aware and totally devoted to their responsibilities to "what was pre-promised". Both canonical NT usages match Arrian's as passive forms made substantive by the preceding word. Whereas the preceding pronoun and regular verb in Rom 1:2 are somewhat distinctive, 2Cor has a closer match: a plural definite article precedes the participial form of the lemma. The literary juxtaposition of Paul with Apollophanes is also befitting as a form of literary imitation and rivalry of a notable Apollo-theophore.¹⁹

Claudius Ptolemy (ca 127–178 CE)

Claudius Ptolemy is estimated to have lived between 100 and 178 CE.²⁰ The astronomical observations in his *Almagest* date between 127 and 151 CE, and its composition was mostly if not entirely post-138 CE. The *Tetrabiblos* mentions the *Almagest*, and thus the *Tetrabiblos* dates sometime after 151 CE.²¹

ἐξορκιστής / *eksorkistēs* / “exorcist” may be a commonly known word today, but its first appearance in non-Christian Greek literature according to the TLG is in the astrologer Ptolomy.

ἰδίως δὲ πάλιν, ἐὰν ἡ σελήνη τὸν πρακτικὸν τόπον ἐπισχῇ τὸν ἀπὸ συνόδου δρόμον ποιουμένη σὺν τῷ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ... ποιεῖ ... ἐν δὲ Ζυγῷ καὶ Κριῷ καὶ Λέοντι θεολήπτους, ὄνειροκρίτας, **ἐξορκιστάς**. (*Anth.* 4.4.11)

Characteristically again, if the moon holds the active place, making course on a conjunction with Mercury ... this produces ... in Libra and Aries and Leo them who are God-possessed, dream-readers, **exorcists**.

This evidently new Greek word also appears in Acts 19:13. The passage opens by claiming God worked miracles through Paul (19:11), healing diseases even by way of cloth that had touched him (19:12). Then:

ἐπεχείρησαν δέ τινες καὶ τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων **ἐξορκιστῶν** ὀνομάζειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰ πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες, Ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει.

Some of the itinerant Judean **exorcists** attempted to name the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had the evil spirits, saying, I oath-bind you by Jesus, whom Paul preaches.

This immediately leads to the exorcists (seven sons of Sceva) getting pummeled and stripped naked by the demon-possessed man (19:14).

An epigram falsely ascribed to Lucian of Samosata and likely dated to after the 2nd century CE also uses this term, in quite grotesque fashion:

Δαίμονα πολλὰ λαλῶν ὀζόστομος **ἐξορκιστῆς**
ἐξέβαλ', οὐχ ὄρκων, ἀλλὰ κόπρων δυνάμει. (*Epigram*. 11.427)

Speaking to many demons, a foul-breathed **exorcist**
cast them out, not with oaths, but instead with the power of shits.

The cumulative evidence points to Acts making use of a lexical convention of the mid- to late-2nd century CE at the earliest.

μεθοδεία / *methodeia* / “method” first occurs in a chronologically secure setting in Ptolemy’s *Syntaxis* or *Almagest*, completed by 151 CE.²²

τὰ δὲ πέμπτα σελίδια γέγονεν ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ καὶ τὰς ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις
τῶν ἐκκέντρων παρόδοις συνισταμένας κατὰ πλάτος παραχωρήσεις
διευκρινεῖν ἐκ τῆς τῶν παρατιθεμένων ἐξηκοστῶν **μεθοδείας**.

Now the fifth little columns were made by us concerning the occurrences in the other passages of cardinal points according to width, to clarify extensions **by method** of the sixty presented alongside.

It also appears in the [post-]Aurelian *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian:

Τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν διὰ τοῦ ευω ῥημάτων, διὰ τοῦ εἰα γινόμενα θηλυκὰ,
διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφονται· οἷον· λατρεύω, λατρεία· μεσιτεύω,

μεσιτεία· πρεσβεύω, πρεσβεία· καρκεύω, καρκεία· βλακεύω, βλακεία· μεθοδεύω, **μεθοδεία**· καὶ τὰ ὅμοια ὡσαύτως. (Boissonade 1819:221)

The words from those formed with the εὔω, being feminine with the εἶα, are written with the εἰ diphthong, such as: to worship, worship; to mediate, mediation; to represent, representation; to sauce up, sauce; to be lazy, laziness; to do methodically, **method**; and the like similarly.

Among early Christian works, this word first appears in a parallel portion of Marcionite Laodiceans and canonical Ephesians, with only modest [bracketed] differences between them (Lao 6:12 // Eph 6:12):

ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ [πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς] τὸ στῆναι πρὸς τὰς **μεθοδείας** τοῦ διαβόλου·

Be clothed in the panoply of the God [in order for you to be able] to stand up to the **methods** of the devil.

In a verse possibly missing from Marcionite Laodiceans, the same term appeared earlier in canonical Ephesians:

ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν **μεθοδείαν** τῆς πλάνης.

so that we may no longer be infants, wave-tossed and carried round by every wind of the teaching in the trickery of the humans in craftiness unto the **method** of the deception.

One explicit and one supplied instance of this lemma turned up in searches of digitized Greek inscriptions. Milet VI,2 565 uses μεθοδεία explicitly.²³ Though a precise date is not provided in the PHI or TM databases, the text itself mentions Fl[avius] Antiochianus, perhaps one

of the two famous persons by that name who lived in the 3rd century CE.²⁴ The supplied hit (IGLSyr 4 1593) is clearly Christian and dates between 383–395 CE.²⁵

Another neologism for which Ptolemy is arguably the earliest attestor is κοσμοκράτωρ / *kosmokratōr* / “world-ruler”, but in our view Antigonos provides the earliest attestation, and so this lemma is explored in the chapter devoted to Antigonos. Here in the conclusion of the chapter on Ptolemy, we note that two new and/or highly distinctive terms (κοσμοκράτωρ, μεθοδεία) of Ptolemy are found adjacent to each other in Marcionite Laodiceans and canonical Ephesians (6:11–12). This double-finding based on computational queries of all Greek lemmas inside the NT within a broader diachronic view strongly favors the overshadowing influence of the famous astrologer. Certainly, the responses in Marcionite Laodiceans and canonical Ephesians strike an adversarial tone, but appropriation and critique often go hand in hand. Among known candidates for authorship of Marcionite Laodiceans, Valentinus is as good as any. Even if it is presently difficult to be certain of this, we have good reason to be confident about the rhetorical opponent in view: the astrologer Ptolemy.

Apollonius Dyscolus (ca 138–160 CE)

Precise dates are elusive for the famous Alexandrian grammarian, Apollonius Dyscolus, though he is known to have stayed briefly in Rome.²⁶ His son, Aelius Herodian, a “worthy successor” who often borrowed from and even cited his father,²⁷ lived in Rome for an extended time. Herodian worked under the patronage of Marcus Aurelius and dedicated his monumental *General Prosody* to the emperor.²⁸ An Aurelian range for the son, and Antonine range for the father, are thus reasonable even if somewhat imprecise ranges. Both wrote voluminously and were often cited in their own generations and in later centuries for their extensive work on the technical dimensions of Greek language.

The following analysis hinges on two works by Dyscolus, *On Adverbs* / *De adverbiiis* / *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων*, and *On Syntax* / *De constructione* / *Περὶ σύνταξεως*, which are largely intact and generally considered authentic. Herodian’s authorship is another matter entirely. For a fuller discussion of the authenticity and inauthenticity of works attributed to Herodian, see the opening to the later chapter on him. In this chapter, we cover only words that are clearly and first attested by his father, supplementing this analysis with references to Herodian’s works that may be authentic or dubious. Quotations from works of dubious attribution are indicated with “[Ps-]Herodian” as the author.

βρύχω / *brucho* / “to gobble|devour|gnaw” is a postclassical Greek form of the classical Greek βρύκω / *brukō*, a lemma commonplace from Hesiod onward (736 TLG hits), regularly used by non-Christian and Christian authors alike. The variant spelling with a *chi* in place of the *kappa* is later

and rarer (21 TLG hits). This particular lemma first appears in Dyscolus' treatise *On Adverbs*.²⁹

καὶ παρὰ ῥῆμα σχηματίζεται, ἐκ μὲν βαρυτόνου τοῦ **βρύχω** τὸ βρυχηδόν·

[Words ending in *-don*] are also formed from verbs; from the uncircumflexed verb “**to gnaw**” comes “gnawingly”.

A generation later, his son uses the same, unusual spelling in his *General Prosody*,³⁰ the monumental work dedicated to Marcus Aurelius.

Τὰ εἰς χω δισύλλαβα ἀρχόμενα ἀπὸ συμφώνου μὴ διὰ τοῦ η παραληγόμενα φύσει μακρᾷ βαρύνεται· εἰ δέ τι περισπᾷσθῃ, τοῦτο ἐκ βαρυτόνου παρήχθη ὥς ἐπὶ τοῦ τρέχω τροχῶ ... βαρύνεται δὲ ταῦτα, στείχω, τεύχω, ψύχω, τρύχω, σμύχω, **βρύχω**

Disyllabic words beginning with consonants, ending in *χω*, when not lengthened by *η*, are naturally unaccented on the long [syllable]. But if a certain one is circumflexed, it was derived from an unaccented word, as with *trecho* for *trochō* ... These are unaccented: *steicho*, *teucho*, *psucho*, *trucho*, *smucho*, **to gnaw** / **brucho**

The lemma also appears in the *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian,³¹ in a list of words starting with the letters *βρυχ* / *bruch*:

βρύχω, ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπου· βρυχῶμαι, ἐπὶ λέοντος· καὶ βρύχημα.

To gnaw, [said] about a human; to roar, [said] about a lion; and roar.

Despite the Alexandria-based LXX using the classical and more common spelling five times,³² the only occurrence of the lemma in the NT follows the rare spelling used by two blood-related, leading grammarians of

the mid-2nd century. Even more fascinating in context is the characterization of Stephen’s would-be killers as carnivorous animals with hearts made of saw-like teeth (Acts 7:54):

Ἀκούοντες δὲ ταῦτα διεπρίοντο ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν καὶ ἔβρυχον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπ’ αὐτόν.

Now hearing these things, they were sawing asunder in their hearts and **were gnawing** the teeth over him.

The confluence of a new lemma and astonishingly similar surrounding context favor not merely the general neologistic influence of Dyscolus, but indeed the more immediate influence of a wordlist akin to that attributed to Herodian. This connection also highlights by contrast how English translations of διεπρίοντο / *dieprionto* as a bland passive or mere emotional state are erroneous morphologically (the verb is likely middle) and/or oblivious to the animal imagery. Compare:

- “they were cut to the heart” (KJV)
- “they were cut to the quick” (NAS)
- “they became enraged” (NRS)
- “they were furious” (NIV)

For lexical context, the LSJ entry for διαπρίω / *diapriō* opens: “-ιοῦμαι, to saw quite through, saw asunder”. To wit, Stephen’s executioners most closely resemble the lexicographic lions of [Ps-]Herodian.

γαμίζω / *gamidzō* / “to marry” | “to marry off” (78 TLG hits) might surprise some readers as a neologism candidate, given that it occurs seven times in canonical NT texts: Mt 22:30, 24:38, Mk 12:25, Lk 17:27, 20:35, 1Co 7:38 (*bis*). But other lemmas with similar meaning appear earlier in Greek

literature, including the verb γαμίσκω / *gamiskō* / “to marry” | “to marry off” (60 TLG hits from Aristotle on), and the more ancient and far more prevalent cognate γαμέω / *gameō* / “to marry” | “to marry off” (8000+ TLG hits from Homer on). The first usage of γαμίζω / *gamidzō* outside early Christian literature is in Dyscolus’ treatise *On Syntax / De constructione*. In the literary context, he explains the difference between verbs ending in a simple *omega* and verbs ending in *iota-zeta-omega*, noting the latter convey the sense of giving something to someone else.

Τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει διαφορὰν καὶ τὸ γαμῶ πρὸς τὸ **γαμίζω**· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ μὲν πρότερον γάμου μεταλαμβάνω, τὸ δὲ **γαμίζω** γάμου τινὶ μεταδίδωμι· τό γε μὴν γαμῶ παθητικῶς κλίνεται, καθὸ τὰ τῆς διαθέσεως πρὸς σύνταξιν ἐμψύχου προσώπου κατεγίνετο. (*Constr.* 153)³³

The same distinction holds also for “to marry” relative to “**to marry off**”. For the former is to partake of marriage, but “**to marry off**” is to give over in marriage to someone. Even so, “to marry” can be inflected as passive, just as matters of function are constructed following the syntax of an animate character.

Though the lemma occurs in canonical Luke 17:27 and 20:35, and was reconstructed for Marcion’s *Evangelion* by some editors, we conclude it was entirely missing from the *Evangelion*.³⁴ It is also notable that Vaticanus and ms 124 attest the older and more commonplace lemma (here γαμίσκονται / *gamiskontai* not γαμίζονται / *gamidzontai*) for Luke 20:35. Likewise, Marcion’s *Apostolos* only has γαμέω / *gameō* (*1Cor 7:39),³⁵ while γαμίζω / *gamidzō* occurs twice in the immediately preceding canonical verse (1Cor 7:38).

A pattern begins to emerge. Marcion’s *Evangelion* and *Apostolos* speak of marriage in more ascetic and gender egalitarian terms, yet

use the most traditional and commonplace word form to do so. The canonical NT Gospels and Paulines reinstitute patriarchal marriage conventions, and yet make use of what appears to be a new word form introduced and/or popularized by Dyscolus. This suggests that the final form of the marriage teachings associated with both Jesus and Paul were revised and supplemented in a post-Hadrianic setting.

πεισμονή / *peismonē* / “persuasion|confidence” appears first in a non-Christian text in Dyscolus’ treatise *On Syntax / De constructione*.

Οὕτως δ’ οἶμαι ἔχειν καὶ τὸ πείθομαι ὑπὸ σοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τι σημαίνει τὸ πείθομαι σοί ἢ τὴν ἐξ ἀλλήλων πρὸς ἀλλήλους γινομένην **πεισμονήν**. (*Constr.* 186)³⁶

So I think it is also [like this with] the [expression] “I am persuaded by you”, and “I am persuaded by you” means nothing else than the **persuasion** happening from each other toward each other.

In Christian texts outside the NT, the lemma appears first in Justin Martyr’s *Dial. Trypho* (ca 155–167 CE):

Πολλὰς μὲν οὖν καὶ ἑτέρας προφητείας ἔχοντες εἰπεῖν, ἐπαυσάμεθα, αὐτάρκεις καὶ ταύτας εἰς **πεισμονήν** τοῖς τὰ ἀκουστικά καὶ νοερὰ ὅσα ἔχουσιν εἶναι λογισάμενοι καὶ νοεῖν δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἡγούμενοι ὅτι οὐχ ὁμοίως τοῖς μυθοποιηθεῖσι περὶ τῶν νομισθέντων υἱῶν τοῦ Διὸς, καὶ ἡμεῖς μόνον λέγομεν ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἀποδείξαι ἔχομεν. (*Dial. Trypho* 53.1)

Thus, though having many other prophecies to speak, we pause, reckoning these being sufficient for **persuasion** to those who have tempered and intellectual ears, and considering them to be able to understand, because they are not similar to the mythmakings about those held as sons of Zeus, and we alone speak but we do not have to prove.

The lemma appears in the NT just once, in canonical Gal 5:8, in a portion evidently missing from its Marcionite counterpart:

Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν [τῇ] ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι; ⁸ ἡ **πεισμονή** οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. (Gal 5:7–8)

You were running virtuously. Who thwarted you not to be persuaded by [the] truth? ⁸ The **persuasion** is not from the one who calls you.

It also appears in all of the major recensions of the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (Ign3 Ign7 Ign13) at *Rom* 3.3,³⁷ and around 180 CE, in two fragments of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies* (fr. 15, 17).

The lemma did not show up in searches of major databases of digitized Greek papyri and Greek inscriptions. The accrued evidence points to the grammarian Dyscolus as the strongest candidate for coining and/or popularizing this neologism, one that he or his son Herodian brought to Rome, where Justin also taught as a contemporary. It also points to the canonical Pauline redaction to Galatians happening during the reign of Antoninus Pius at the earliest, and more likely during or after the time of Marcus Aurelius.

Aelius Promotus (ca 138–193 CE)

According to the *Oxford Reference* entry, Aelius Promotus was a “physician from Alexandria, probably belonged to the period between Hadrian and Pertinax (ad 138–93)”.³⁸ This reference entry is outdated, though, in regard to its claim that his work *On Potency* / Δυναμepόν is unedited, given that Crismani 2002 contains just such an edition, one now available to query in the TLG. The treatise *On Poisonous Animals and Toxic Drugs* / *De venenatis animalibus et venenis medicamentis* is a different matter.

While the latter treatise has traditionally been attributed to Promotus, this attribution was dubiously based on two manuscripts that set the treatise between two different works of Promotus.³⁹ Ihm’s critical edition (1995) and related article (1996) refute Rohde (1873, 1901), who had claimed that *De venenatis* was composed by the 1st–2nd century CE medical author Archigenes, when in fact Archigenes was only occasionally excerpted, along with several other medical authors who date no later than the 2nd century CE. Ihm does not conclusively disqualify Promotus as author of this treatise, but cautiously maintains that its author is unknown, that it was composed and occasionally edited between the 2nd and 6th century CE. Given the complex, evolving character of the work, we indicate the author of *Poisonous Animals* as [Ps-]Promotus.

ἄψινθος / *apsinthos* / “wormwood”|“absinth”, as a feminine, second declension noun (LSJ ἄψινθος, ἡ), has its first possible occurrence in non-Christian texts in the TLG in one of three candidates: the medical authors [Ps-]Promotus and Aretaeus, and the grammarian Herodian. While Aretaeus and Herodian are likely more secure chronological origin points

for the feminine second-declension noun, we are exploring this formal neologism candidate in the chapter on Promotus because the usage by [Ps-]Promotus bears the closest resemblance to the usage found in the NT. Indeed, in our opinion the Promotus-affiliated tradition partly inspired the editor(s) of Revelation at this point.

Before exploring the earliest history of the feminine second-declension noun, we must take note that the neuter second declension ἄψινθιον / *apsinthion* is attested in Attic Greek works by Xenophon (*Anab.* 1.5.1) the medical author Hippocrates (15 TLG hits), the botanist Theophrastus (7 TLG hits), and others. The neuter lemma remains consistent in the mid-1st century CE medical author Dioscorides Pedanius (65 TLG hits), the first Greek author in the TLG to attest the derivative lemma ἄψινθίτης / *apsinthitēs* / “absinthine wine” and the Latin loan-word *apsinthium*. The consistent use of the neuter second-declension continues in several other medical authors roughly contemporaneous to NT texts, such as:

- Ps-Dioscorides (10 TLG hits, post 1st c. CE)
- Rufus (7 TLG hits, 1st–2nd c. CE)
- Soranus (7 TLG hits, 1st–2nd c. CE)
- Archigenes (8 TLG hits, 1st–2nd c. CE)
- Galen (120 TLG hits, mid-2nd c. CE)
- Ps-Galen (23 TLG hits, post 2nd c. CE)

Among Greek papyri, only the neuter form appears (11 hits), and only two of these are prior to the 2nd century CE (p.herc. 182, p.herc. 1471). Among non-canonical (or ambiguously canonical) Christian writings, the *Shepherd of Hermas* also only uses the neuter second-declension (3 hits, all in ch. 33).

The neuter lemma appears only once in the [Ps-]Promotus treatise *On Poisonous Animals and Toxic Drugs*, specifically when the author/compiler quotes the Classical medic Epaenetus (*venen.* 63). Elsewhere the unusual spelling ἀψίνθιν / *apsinthin* appears (*venen.* 53), a rare feminine third-declension form, or perhaps a misspelling.

What may be one of the earliest uses of the feminine second-declension noun ἄψινθος / *apsinthos* is found in the same work by [Ps-]Promotus, in the section “On Mosquitos” / πρὸς κώνωπας. It comes as the last of eight (!) different methods prescribed for keeping mosquitos away from one’s home and body. The fifth method sounds somewhat similar to the sizzle of today’s electric mosquito zappers; it entailed placing a fuming oil lamp inside a pot with many holes, designed to attract and kill the insects.

ἄλλο· χύτραν πολύοπον πάνυ κατασκευάσας καὶ τέμβαλὼν† λύχνον λάβρως ἀνάπτων, ἐπιτίθει κατ’ αὐτοῦ τὴν χύτραν κατακέφαλα ἐναποκλείων τὸν λύχνον. καὶ πάντες ἐκεῖ διαδραμόντες φλέγονται τὰς πτέρυγας. ... ἄλλο· **ἀψίνθη**ν σὺν ἐλαίῳ ἀπόζεσον καὶ χρῆε καὶ οὐχ ἄψονταί σου, ἢ ἔλαιον ῥαφάνινον. (*venen.* 45)

Another [method]: Thoroughly crafting a many-eyed clay pot, and putting inside a lamp, furiously kindling it, put down over it the clay pot, head down, enclosing the lamp inside. And there all of them, coursing through it, will have their wings burned. ... Another [method]: **absinth** with oil, boil to a froth and anoint [yourself], and they will not touch you, or radish oil [as a substitute].

The usage of absinth to deal with mosquitos was not original to [Ps-]Promotus. The 1st century CE Dioscorides Pedanius may be the first known author to prescribe “absinth with oil” / ἀψίνθιον σὺν ἐλαίῳ /

apsinthion sun elaiō (*Eupor.* 2.137.1) for this. In Philumenus’ late 2nd, early 3rd century CE treatise by a similar name to that of [Ps-]Promotus, *On Venemous Animals and on Their Remedies* / *De venenatis animalibus eorumque remediis*, “absinth with oil in a soaked poultice” / ἀψίνθιον cὺν ἐλαίῳ ῥαφανίνῳ [καὶ] κυγχρίου / *apsinthion sun elaiō raphaninō [kai] sugchriou* is twice mentioned as a preventative remedy for mosquitos (12.2–3).

In a later section “On Pine-Thistle” / περὶ ἰξίας, [Ps-]Promotus uses the feminine first-declension nominative, “absinth with wine” / ἀψίνθη μετ’ οἴνου / *apsinthē met oinou* (*venen.* 59), specifically as a remedy to alleviate the poisonous effects of those who ingested this toxic plant. And again, in the section “On Deadly Mushrooms”, [Ps-]Promotus also uses the first-declension feminine accusative ἀψίνθην / *apsinthēn*, specifically as a cure for mushroom poisoning (*venen.* 67). The latter belongs to a list of remedies that Promotus attributes to Epaenetus, though in this case, given the broader diachronic patterns of declension and spelling, it is very likely the spelling was updated from neuter second-declension to feminine first-declension.

In his two books *On the Cure of Chronic Diseases* / *De curatione diuturnorum morborum*, the mid-2nd century CE medical author Aretaeus twice uses the feminine second-declension of “absinth”, both with the formula “juice of **absinth**” / χυλοῦ|χυλῶ τῆς ἀψίνθου / *chulou|chulō tēs aphinthou*, once as a remedy for stomach bile (1.5.6) and once as a remedy for stomach ulcers (1.13.4). Elsewhere, Aretaeus favors the traditional and far more common neuter second-declension (7 TLG hits), three times as a “powder of absinth” / ἀψινθίου κόμην|κόμη / *apsinthiou komēn|komē* (2.3.13, 2.4.6, 2.6.4), twice as a standalone reference to a liquid ἀψίνθιον / *apsinthion* / “absinth” (2.6.2, 2.7.3), one as “absinth of wine” / ἀψινθίου τοῦ οἴνου / *apsinthiou tou oinou* (2.13.11), and once as “juice of absinth” / ἀψινθίου χυλὸν / *apsinthiou chulon* (1.1.25).

The same second declension neuter lemma also appears in the authentic *General Prosody* of Herodian, who notes the variant spelling:⁴⁰

Ἄψυνθος πόλις Θράκης. ἔστι καὶ εἶδος φυτοῦ. διχῶς δ' ἡ γραφή καὶ διὰ τοῦ υ καὶ διὰ τοῦ ι. (*Pros.cath.*, GG 3.1:147)

Apsunthos is a city in Thrace. It is also a type of plant. But it is written in two ways, with an *upsilon* and with an *iota*.

Herodian's writings only apparently contain these descriptions of the neuter second-declension and feminine third-declension spellings for the lemmas associated with the plant, not the actual words themselves.

Lemmas associated with absinth occur in only one place in the NT, specifically in canonical Revelation, also known as the Apocalypse of John. As the LSJ entry for ἀψίνθιον indicates, Revelation is unique for pairing a feminine second-declension noun with a clearly masculine definite article. At least according to the NA²⁸ edition of the Greek NT,⁴¹ no notable variant spelling appears here. This makes it stand out in the sweep of linguistic history, but also likely reflects the unrefined Greek style of its editor(s) (Rev 8:10–11):

Καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν· καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀστὴρ μέγας καιόμενος ὡς λαμπὰς καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων, ¹¹ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρος λέγεται ὁ Ἄψινθος. καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων εἰς ἄψινθον, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανον ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων, ὅτι ἐπικράνθησαν.

And the third angel trumpeted. And there fell from the heaven a great star, burning like a lamp, and it fell upon a third of the rivers and upon the springs of water. ¹¹ And the name of the star is called the **Apsinthos**. And a third of the waters will turn into **absinth**, and many of the men will die from the waters, because they were made bitter.

In context, the apocalyptic seventh seal had been broken; the third of seven trumpet-bearing angels sounds forth, bringing a third set of plagues. The context also shares notable features with the [Ps-]Promotus passage. Not only do both use the rare second-declension feminine noun, but also make clear, proximate references to a lamp, burning, and death. If the intertext holds, then John (a late 2nd century!) Revelator (or his redactor) borrowed the Promotean image of an absinth-powered, mosquito-burning contraption and turned it into an Exodus-like plague oracle over waters, i.e., the places where mosquitos spread. Given the Thracian wordplay in Herodian, one also wonders if Revelation's Absinth-star makes a Thracian political/geographical allusion. Spartacus, for example, leader of the most famous slave-revolt in Roman history, was notably from Thrace (modern Bulgaria).

δυσεντέριον / *dysenterion* / “dysentery” first appears in the TLG, excepting NT texts, under the name of Aelius Promotus. Dysentery is obviously a common medical term today. It occurred frequently among many Greek medical authors. Yet before, concurrent with, and even somewhat after Promotus, it occurs only as a feminine lemma, not a neuter lemma, as Promotus was apparently the first to use. In non-Christian literature, the neuter lemma next occurs in Moeris (late 2nd or 3rd century), who notes the specific distinction between the traditional Attic lemma and the new Hellenistic lemma (*Moeridis atticista* δ 34):

δυσεντερία θηλυκῶς Ἀπτικοί· **δυσεντέριον** Ἑλλήνες.

Dysenteria feminine Attic [writers]; ***dysenterion*** Hellenes.

The mid- to late-2nd century CE Greek medical author Galen used only the feminine, not the neuter form. He thus remained consistent with the custom of Herodotus, Plato, and Hippocrates.⁴²

In the context of Promotus' main work, *Δυναμερόν* / *Potency*, the neuter gender is not the only distinctive feature in his use of the word.

ρκβ' Πρὸς τεινεσμούς καὶ κοιλιακούς — Προηγείται τὸ πλεῖστον **δυσεντερίων**. Χρὴ δὲ φλεβοτομεῖν εἰ ἐνδέχοιτο, εἰ δὲ μή γε αἰτία μέχρι διατρίτου ὠμηλύσεις τε [καὶ] θερμαὶ τιθέμεναι κατ' ὀσφύος καὶ ἥτρου. Μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ἐγκαθιζέτωσαν εἰς ἀφέψημα τήλεως ἢ μαλάχης ἢ λινοσπέρμου· εἰ δὲ ἀλγοῖεν μετὰ τὰς ἐκκρίσεις, ἐγκαθιζέτωσαν εἰς στυμμάτων ἀφέψημα καὶ ἀγαθίδα διὰ στυμμάτων θερμὴν προστιθέσθωσαν <ἢ> πίτυρα ἐν ἀποδέσμῳ δι' ὀξυκράτου θερμοῦ. (*Potency* 122)

122. For tenesmus and abdominal aches — Usually this is preceded by **dysentery**. One should do phlebotomy if possible, otherwise no grain until the third day, applying warm poultices upon the lower back and lower abdomen. Now after the excretions, let them sit in a decoction of fenugreek or mallow or linseed. But if one might feel pain after the secretions, let them sit in a decoction of astringents, and let them apply a warm skein of astringents <or> husk in a girdle saturated with a warm sour wine mix.

Near the end of Acts, when Paul and his sea-faring companions are stranded on Malta, after he miraculously survives a venomous snakebite, Paul is told that the father of Publius, the “leading-man” or “chief official” of the island, suffered with (neuter) “dysentery” (Acts 28:8–9):

ἐγένετο δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Ποπλίου πυρετοῖς καὶ **δυσεντερίῳ** συνεχόμενον κατακεῖσθαι, πρὸς ὃν ὁ Παῦλος εἰσελθὼν καὶ προσευξάμενος ἐπιθείς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἰάσατο αὐτόν. ⁹ τούτου δὲ γενομένου καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας προσήρχοντο καὶ ἐθεραπεύοντο.

Now it happened that the father of Publius was bed-ridden, occupied with fevers and **dysentery**. Entering before him, praying, and laying hands upon him, Paul healed him.⁹ But after that happened, everyone else on the island who had ailments went to him and were cured.

The manuscripts are somewhat divided, with the earliest and best witnesses maintaining the neuter form *dusenteriō*, yet at least a few dozen minuscules (33 81 104 527 etc) reverting to the feminine *dusenteriâ*.

Manuscripts are important to consider, but so is the narrative context and wonder-working depiction in Acts. Once bitten by a snake, Paul emerges in a decidedly public, Asclepian role, becoming a surpassing, divinely-empowered doctor/priest capable of curing all diseases and worthy of the trust of the entire populace.

If one did not start from the assumption of a 1st or even early 2nd century context for Acts, then one would be inclined to find here that author/editor of Acts has borrowed (whether directly or indirectly) a rare and perhaps original lemma spelling used by the Greek medical author Promotus, then used it to show how Paul (likely representing proto-Orthodox Christian priests as miracle-workers more generally) surpasses all Greek medical experts and expertise. As they often say in operating rooms in the US, petty poultices ain't got anything on the healing hands of a divine doctor.

Favorinus of Arles (ca 117–161 CE)

Favorinus flourished as a widely renowned Sophist and rhetor during the reign of Hadrian, even after the emperor publicly chastised him. Yet he outlived the emperor by over 20 years, and he continued to speak, write, and teach until his death. Intense scholarly debates continue to roil on about when Favorinus composed the oration *On Exile* and whether it reflects authentic autobiography, caricatures his primary Sophist rival (Polemon of Laodicea|Smyrna), or is entirely fictive. Questions of autobiography and chronology go hand in hand; his relationship with Hadrian is another related factor. Here I dare not wade into the thick of such weeds, but simply adopt the position of past (Barigazzi) and current (Amato) Italian experts who affirm that this work of Favorinus is autobiographical in some sense, refers to his exile late in Hadrian's reign, and reflects a newfound confidence subsequent to Hadrian's death rather than a foolhardy attempt to take the emperor directly to task.⁴³

On this reading, Favorinus' reference to progeny, given his biological incapacity to father children, is not an authorial sticking point so much as a hang-up of modern scholars more preoccupied with functioning genitalia and patrilineage than Second Sophistic rhetorical conventions, patronage networks, and educational contexts. References to progeny and inheritance can be humorous, philosophical, communitarian, and/or adoptive in meaning, precisely the forms of fictive kinship that permeate the canonical Paulines. Aulus Gellius was among his beloved students and attested to Favorinus' ongoing, caring tutelage during the reign of Antoninus Pius. As we will soon see, there may also be neologistic grounds for a post-Hadrianic date for the composition.

ἐπιπόθησις / *epipothēsis* / “yearning” as a lemma first appears in one of four roughly contemporaneous non-Christian texts. among whose candidates are Favorinus’ oration *On Exile*, the *Roman History* of Appian, and two grammatical works by Herodian. The corresponding verb, ἐπιποθέω / “to yearn”, goes back to Attic authors and was common in subsequent centuries (1649 TLG hits). The TLG indicates two previous, ambiguous hits for the verb or noun lemmas, but both are clearly verbs: μὴ ἔχων οὐκ ἐπιποθήσεις / “and not having you do not yearn” (Teles, *Comparison of Poverty and Wealth*);⁴⁴ οὐκ ἐπιποθήσεις ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐδ’ οὐ μὴ σκεπάσης αὐτόν / “you shall not yearn after him nor shall you cover him” (LXX Deut 13:9). For Favorinus, the noun (though separated by seven words from its definite article) supplies the syntactical opening of his speech:

Ἡ δὲ | τῶν οἰκείων φίλων τε καὶ συγγενῶν | **ἐπιπόθησις** τοῦ τῆς πατρίδος ἔρωτος ἐξηρ|τημένη δεύτερον ἐπ’ ἐκείνῳ ἀγώνισ|μα προτέθεται.

Now the **yearning**, both for familiar friends and relatives, surpassed by the lust for the fatherland, is set forth as a second struggle after that.

In the extant writings of Appian, the verb appears once, specifically in the volume entitled *Celtica*, describing the Gallic sack of Rome (ca. 390 BCE) and written around the 150s CE. It is found within an excerpt preserved in the Byzantine *Suda* (10th cent. CE), in a quotation derived in turn from the somewhat earlier *Excerpta de Virtutibus*.⁴⁵ In it, the Roman general Marcus Furius Camillus speaks in response to a plea by Caedicius, the legendary auditor of a divine oracle predicting the Gallic invasion.

οὐκ ἂν εὐξάμην ἐπιποθῆσαί με Ῥωμαίους, εἰ τοιαύτην ἤλπισα τὴν **ἐπιπόθησιν** αὐτοῖς ἔσεσθαι. νῦν δὲ δικαιότεραν εὐχὴν εὐχομαι, γενέσθαι τῇ πατρίδι χρήσιμος ἐς τοσοῦτον ἀγαθοῦ, ἐς ὅσον κακοῦ περιελήλυθεν.

I would not have prayed that the Romans yearn for me, even if I hoped there would be such a **yearning** for them. But now I pray a more righteous vow, to become useful to fatherland for something of good, to an extent equal to the evil it has endured.

In his authentic, Antonine-era grammatical works, Herodian twice clarifies the term's meaning, first briefly: ποθή ή ἐπιπόθησις / “longing is **yearning**” (*orthog.* GG 3.2:456). The second is more involved:

ὥσπερ γάρ χόλος τὸ πάθος, χολή δὲ ἀφ’ οὗ τὸ πάθος, οὕτω καὶ πόθος τὸ πάθος, ποθή δὲ ή ἐπιπόθησις καὶ ἐπιθυμία. (*Pros.cath.* GG 3.1:312)

For just as anger (*cholos*) is passion, but bile (*cholē*) what arises from passion, so also longing (*pothos*) is passion, but longing (*pothē*) is **yearning** or coveting.

The same term appears three times in the Pauline letters, but only in their canonical — not Marcionite — versions. The first two are related to the arrival of Titus in Corinth (2Cor 7:6–7, 11):

ἀλλ’ ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινοὺς παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ Τίτου· ⁷ οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει ἣ παρεκλήθη ἐφ’ ὑμῖν, ἀναγγέλλων ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἐπιπόθησιν, τὸν ὑμῶν ὀδυρμόν, τὸν ὑμῶν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι. ... ¹¹ ἰδοὺ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ θεὸν λυπηθῆναι πόσῃν κατειργάσατο ὑμῖν σπουδὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολογίαν, ἀλλὰ ἀγανάκτησιν, ἀλλὰ φόβον, ἀλλὰ ἐπιπόθησιν, ἀλλὰ ζῆλον, ἀλλὰ ἐκδίκησιν·

But the God who encourages the humble encouraged us in the arrival of Titus. ⁷ But not only in his arrival, but also in the encouragement with which he was encouraged by us, announcing to us the **yearning** of yours, the lamentation of yours, the rivalry of yours over me, so

that I was gladdened even more. ... ¹¹ For behold, this very thing, being pained based on God, produced in you how much haste, instead defense-speech, instead indignation, instead fear, instead **yearning**, instead rivalry, instead vindication.

The third addresses Paul's planned journey to Spain (Rom 15:22–24):

Διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ²³ νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, **ἐπιποθίαν** δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, ²⁴ ὥς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν·

Hence was I also hindered many times from coming unto you. ²³ But now no longer having a place in these regions, yet having a **yearning** for many years to come before you, ²⁴ as I might go into Spain.

Both Favorinus and Appian used the lemma with reference to patriotism, specifically the yearning for fatherland during exile or a time away from home. The usage in canonical Romans carries similar notes of geographical displacement, the longing for a place of familiar belonging, and perhaps even military-like duty to travel abroad. The two occurrences in canonical 2Cor bear the most resemblance to the seminal usage by Favorinus. They (i.e., Favorinus) enjoyed a famously close association with Corinth, only for that relationship to turn to public shame. It was in Corinth that an honorific statue of Favorinus was erected only later to be dethroned and replaced with another statue that mocked his physical appearance.⁴⁶ The use of this neologism in the canonical Paulines very likely casts Titus as a second Favorinus. In this regard, the notoriously ample or absent genitalia of Favorinus do at last turn out to be comparatively meaningful. For Titus was the associate whom Paul (Marcionite and canonical) refused to circumcise, and thus the fictive Timothy of the canonical redaction had to undergo the procedure in his place.

Areteaus of Cappadocia (ca 140–160 CE)

A famous Greek medical author, Areteaus of Cappadocia wrote roughly around the mid-2nd century.⁴⁷

βιαστής / *biastēs* / “violence” | “violent person” is a noun lemma which is conflated with the adjective βιαστός / *biastos* / “violent” in TLG search results. The 335 TLG hits on a TLG search of either thus encompass both of these lemmas. The adjective lemma, as well as its antonym adjective ἀβίαστος / *abiastos* / “non-violent”|“unforced”, are commonplace in Attic Greek.⁴⁸ can have a substantival sense, essentially an adjective functioning as a noun, i.e., “the violent one[s]”. The noun lemma βιαστής / *biastēs* reflects a newer, modified spelling of the far earlier noun βιᾷτάς / *biatas* (18 TLG hits, starting with Alcmon and Pindar). Plutarch used the ancient form only once (*De defectu oraculorum* 426C). Then it essentially disappeared, except in the *Scholia on Pindar*, where the clarifying comments confirm that the old noun had fallen out of usage.

The newer lemma first appears among non-Christian authors in Aretaeus, a passage we will analyze shortly. In early Christian texts, it would seem to appear first in Matthew 11:12.⁴⁹ This verse is especially interesting in that it contains a saying of Jesus with close parallels in Marcion’s *Ev 16:16 and canonical Luke 16:16. A different, simpler version of this saying is quoted for Marcion’s *Evangelion* both by Tertullian in Latin and Epiphanius in Greek, and both lack this specific lemma.⁵⁰ In subsequent Christian literature, the term is often repeated, but almost always in reference to the Matthean saying.

In the passage from Areteaus, the term accentuates that, when afflicted with gout, women endure more intense pain than men.

γυναῖκες δ' ἀραιότερον μὲν ἀνδρῶν, χαλεπώτερον δέ· τὸ γὰρ μὴ ἐν
ἔθει μηδὲ οἰκεῖον, ἣν ὑπὸ ἀνάγκης κρέσσον γένηται, **βιαστήν** μέζονα
τίκτει τὴν ξυμφορὴν. (S.D. 2.12.12)⁵¹

Though women have it more infrequently than men, it is worse. For what is neither customary nor familiar, which may become necessarily greater, births a most **violent** consequence.

In this volume we do not assume that Justin's claim to quote a saying by Jesus establishes that saying as reflecting an earlier, stable text form of Matthew or even necessarily an oral tradition. Elsewhere in this volume and in our previous research (see esp. *SGC*), we have surfaced evidence that Justin likely had a hand in the editing of canonical Matthew and canonical Mark. Here Justin quotes the saying for highly polemical purpose, to aver that Jesus Christ — as *the* decisive, new covenant —, explicitly said that John the Baptist was the last Judean prophet, after whom no other Judean prophets would arise. In view of subsequent Christian history (from Montanists to Pentecostals), this strategy of charismatic suppression rarely proved successful.

Justin thus has Jesus *in voce propriae* relegate all legitimate prophecy to himself and his Judean/Israelite predecessors, while denying any legitimate future prophecy, even among his followers. The Marcionite and canonical Paulines, and canonical and non-canonical Acts, show this was quite a contentious issue for 2nd century Christian communities. Justin's dominical logion here may reflect his own tampering with Matthew, and his patriarchal, scribal, early-Orthodox aversion toward Judean and/or Christian charismatic prophets (male and female).

If the editor of canonical Matthew and/or Justin picked up this specific term from the medical author Aretaeus (through whatever mode and across whatever degrees of separation and transmission), then such usage would be quite meaningful. The saying occurs within a confrontation between Jesus and Pharisees in Matthew, and within Justin’s pioneering anti-Judean polemic. Both may imply Jerusalem was a disease-stricken woman whose pain (i.e., fall) the prophetic Jesus had foretold in dire, even medical terms. A borrowing from roughly contemporaneous medical terminology is interesting to consider, even if the dates of Aretaeus and clarity of dependence are uncertain.

ἐλαφρία / *elaphria* / “levity|lightness|alleviation” appears just once in the NT, yet 105 times in total in the TLG. This noun is cognate to, yet distinct from, the adjective **ἐλαφρός** / *elaphros* / “light in weight or movement, nimble” (2636 TLG hits, starting with Homer) and the verb **ἐλαφρίζω** / *elaphridzō* / “to lighten” (131 TLG hits, starting with Archilochus, 7th c. BCE), among other variations. The first occurrence of the noun **ἐλαφρία** / *elaphria* among extant and digitized non-Christian writings is found within Aretaeus’ *De curatione diuturnorum morborum* / *On the Cure of Chronic Diseases*. In the section on the treatment of diabetes, as Aretaeus prepares to describe an involved treatment regimen, and after comparing diabetes and dropsy, he states (*cur.* 2.2.1):

ἥδε τοῖσι ὑδριῶσι ἡ ὁδὸς ἐπιγίνεται, ἣν ἐς ἀγαθὸν ἡ νοῦκος τρέπεται· ἀγαθὸν δὲ ἡ λύσις τῆς αἰτίας καὶ μὴ τοῦ ἄχθεος **ἐλαφρίη** μοῦνον.

The path [to recovery] for those with dropsy has already been laid out, by which the sickness is turned to good. But what is good is the release of the cause and not merely the **alleviation** of the burden.

The term occurs once in the NT, in a part of 2Cor missing from Marcion's *Apostolos*, one filled with gratuitous travel details and rhetorical fluff:

Καὶ ταύτη τῇ πεποιθήσει ἐβουλόμην πρότερον πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, ἵνα δευτέραν χάριν σχῆτε, ¹⁶ καὶ δι' ὑμῶν διελθεῖν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, καὶ πάλιν ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν. ¹⁷ τοῦτο οὖν βουλόμενος μήτι ἄρα τῇ **ἐλαφρίᾳ** ἐχρησάμην; ἢ ἃ βουλευόμεαι κατὰ σάρκα βουλευόμεαι, ἵνα ἢ παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ Ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ Οὐ οὐ;

And in this confidence I was planning previously to come unto you, so that a second favor you may have, ¹⁶ and through you to pass into Macedonia, and again from Macedonia to come unto you, and by you to be sent forth into Judea. ¹⁷ Planning this, then, consequently did I conceive [this plan] **with levity**? Or what I plan, do I plan based on flesh, so that there be from me “yes, yes” and “no, no”?

By my lights, there is little else besides the new/rare lemma that connects canonical 2Cor to Athenaeus here, so it seems overmuch to postulate direct dependence. Even so, the use of the term in a mid-2nd century CE medical setting seems a far more plausible context of origin than a quasi-autobiographical segment of a letter by an Hellenistic Judean religious entrepreneur of the mid-1st century CE. The term also does not seem to appear in digitized Greek inscriptions, and is found only once in a Greek papyrus dated to the 6th century CE.⁵² After Athenaeus and canonical 2Cor, its next attestation in the TLG is around the mid-4th century CE in the *Homilies* of Symeon the Mesopotamian (commonly known as Ps-Macarius). The preponderance of evidence points to a mid-2nd century or later date for this portion of 2Cor.

Appian of Alexandria (147–161 CE)

Appian of Alexandria wrote his massive *Historia Romana* no earlier than 147 CE, after his appointment as procurator, and some 900 years after Rome’s founding, as he claims.⁵³ This monumental work was likely completed no later than 162 CE, since it shows no awareness of later events.⁵⁴

ἐπιπόθητος / *epipothētos* / “yearned for” yields 102 TLG hits. It is cognate to **ἐπιπόθησις** / *epipothēsis* / “yearning”, covered in the chapter on Favorinus. Appian stands as the second non-Christian author to use the former lemma, but the first to use the lemma *epipothētos*, specifically in the *Roman History*, in the book *Iberica*.

Φλάκκω μὲν οὖν διάδοχος ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν στρατηγίαν Τιβέριος Σεμπρώνιος Γράκχος. ... Τοὺς δὲ ἀπόρους συνώκιζε καὶ γῆν αὐτοῖς διεμέτρει καὶ πᾶσιν ἔθετο τοῖς τῇδε συνθήκας ἀκριβεῖς, καθ’ ἃς Ῥωμαίων ἔσονται φίλοι· ὄρκους τε ὤμοσεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔλαβεν, **ἐπιποθήτους** ἐν τοῖς ὕστερον πολέμοις πολλάκις γενομένους. Δι’ ἃ καὶ ἐν Ἰβηρία καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ διώνυμος ἐγένετο ὁ Γράκχος καὶ ἐθριάμβευσε λαμπρῶς. (*H.R. Iber.* 43.175, 179)

So then, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus came as successor to Flaccus in military command. He was uniting the unmanageable ones and was allotting them land and was setting strict treaties with all of them present, according to which they would be friends of the Romans. And he swore oaths to them and received [them in return], [oaths] many times **yearned for** in later wars. Based on these [accomplishments], both in Iberia and in Rome, Gracchus became far-famed and brilliantly led a triumph-procession.

The same, apparently new word occurs in canonical Philippians 4:1, in a passage not evidently present in Marcion's *Apostolos*.

“Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ ἐπιπόθητοι, χαρὰ καὶ στέφανός μου, οὕτως στήκετε ἐν κυρίῳ, ἀγαπητοί.² Εὐδοίαν παρακαλῶ καὶ Συντύχην παρακαλῶ τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν κυρίῳ.³ ναι̃ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ, γνήσιε σύζυγε, συλλαμβάνου αὐταῖς, αἵτινες ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθλησάν μοι μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν συνεργῶν μου, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς. (Phlp 4:1–3)

So then, my beloved and **yearned for** brothers, joy and crown of mine, thus stand in Lord, brothers.² Euodia I urge and Syntyche I urge, to be minded the same in Lord.³ Yes, I ask you also, genuine yoke-fellow, take up together with them, they who co-competed with me in the Gospel along with Clement and the other co-workers of mine, whose names [are] in the book of life.

Note not only the parallel new lemmas, but also similar themes, including the unification of hostile parties and celebration of victory. Canonical Paul in effect becomes a legendary rhetorical general, bringing harmony to relationships in the Christian community the way Gracchus forged alliances in Iberia. Against this background, the name *Syntyche* / “Shared-Fortune” also cleverly hints at the formation of a treaty after conflict, a cessation from hostilities. The mention of a certain “Clement” in this context is also a crossover redactional tell. Notice the same new lemma appears in Ps-Clement, *1Cor* 65, in a section that begins abruptly after a doxological conclusion in *1Cor* 64, one that also contains a Fortune-related name.

Τοὺς δὲ ἀπεσταλμένους ἀφ’ ἡμῶν Κλαύδιον Ἐφηβον καὶ Οὐαλέριον Βίτωνα σὺν καὶ Φορτουνάτῳ ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ χαρᾶς ἐν τάχει

ἀναπέμψατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὅπως θάττον τὴν εὐκταίαν καὶ ἐπιποθήτην ἡμῖν εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοϊαν ἀπαγγέλλωσιν, εἰς τὸ τάχιον καὶ ἡμᾶς χαρῆναι περὶ τῆς εὐσταθείας ὑμῶν.

Now them sent forth by us — Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito, along with Fortunatus — send back unto us in peace with joy in haste, so that they may more hastily report unto us the votive and peace and harmony **yearned for** by us, in order that we be made joyful more hastily concerning the tranquility of yours.

A secondary, yet again strictly canonical word-link deepens the parallel between the canonical Pauline redaction and Appian's Gracchus. Notice here the word εὐωδία / *euōdia* / “fragrance” (identical to the personal name Euodia) and the verb “to lead a triumph-procession” / θριαμβεύω / *thriambeuō*. Cp. θριαμβεύοντι / *thriambeuonti* (2Co 2:14) and ἐθριάμβευσε / *ethriambeuse* (*H.R. Iber.* 43.179). The fuller canonical quotation follows. Note that this segment was missing from Marcion's *Apostolos*, even though it picked up immediately after with 2Cor 2:15b.

Τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τὴν ὁσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ· ¹⁵ ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ (2Cor 2:14–15)

Now favor be to the God who always leads us in triumphal procession in the Christ and through us in every place manifests the scent of the knowledge of him, ¹⁵ for we are Christ's fragrance to the God.

ἐπιπόθητος / *epipothētos* is also found in *Ep.Barn.* 1.3b and the *Acts of Andrew* 10. Both passages echo additional language and stylistic tendencies found in Phlp 4:1–3 and Ps-Clem, 1Cor, such as terms related to haste, peace, joy, and solidarity, as well as words gratuitously prefixed with συ-/su-, translated “con-|with”.

Aelius Aristides (ca 147–181 CE)

Born in rural Bithynia in 117 CE, and granted citizenship as a child by Emperor Hadrian, a grant made also to his father, Aelius Aristides eventually became one of the most famous orators in the empire. As a young man he lived and learned in Smyrna. After travels and further education in Alexandria, Egypt, he planned to travel west, but ill health prevented. Multiple years of seeking healing and dwelling in an Asklepion led to a modicum of recovery and a variety of religious experiences. Around 154 CE, he found health sufficient to travel, stayed in Athens and then in Rome, where he also took on students.

περιαστράπτω / *peristraptō* / “to flash around” in the TLG has its results conflated with another lemma, **περιστρέφω** / *peristrephō* / “to crown around”. Once we filter out hits of the latter, the first non-Christian use of the former is found in the enormously famous *Panathenaic Oration* of Aelius Aristides. Scholars are somewhat divided about when the oration was composed: Behr maintained 155 CE, but Oliver placed it in 167 CE, and Follet in 168 CE.⁵⁵ This “encomium to the city of Athens, phrased as if delivered as part of the celebration of the four-yearly Great Panathenaea”,⁵⁶ was not likely performed at the official ceremonies, not least because of its overwhelming length.⁵⁷ Athenian cultural superiority echoes across the entire speech, but Athens’ military achievements take up its bulk (§§ 25–330).⁵⁸

In section 165 of the oration, Aristides commemorates the victory of the Athenian Greeks at the Battle of Salamis, noting just before (§160) that the Spartans and other Greeks were not present at the battle. It is

in this episode, a dramatic, decisive, yet still early turning point in the Greek wars with Persia, where the new lemma occurs.

κατὰ οὖν τοὺς ἐκπίπτοντας ἐκ τῆς ναυμαχίας ἐτάχθη τὰ κύρια τῆς στρατιᾶς, ἄνδρες Περσῶν οἱ πρῶτοι, καὶ κατέσχον τὴν νῆσον ἐφεστηκότες ὡς ἐφ’ ἐτοίμοις. ὡς δὲ τῶν πρώτων ἀπέτυχον καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἦν ἡ τύχη καὶ **περιέστραπτο** ἡ πεῖρα, ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναίων εἷς ἐθελοντῆς τὸν κίνδυνον ὑφίστατο καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ὄντας αὐτῶν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι τοὺς πρεσβύτας ἀποβιβάσας εἰς τὴν νῆσον κτείνει πᾶν τοῦτο τὸ Περσικόν. (*Panathen.* 165)⁵⁹

Therefore, against those cast ashore from the naval battle, the lords of the army were stationed — the foremost men of the Persians —, and they were holding down the island, having taken a stand as over prepared matters. Now as those of the front lines failed, and Fortune was with the Greeks, and the travail **was flashing around** them, one man of the Athenians, a volunteer, undertook the danger, and taking those of them in Salamis who were the elders, and disembarking them on the island, he slew this entire Persicon.

In Aristides’ telling, this turn of the battle tide led Xerxes to behold Athens with amazement, then make a hasty retreat (§166).

The same new lemma is used in the famous, first telling of Saul’s encounter with the risen Jesus on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:3–4):⁶⁰

ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίξιν τῇ Δαμασκῷ, ἐξαίφνης τε αὐτὸν **περιήστραψεν** φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ⁴ καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ, Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις;

Now as he was going, it happened as he drew near to Damascus, suddenly light from the heaven **flashed around** him, ⁴ and falling upon the ground, he heard a voice saying to him, Saoul, Saoul, why are you pursuing me?

In previous scholarship, van der Horst wrote an entire monograph comparing the themes and vocabulary of Aelius Aristides to the New Testament and in regard to Acts 9:3 noted a parallel of light as a divine manifestation, but failed to notice this unique lemma connection.⁶¹ The imitation, if strategic and deliberate, suggests that the Christ who conquered Saul on the Road to Damascus is not merely divine, but is also a personification of the power of Greek culture. Christ overcame Saul, flashing all around him, the same way that the Athenian Greeks overcame Xerxes. Saul subsequently could only marvel at Christ near Damascus, just as Xerxes could only stand in astonishment at the miraculous power of Athens Herself. It could also suggest that Damascus is implicitly depicted in Acts as a center of Hellenistic culture and political power.

The editor(s) of 4 Maccabees — which may well be the same person(s) as the editor(s) of Acts — also likely made use of Aristides' imagery and vocabulary. As I described in *Apostle Paul Atreides* (chp 8):

Apollonius of Tarsus, introduced as governor of Coelesyria and Phoenicia (2Mac 3:5), or of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia (4Mac 4:2), is worth considering as dual theophoric and mimetic antecedent to Paul. Both share Tarsus as home city. Apollonius is implicated in an attempt by Simon, a displaced Judean high-priest, to summon King Seleucis to plunder and thus profane the Jerusalem temple, similar to the temple-focused accusations Paul faces in Acts both in Jerusalem and Ephesus. In Maccabean lore this Apollonius also fell to the ground due to a divine epiphany involving horses! In 2

Maccabees (3:24–30), Heliodorus (not to be confused with the author of the Greek novel several centuries later) represented Seleucis and encountered an epiphanic divine army counter-assault on horseback. But in 4 Maccabees, Apollonius of Tarsus now takes the role as emissary, potential plunderer of Jerusalem's temple, and victim of divine, epiphanic downfall.

The relevant quotation follows:

ἀνιόντος τε μετὰ καθωπλισμένης τῆς στρατιᾶς τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου πρὸς τὴν τῶν χρημάτων ἀρπαγὴν οὐρανόθεν ἔφιπποι προυφάνησαν ἄγγελοι **περιαστράπτοντες** τοῖς ὅπλοις καὶ πολὺν αὐτοῖς φόβον τε καὶ τρόμον ἐνιέντες.¹¹ καταπεσὼν γέ τοι ἡμιθανὴς ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐπὶ τὸν πάμφυλον τοῦ ἱεροῦ περίβολον τὰς χεῖρας ἐξέτεινεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ μετὰ δακρύων τοὺς Εβραίους παρεκάλει ὅπως περὶ αὐτοῦ προσευξάμενοι τὸν οὐράνιον ἐξευμενίσωνται στρατόν. (4Mac 4:10–11)

And when Apollonius with his well-armed battalion was going up for the seizure of the financial property, from heaven horse-riding angels appeared ahead, **flashing around** with their weapons and infusing into them much fear and trembling.¹¹ Then Apollonius, falling down half-dead upon the all-tribes courtyard of the temple, stretched out hands to the heaven, and with tears was begging the Hebrews that they, praying for him, would propitiate the heavenly army.

Here Apollonius (and the Seleucid Greek ruler Antiochus IV Epiphanes, whom Apollonius represents) become a second Xerxes, and Jerusalem becomes a second Athens. The audacious endeavor to pillage the Jerusalem temple, a wealthy religious center akin to Athens, is met, stopped, and undone with divine flashes of lightning.

Lucian of Samosata (145–185 CE)

A prolific satirist and essayist of the mid- to late-2nd century, Lucian is well-known to Christian scholars, most especially for his roasting of the sometime Christian *Peregrinus*, whose self-immolation Lucian witnessed during the Olympic games of 169 CE.

προσδαπανάω / *prosdapanaō* / “to spend extra” has 90 TLG hits. The first known non-Christian use is most likely in Lucian’s *Saturnalia*, otherwise known as *Cronosolon* / Κρονοσόλων.⁶² As Popescu has described, the three distinct sections of the work treat of similar subject matter, while changing perspectives and roles.⁶³ This “mini-corpus” contains a succession of dialogues, laws, and epistles; it thus enacts an eclectic, meta-textual performance and commentary on Lucian’s many previous, more substantive essays.⁶⁴ In two of the dialogues, Lucian wears the guise of a priest of Cronus, but he also apparently depicts himself, by way of the fettered Cronus, as “an old, gout-ridden word-charmer”.⁶⁵ This framing aligns at a general level with the work’s date deduced by Fowler & Fowler, around 165 CE.⁶⁶ The Fowlers additionally imply the coherence of the materials when describing the “*Saturnalia*” as “dialogue and letters on the relation of rich and poor”.⁶⁷

The new/rare lemma appears at the very end of the *Saturnalia*, in a letter the rich collectively write back to Cronus, right after they have accused their impoverished guests of several gross improprieties.

Ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὑφ' ὧν ἡμεῖς ἐβουλευσάμεθα πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν ἀσφαλείας τῆς ἡμετέρας ἔνεκεν μηκέτι ἐπιβατὸν αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν τὴν οἰκίαν. εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ σοῦ συνθοῖντο μετρίων δεήσεσθαι, ὥσπερ νῦν φασι, μηδὲν δὲ ὑβριστικὸν ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις ἐργάσεσθαι, κοινωνούντων ἡμῖν καὶ συνδειπνούντων τύχη τῇ ἀγαθῇ. καὶ τῶν ἱματίων, ὡς σὺ κελεύεις, πέμψομεν καὶ τοῦ χρυσίου ὅποσον οἶόν τε καὶ **προσδαπανήσομεν**, καὶ ὅλως οὐδὲν ἐλλείψομεν. καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀφέμενοι τοῦ κατὰ τέχνην ὁμιλεῖν ἡμῖν φίλοι ἀντὶ κολάκων καὶ παρασίτων ἔστωσαν. (*Saturn.* 39)⁶⁸

These things, and such things as these, based on which we took counsel, for the sake of what remains of our own security, no longer to make the house accessible to them. But if they should covenant with you to restrain themselves by limits, just as they now say, and participate in no insolence at the symposiums, let them share with us and let them feast together with good fortune. And as you command, we will send them cloaks and gold, as much as such, and **we will spend extra**, and nothing at all will we lack. And so now let them, abandoning their crafty consorting with us, be friends instead of flatterers and parasites.

This new lemma also appears in Luke 10:35, in the famous fable of the Good Samaritan, a story attested as absent for Marcion's *Evangelion*. After an anonymous traveler is beaten, left half-dead, and passed by a priest and a Levite, a Samaritan has compassion on him, tends to his wounds, puts him on his pack animal, and brings him to an inn. He then instructs the innkeeper:

Ἐπιμελήθητι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅ τι ἂν **προσδαπανήσης** ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχῃ-
εσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι.

Take care of him, and whatever **you should spend extra**, I myself, on my journeying back, will give back to you.

The connection is both deeper and broader than the signature lemma. In both cases, the treatment of the poor by the rich is in focus. Both texts use playful storytelling to illustrate the dilemma, both are stories within stories, and both follow after an ethical dialogue/debate. Both also accentuate the theme of hospitality to the poor. The Lukan story is framed by a question from a law-expert, “who is my neighbor?” Lucian’s dialogues, laws, and letters in the *Saturnalia* all focus on the obligation of the wealthy to give to the poor. Indeed, Lucian’s law-giver (Cronosolon) elaborates the specific obligation of the wealthy to give “a tenth” / τὸ δέκατον / *to dekaton* of their annual income to their poor neighbors (*Saturn.* 14).⁶⁹

The precise, shared lemma and this larger array of stylistic and thematic similarities cannot be mere coincidence. The editor of canonical Luke was almost certainly inspired by the learned composition of Lucian on the *Saturnalia*, pushing the date of the canonical form of Luke after 165 CE.⁷⁰

Antigonus (ca 150 CE)

Antigonus of Nicaea, or Antigonus the Astrologer, wrote his *Horoscope of Hadrian / Hadriani genitura* around 150 CE.⁷¹ This work happens to be the earliest extant biographical source on the life of the emperor Hadrian.⁷²

κοσμοκράτωρ / *kosmokratōr* / “world-ruler” is a term well known in the history of Christian dogma and liturgy, but did Christians invent the term or appropriate it from their predecessors? A TLG query of the lemma shows that Antigonus and Ptolemy attest its earliest extant non-Christian uses.⁷³ The relevant passage in Antigonus follows immediately after his report of the death of Hadrian from “dropsy” / ὑδρωπικός.⁷⁴ This famous death, incidentally, as well as its surrounding astrological language, may have partly inspired the Lukan story of Jesus healing “a certain man with dropsy” / ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν ὑδρωπικός (Lk 14:2), whom he encountered “in the house of a certain one of the rulers” / εἰς οἶκόν τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων (Lk 14:1). Antigonus proceeds to describe the astrologically auspicious birth of Hadrian:⁷⁵

καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν δορυφορούντων αὐτῇ ἀστέρων οἰκείως εὐρεθέντων, τῆς μὲν Ἀφροδίτης ἐν οἰκείῳ ὑψώματι, τοῦ δὲ Ἄρεως ἐν ἰδίῳ τριγώνῳ καὶ ἰδίαις μοίραις τὴν στάσιν ἔχοντος, ἀμφοτέρων ἰδιοτοπούντων καὶ ἐπαναφερομένων τῇ Σελήνῃ· προσέτι δὲ καὶ τοῦ **κοσμοκράτορος** Ἥλιου δορυφοροῦντος αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἐξῆς αὐτῆς μοίραις καὶ αὐτοῦ δορυφορουμένου παρά τε τοῦ Κρόνου ὄντος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ οἴκῳ καὶ Ἑρμοῦ, ἀμφοτέρων ὄντων ἐπὶ ἐφάσ ἀνατολῆς.

And of the stars who guard-attend her that are familiarly found, that of Aphrodite in familiar exaltation, that of Ares in his proper trian-

gle and holding place with his proper Fates, both of proper place and counter-revolving with the moon. Over and above, also that of the **world-ruler** Helios guard-attending her in her successive Fates, and he himself attended by Cronos in his proper house and Hermes, both of whom [are] on East's horizon.

Antigonus' use of the term in the singular makes it distinct from that of Ptolemy, who uses the plural instead, specifically in a section on "worth and ... happiness" / ἀξίας καὶ ... εὐδαιμονίας:

καὶ ἐὰν μὲν οἱ δορυφοροῦντες ἀστέρες ἦτοι ἐπίκεντροι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὧσιν ἢ πρὸς τὸ ὑπὲρ γῆν κέντρον συσχηματίζονται, μεγάλοι καὶ δυναμικοὶ καὶ **κοσμοκράτορες** διατελοῦσι, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον εὐδαίμονες, ἐὰν οἱ δορυφοροῦντες δεξιῶι τοῖς ὑπὲρ γῆν κέντροις συσχηματίζονται, ἐὰν δὲ τῶν ἄλλων οὕτως ἐχόντων μόνος ὁ ἥλιος ἢ ἐν ἀρρενικῷ ἢ δὲ σελήνῃ ἐν θηλυκῷ, ἐπίκεντρον δὲ τὸ ἕτερον τῶν φώτων, ἡγεμόνες μόνον ἔσονται ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου κύριοι. (*Tetr.* 4.3.2)

And if the guard-attending stars either be themselves at cardinal points or are arranged together unto a point over earth, great and powerful and **world-rulers** are brought forth, and even more fortunate, if the northerly guard-attending are arranged together by the points over earth. But of all others who have this, only if the sun be in a masculine position, and the moon in a feminine position, and another cardinal point of the stars, only then will rulers be lords of life and death.

Despite the numerical difference in the use of this keyword, the passages overlap considerably in regard to subject (auspicious births of rulers), technical astrological terms ("guard-attending"), and specific stars.

The same term appears in a variety of 2nd century Christian texts, and all of them are most likely subsequent to and perhaps even de-

pendent upon (even if loosely and/or combatively) Antigonus and/or Ptolemy. Both Marcionite Laodiceans and canonical Ephesians use the term in the plural, closest to Ptolemy in this regard, and both have surrounding terminology highly evocative of astrological imagery. Word differences are rendered in italics to facilitate comparison (Lao 6:12):

ὅτι ἔστιν ὑμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς **κοσμοκράτορας** τοῦ σκούτου τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.
Because for *you* the battle is before the authorities, before the **world-rulers** of this darkness, before the spiritualia of evil in the heavenlies.

ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς **κοσμοκράτορας** τοῦ σκούτου τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. (Eph 6:12)

Because for *us* the battle is *not before blood and flesh, but instead before the rulers*, before the authorities, before the **world-rulers** of this darkness, before the spiritualia of evil in the heavenlies.

Though it is derivative, a quotation of Eph 6:12 in 13Ign Eph 11:2 also attests this plural form. The term appears in the singular form in Ps-Clementine *Hom.* 6.21.2 and ActJohn 23.

Charax of Pergamum (ca 150–200 CE)

According to the most recent edition of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*,⁷⁶ Charax wrote sometime in the 2nd half of the 2nd century.

μεμβράνα / *membrana* / “membrane” may have appeared first in a writing by Charax, but it is only attested second-hand almost a millenium later. According to a fragmentary and paraphrasing summary of his writing as preserved by Eustathius of Thessalonica (late 12th cent.):

Ὁ Χάραξ τὸ χρυσοῦν δέρμα μέθοδον εἶναι λέγει χρυσογραφίας **μεμβράναις** ἐμπεριειλημμένην, δι’ ἣν, ὡς λόγου ἀξίαν, τὸν τῆς Ἀργοῦς καταρτισθῆναι στόλον φησί. (*Frag.* 14)

Charax says the craft of golden skin was gold-lettering gilded **on membranes**, on account of which, as is worthy of note, he says the fleet of Argos was equipped.

This lemma only appears once in the NT, in a Pastoral letter (2Tim 4:13):

τὸν φαιλόνην ὃν ἀπέλιπον ἐν Τρωάδι παρὰ Κάρπῳ ἐρχόμενος φέρε, καὶ τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς **μεμβράνας**.

Bring the cloak which I left behind in Troas with Carpus, carrying it and the little books, especially the **membranes**.

It also appears twice in quick succession in the apocryphal *Acts of John by Prochorus*.⁷⁷ While the evidence is admittedly minimal and questionable, it suggests that early-Orthodox portraiture of Paul was modeled, whether in passing and/or as satire, on the prestigious, opulent scribal craft detailed by Charax.

Vettius Valens (152–165 CE)

Born and raised in Antioch, Vettius Valens learned and wrote about astrological traditions in Alexandria, Egypt. Next to Ptolemy, Valens was the best known and most highly regarded astrologer of the 2nd century CE. According to Neugebauer (1954), Valens wrote his astrological compendium, the *Anthology*, largely between 152 and 165 CE.

ἀφελότης / *aphelotēs* / “simplicity” first occurs in non-Christian literature in Valens’ *Anthology*, in two different passages.

ἦν εἴ τις φυλάττοι, εὐκατάληπτον ἔξει τὴν τῶν ζητουμένων ἀλήθειαν. τινὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ μυστικῶς διεγράψαμεν εἰς διάκρισιν καὶ σύγκρισιν τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων οὐ φθόνῳ φερόμενοι οὐδὲ **ἀφελότητι**, ἀλλὰ προθυμίαν τινὰ καὶ ἐπιμονὴν βουλευόμενοι παρεισφέρειν τῷ μαθήματι· πᾶς γὰρ καταθυμίου προαιρέσεως ἀκολάστως τυχὼν ἀχάριστον τὴν δωρεὰν ἡγήσατο, ὁ δὲ μετὰ πόνου καὶ ζητήσεως οὐ μόνον ἡδονὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ κατόρθωσιν τῇ πραγματείᾳ ἐπεισήνεγκεν. (*Anth.* 3.10)

If anyone should guard this [method], from things sought he will hold the truth easily recognizable. While then some things we delineated mystically for differentiation and comparison of things encountered, not being carried away by envy or by **simplicity**, but being desirous to introduce a certain readiness and endurance to the study. For everyone who chances effortlessly on an heartfelt preference considers the gift ungrateful, but one who with toil and seeking brings not only pleasure, but also accomplishment as well in the research.

πολλάκις γὰρ εὐρίσκεται τις ὢν δημιουργὸς καὶ μεθοδικὸς πρὸς τὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῶν πράξεων καὶ ἐπιτευκτικὸς κἂν ἄπειρος γραμμάτων ἐπιτυχάνῃ, ὁ δὲ πάνυ πεπαιδευμένος ῥαδίως ἀλίσκεται ὡς ἄπειρος τῶν πρακτέων, ὑπ’ **ἀφελότητος** καὶ ἀδιοικησίας προδεδομένος· καὶ οὗτος ὁδυνώμενος ματαίαν ἡγεῖται τὴν τῆς παιδείας ἐπιβολὴν καὶ εὐδαίμονα προκρίνει τὸν ἀμαθῆ. (*Anth.* 6.1)

For oftentimes someone may be found who, being industrious and methodical in their endeavors of action and effective, even if he chances to be unacquainted with writings, while one who is altogether educated easily succumbs as one unacquainted with what must be done, betrayed by **simplicity** and want of management. And this one who is grieved considers empty the endeavor of education and prefers the unlearned as fortunate.

In both passages, Valens uses the lemma in a negative sense. He pictures “simplicity” as an external and seductive force in the life of the learned, akin to the lure of laziness and naïveté. And yet in the same context he also recognizes the potential virtue of the unlearned, even though he does not directly associate the word “simplicity” with that virtue.

These two examples from Valens are quite reasonable as background for the usage in Acts, where the term ἀφελότης / *aphelotēs* / “simplicity” is an NT *hapax legemenon*. Here it seems that Acts presumes yet also inverts the sense, turning “simplicity of heart” into a virtue. This shift may owe its inspiration to a secondary source, canonical Ephesians, which in a verse apparently missing from Marcionite Laodiceans, addresses slaves and encourages them to act with “singleness of heart” / ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας (Eph 6:5).

καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ **ἀφελότητι** καρδίας, ⁴⁷ αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν λαόν. (Acts 2:46–47)

Daily with one accord in the temple, breaking bread in each home, partaking of food with delight and **simplicity** of heart, ⁴⁷ praising the God and having favor with the entire people.

In the subsequent context, Peter gives a formal, public speech to an audience that includes “the priests and the military commander of the temple and the Sadducees” / οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι (Acts 4:1). After hearing Peter speak, “they were amazed” / ἐθαύμαζον, “because they were unlettered and ignorant men” / ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοί εἰσιν καὶ ἰδιῶται (4:11). Acts thus evokes and challenges the very contrast that Valens described between the learned and unlearned, perhaps subtly depicting Peter as a second Aesop, suddenly and divinely gifted with oratorical skill and boldness.

The lemma also appears in manuscripts of the late 2nd century sermon *On the Pasch* by Melito of Sardis. These concluding lines could be read as Melito’s closing, poetic benediction, or as an editorial *explicit*.⁷⁸

Εἰρήνη τῷ γράψαντι καὶ τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι καὶ τοῖς ἀ-
γαπῶσι τὸν κύριον ἐν **ἀφελότητι** καρδίας. (Pascha, 825–826)

Peace to him who writes and him who reads and them who
love the Lord in **simplicity** of heart.

In the TLG, for both Christian and non-Christian literature, the lemma next occurs in the 4th century CE. It also seems to be absent from Greek papyri and inscriptions, strengthening the link of this rare word between Valens and canonical Acts.

εὐμετάδοτος / *eumetadotos* / “readily giving” first appears in a chronologically secure text in the *Anthology* of Valens. Most of the eleven (!) occurrences of this lemma are found within two clusters in book one (1.2.50, 1.2.164, 1.2.197, 1.20.42, 1.20.161, 1.20.167, 1.20.230), a volume written early in that period. Only one hit appears in book 2 (2.21.7), but two more in the appendix for book 1 (10.1.149, 10.1.172).

Most of the hits, as might be expected, pertain to the significance of various stars and constellations as keys to interpret the meaning of celestial events, the characteristics of human souls and times of birth, and the dispositions of those born under various astrological signs. All of these employ the term as a positive character attribute.

Marcus Aurelius, in his Stoic-adjacent *Meditations*, subsequently uses this lemma twice, both times as a positive character attribute, one apparently associated more with philosophy than astrology (though Stoics admittedly often held these together):

καὶ ἔτι παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ ὁμαλὲς καὶ εὖτονον ἐν τῇ τιμῇ τῆς φιλοσοφίας· καὶ τὸ εὐποιητικὸν καὶ τὸ **εὐμετάδοτον** ἐκτενῶς καὶ τὸ εὐέλπι·

And also from him [i.e., Severus, I learned] what is equitable and energizing in the value of philosophy, and what is beneficent, and what is **readily giving** extensively, and what is hopeful. (*Medit.* 1.14.2)

Ὅταν εὐφραῖναι σεαυτὸν θέλῃς, ἐνθυμοῦ τὰ προτερήματα τῶν συμβιούντων· οἷον τοῦ μὲν τὸ δραστήριον, τοῦ δὲ τὸ αἰδήμον, τοῦ δὲ τὸ **εὐμετάδοτον**, ἄλλου δὲ ἄλλο τι. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως εὐφραίνει ὥς τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐμφαινόμενα τοῖς ἥθεσι τῶν συζώντων καὶ ἄθροα ὥς οἷόν τε συμπίπτοντα. (*Medit.* 6.48.1)

Whenever you wish to cheer yourself up, take to heart the superior qualities of those living with you, such as the efficacy of this one, or the modesty of that one, or the **ready generosity** of that one, or

something else of another. For nothing cheers up as much as the likenesses of the virtues shining in the ethics of those living with you and shared together as such and co-occurring.

In its single appearance in the Pastorals, the term carries a decidedly ethical sense. This makes the emperor's philosophical reflections the more likely, immediate conduit rather than the astrology of Valens, even if Valens coined or first popularized the term. The focus on the practice of virtue and modesty in community also makes Pauline proto-Orthodox guidance resonate with imperial introspection (1Tim 6:17–18):

Τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι παράγγελλε μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν μηδὲ ἡλπιέειν ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότῃ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θεῷ τῷ παρέχοντι ἡμῖν πάντα πλουσίως εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ¹⁸ ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς, **εὐμεταδότους** εἶναι, κοινωνικούς.

To those rich in this present age, command them not to be high-minded nor to hope in uncertain wealth, but instead [to hope] in God who supplies us everything richly for enjoyment, ¹⁸ [and] to do good, to be rich in beautiful deeds, to be **readily giving**, sharing.

The character trait of ready generosity, initially indicated by Vettius' stars, later transformed by the Stoic philosopher-emperor into philosophical aspiration, now becomes a hallmark of early-Orthodox ethical guidance in the form of *synkrisis*: litanies of virtues and vices composed in the interest of character and community formation.

ἰσάγγελος / *isangelos* / “angel-like” has 553 TLG hits, yet it seems to have first become popular in the mid-2nd century. It first appears in a non-Christian writing in an appendix to Valens' *Anthology*. The section begins with the heading, Περὶ σχηματισμοῦ τῶν ἀστέρων κατὰ σύνοδον

γινομένου οὐχ ἑνὸς πρὸς ἓνα ὡς διείληπται πρότερον ἀλλ' ἑνὸς πρὸς δύο ἢ καὶ πλείους / “On the Configuration of the Stars according to Meeting, Not When One Comes unto One, as Was Explained Before, but When One Comes unto Two or even Many”.

Ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἡλίου καὶ Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Σελήνης σεμνοῦς, καθαρῶν, εὐνοκρίτους, οἰκονομικούς, μυστηρίων μετόχους, κατορθωτὰς πραγμάτων, πλείστην φαντασίαν τῆς ὑπάρξεως κεκτημένους, σωματοφύλακας, **ἰσαγγέλους**, ἐπάνω χρημάτων, γραμμάτων, ψήφων τεταγμένους τῶν δὲ τοιούτων καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξισχύσει πρὸς συμβουλίαν καὶ ἡ διδασχὴ. (*Anth. App.* 10.1, lines 232–236)⁷⁹

The co-configuration of the Sun and Mercury and the Moon [renders persons who are] reverent, pure, part-suited, house-managerial, part-takers of mysteries, accomplished in dealings, having been possessed of the greatest prestige of substance, bodyguards, **angel-equals**, being stationed over means, letters, and votes. The word and the teaching of such ones prevail on the assembly.

This same word appears in a close parallel shared between Marcion's *Evangelion* and canonical Luke, with subtle surrounding differences between the two. Here we only quote our Marcionite reconstruction:⁸⁰

οὓς κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τῆς κληρονομίας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίσκονται⁸¹
³⁶ οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν, **ἰσαγγελοι** γάρ εἰσιν καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες.

Those whom the God made worthy of the age, that of the inheritance and of the resurrection that [is] from the dead, neither do they marry, nor are they married,³⁶ nor do they die, for they are **angel-equals** and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.

The Gospel passages share with Valens not only the new lemma “angel-equal”, but also a focus on divine destiny, possessions, authority, and royal responsibilities. By my lights, Valens is a likely source behind both Marcion’s *Evangelion* and canonical Luke at this point. It is usually assumed that Justin quotes canonical Luke 20:25, but the quotation shares elements with Marcion’s *Evangelion* and canonical Luke, while also evidencing distinctive verb and noun choices:

ὅπερ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν εἶπεν, ὅτι Οὔτε γαμήσουσιν οὔτε γαμηθήσονται, ἀλλὰ **ἰσάγγελοι** ἔσονται, τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ὄντες. (*Tryph.* 81.4)

Those whom the Lord of ours said, Neither will they marry nor will they be made to marry, but they will be **angel-equals**, being children of the God of the resurrection.

In other early Christian literature, the lemma also appears in Ps-Clem, *Hom.* 17.16.5, which speaks of bodies becoming light and “**angel-equals**” / **ἰσάγγελοι**, akin to the way angels of light become flesh to be seen by humans. It also appears numerous times in the writings of ClemAlex.⁸²

Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* could date anywhere from 155 to 167 CE.⁸³ The lemma is not apparently attested in any Greek papyri or Greek inscriptions digitized in the major databases. By my lights, if a progenitor is to be chosen from among available candidates, then Vettius Valens is the strongest. On this reading, Marcion’s *Evangelion* (at least in its secondary redaction), Justin, and a redactor of canonical Luke obtained this ostensibly dominical teaching not from Jesus of Nazareth, but from their famous astrologer colleague in Rome.

λογομαχία / *logomachia* / “word-fight” has its first chronologically secure TLG hit in a fragment by Valens about the “natal star” / γενεθλίου.⁸⁴

ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὸ τετράγωνον τῆς γενέσεως, ποιεῖ **λογομαχίας** πρὸς θηλυκὰ πρόσωπα καὶ βιωτικὰς βλάβας καὶ σωματικὰς ἐπιζητήσεις.

Now if it comes to the quadrangle of the birth, it indicates **word-fights** after a womanish character and biological harms and bodily cravings.

Its single NT appearance is in the Pastorals, specifically 1Tim 6:3–5:

εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις, τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῇ κατ’ εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ,
⁴ τετύφωται, μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ **λογομαχίας**, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί,
⁵ διαπαρατριβαὶ διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστ-
 ερμημένων τῆς ἀληθείας, νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν.

If anyone teaches otherwise and does not proceed to speak with healthy words, with those of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in teaching according to devotion, ⁴ he has become demented, understanding nothing, but instead diseased over cravings and **word-fights**, from which comes malice, envy, blasphemies, evil suspicions, ⁵ constant wrangling between humans corrupted in the mind and defrauding of the truth, who deem monetary gain to be devotion.

The echo of the new and rare word **λογομαχία** / *logomachia* is notable, especially given that here it is also plural and accusative. Supplemental confirmation of dependence obtains in the adjacent use of the lemma “craving”, though in a slightly different form. Compare ἐπιζητήσεις / *epidzētēseis* and ζητήσεις / *dzētēseis*. The semantics of health (good and/or ill) also overlap. It appears that even when the Stoic emperor

did not explicitly appropriate the terminology of Valens — at least based on the extant Greek texts of Aurelius available in the TLG —, another of his distinctive neologisms still found its way into early-Orthodox ethical instruction, this time as a sign of shame.

Herodian Gramm. (ca 161–180 CE)

Herodian the Grammarian should not be confused with the early 3rd century CE Herodian the Historian. The former was the son and fellow grammarian of Apollonius Dyscolus. Scholars accept the authenticity of several works by this Herodian, chief of which is the *General Prosody* / *De prosodia catholica*, with some caveats as to the reliability of the most recent scholarly edition (Lentz 1867).⁸⁵ By comparison, the *Word Divisions* / *Partitiones* / Ἐπιμερισμοί traditionally attributed to Herodian are, as Dyck put it, “surrounded by misunderstandings”.

Foremost among current misunderstandings is whether the *Partitiones* attributed to Herodian should be considered as a single work in two books, or as two separate works. Assembling a comprehensive catalog of works attributed to Herodian (correctly or falsely), Dickey catalogued these as two distinct works called the *Partitiones* / Ἐπιμερισμοί / *Epimerismoi* that traveled under the name of Herodian.⁸⁶ Dickey claimed that the first of these, not available in the TLG, has only fragmentary witnesses by later authors, may originally have derived from Herodian, but has been so suffused with later glosses as to make the recovery of any authentic Herodian content impossible and the question of authenticity moot. Dickey catalogued the second *Partitiones* / *Epimerismoi* as a lengthy and intact work available in a scholarly (however dated) edition,⁸⁷ one available to search in the TLG, yet entirely spurious in authorship.

Lehrs (1848) and Lentz (1867–1870) had previously found the long-form *Partitiones* spurious, mainly based on the title of the work as indicating a setting of school instruction, unbefitting the serious work of a renowned grammarian.⁸⁸ Yet Lentz also conceded that the doctrines of the longer composition were authentically Herodian and likely

contained some authentically Herodian source material, even if thoroughly excerpted and epitomized. Dyck demonstrated the reception of fragments of the bivolume *Partitiones* in the 10th century CE *Epimerismi Homerici*⁸⁹ as well as in the 6th century CE *Etymologicum* of Orion of Thebes.⁹⁰ In Dyck’s opinion, at least one part of the two-part work had an alphabetical order, but both parts are so saturated with glosses from later grammarians, such as Orus, Helladius, John Philoponus, and Zenobius, that “any attempt to find a Herodianic ‘core’ is doomed”.⁹¹ In his *General Prosody*, however, Herodian claims to have indexed some 60,000 different Greek words.⁹² It seems to me an open question whether the original substrate of the long-form *Partitiones*, particularly given its simplicity in concept and detail, originally comprised just such a word index, suitable for reference and perhaps beginner levels of education.

NT scholarship does not often consider the *Partitiones* (long-form or fragmentary) as potentially significant. Even when this does happen, sometimes the approach is too naïve about authenticity or too cut and dry about inauthenticity. Let us take one excerpt as an example.

Πᾶσα λέξις ἀπὸ τῆς βῆ συλλαβῆς ἀρχομένη διὰ τοῦ η γράφεται οἷον·
Βηθλεὲμ, καὶ Βηθανία, Βηθεσδὰ, Βηθσαϊδὰ, καὶ Βηθσφαγή, ὀνόματα
τόπων ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Βῆλ, θεὸς Αἰγύπτιος (Boissonade 1819:5)

Every word that begins with the syllable βῆ is written with the η, such as: Bethlehem, and Bethany, Bethesda, Bethsaida, and Bethphage, names of places in Jerusalem. Bel, an Egyptian God.

In regard to the former, Smith takes this excerpt from the long-form *Partitiones* as authentic,⁹³ when it likely reflects later Christian interpolation and Christian interest in onomastics of the sort first seen in Eusebius of Caesarea. On the other hand, though Kučera is almost certainly correct

that the excerpt is inauthentic, the dismissal of the entire long-form *Partitiones* as inauthentic is oversimplistic overreach.⁹⁴

While I grant that later glosses cloud both books of the *Partitiones*, and that reconstruction of an authentic core for either is not achievable at present (nor within the scope of this work), it is prejudicial to rule out any and all potentially authentic Herodian content in the long-form *Partitiones*. That is to say, for the purposes of establishing the emergence of a neologism, each excerpt should be evaluated on its own merits, compared with Herodian's clearly authentic writings, and also set within the broader diachronic sweep of a lemma's history and usage.

Thus if Herodian's father, Dyscolus, is the first in extant, digitized Greek literature to use a certain term, *and* the same term is found in the long-form *Partitiones*, *and* the hand of a later gloss is not clearly in evidence, then it is unreasonable to posit such an excerpt as a later interpolation. Indeed, the question of authenticity vs. inauthenticity could run in reverse, since later glossers, epitomizers, and compilers routinely mixed up excerpts of Dyscolus and Herodian, which is to say that a given Herodian attribution may deserve consideration as a Dyscolan excerpt.

When a Greek neologism appears first in the authentic *General Prosody*, and also appears in the long-form *Partitiones*, then again authenticity is reasonable, unless the hand of a later gloss is demonstrable. To go a stretch further, if the long-form *Partitiones* contains what may be the first instance of a Greek word, and late 2nd century non-Christian authors (i.e., rough contemporaries of Herodian) also attest to this word, then it is reasonable to hold that the word reflects an authentic neologism that emerged around the time of Marcus Aurelius. That is to say, in this book we are primarily interested in *chronological-attributional precision* more than *authorial authenticity/disambiguation*.

However, if a word is first attested in non-Christian writings only in the long-form *Partitiones*, and not by any other non-Christian writer in the late 2nd or early 3rd century, then there is reason to doubt and leave the attribution ambiguous as [Ps-]Herodian. Be that as it may, when and if examples reflect later interpolations, then that only pushes the likely emergence of such neologisms later in history, i.e., after the time of Marcus Aurelius rather than contemporaneous to him. Herodian authenticity strengthens the overall thesis of the book that the NT contains a variety of mid-2nd to early-3rd century Greek neologisms, but Herodian inauthenticity strengthens it even more. The diachronic approach to pinpointing neologisms may even model a new, fruitful line of research in regard to delineating between more and less probable Herodian expressions.

ἀνάγαιον / *anagaion* / “above-ground” derives from the classical lemma **ἀνώγειον** / *anōgeion* / “above-ground”.⁹⁵ Philo uses a spelling variant, **ἀνάγειον** / *anageion*, and elaborates on the term’s architectural significance; he specifically notes that women build these raised areas between houses with surrounding walls but no roofs, so as to guard their modesty and allow their voices to travel upwards unimpeded.⁹⁶

The first non-Christian use of the spelling **ἀνάγαιον** / *anagaion* may have been found in the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian.⁹⁷

Διὰ διφθόγγου δὲ καὶ ὁ μικροῦ ταῦτα· ὑπόγαιος· **ἀνάγαιος**· κατάγαιος.

But these [are constructed] with the diphthong and the short o: upon-ground; **above-ground**; below-ground.

The so-called upper-room setting where Jesus is said to have shared the Passover with his students is described with this same term in canonical Mark and canonical Luke. The latter appears in a group of verses

(22:9–13) unattested and very likely missing from Marcion’s *Evangelion*. Both canonical texts follow the apparently new and unique spelling of Herodian. While there are several spelling variants in the manuscripts of Mark and Luke, this particular spelling clearly has the earliest and strongest manuscript attestation.⁹⁸

καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει **ἀνάγαιον** μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἑτοιμον· (Mark 14:15)
And he will show you a large **above-ground** level prepared.

καὶ κεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει **ἀνάγαιον** μέγα ἐστρωμένον· (Lk 22:12)
E’en he will show you a large **above-ground** level.

Based on this lexicographical-chronological finding, the portraits of Jesus piously sharing a traditional ritual meal with his disciples, one that foreshadowed and guaranteed his innocent non-violence, is best read as a literary product of the time of Marcus Aurelius or later.⁹⁹

ἀπροσωπόλη[μ]πτος / *aprosōpolē[m]ptos* / “unbiased by person” (adj),
ἀπροσωπολή[μ]πτως / *aprosōpolē[m]ptōs* / “unbiased by person” (adv),
including various derivative nouns and verbs, first seem to appear in non-Christian writings in the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian.¹⁰⁰

Εὐεικτος δὲ γράφεται διὰ τοῦ εἰ διφθόγγου. Τὰ παρὰ τὸ λήβω, τὸ λαμβάνω, γράφονται διὰ τοῦ η οἶον: ἄληπτος, ἀκράτητος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀνεπίληπτος, ἐπίληπτος, **ἀπροσωπόληπτος**, φρενόληπτος

Now “pliant” (*eueiktos*) is written with the diphthong εἰ. Those [derived] from “to take” and “to receive” are written with η, such as: ungraspable, uncontrollable, incomprehensible, unassailable, culpable, **unbiased**, mentally-composed.

ἄληπτος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀπερίληπτος, **ἀπροσωπόληπτος**, ἀκαταληψία, ἐπιληψία, καὶ γίνεται ἐκ τοῦ λήβω.

Ungraspable, incomprehensible, uncircumscribed, **unbiased**, incomprehension, stoppage, are also derived from “to take”.

While [Ps-]Herodian only uses an adjectival form, the NT only contains an adverbial form, and one instance of the same, at 1Pet 1:17:

καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν **ἀπροσωπολήπτως** κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε.

And if you invoke as Father him who judges **without bias**, based on the work of each, conduct the time of the sojourn of yours in fear.

A similar, adverbial refrain (without the medial μ) appears in *EpBarn* 4:12:

Ὁ κύριος **ἀπροσωπολήπτως** κρινεῖ τὸν κόσμον· ἕκαστος καθὼς ἐποίησεν κομιεῖται—ἐὰν ᾗ ἀγαθός, ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ προηγήσεται αὐτοῦ· ἐὰν ᾗ πονηρός, ὁ μισθὸς τῆς πονηρίας ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ.

The Lord will judge the world **without bias**. Each will receive just as one did — if one be good, that one’s justice will precede oneself. If one be bad, the reward of evil [will go] before oneself.

Though the emphasis on divine judgment without personal bias is distinctive to the early Christian examples, these still likely date during or after the reign of Marcus Aurelius, when the shared stem apparently first gained traction.

ἀρτέμων / *artemōn* / “foresail” in its root form is spelled identically to the named entity Ἀρτέμων / *Artemōn* / “Artemon”, only differing by way of the capitalization of the first letter, an optional custom among post-

classical Greek scribes. The named entity may go back as far as Protagoras and Xanthus in the 5th century BCE. It is the name of a known Greek historian in the 2nd century BCE. Prior to the 1st century CE, this named entity appears 14 times in the TLG and 25 times in digitized Greek papyri, and some 10 additional times in Greek papyri in or after the 1st century CE.¹⁰¹ It appears once in a Judean ossuary (JERU0139) inscribed between 20 BCE and 70 CE.¹⁰² In the TLG, it appears once in Plutarch, writing in the late 1st or early 2nd CE, twice in a possibly Aurelian-era excerpt from the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian, and six times in the *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus in the early 3rd century CE. It even appears once in the NT, in Titus 3:12, as part of a litany of other likely fictitious names evoking learned allusions:

Ὅταν πέμψω Ἀρτεμᾶν πρὸς σὲ ἢ Τύχικον, σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με εἰς Νικόπολιν, ἐκεῖ γὰρ κέκρικα παραχειμάσαι.

Whenever I send Artemas unto you, or Tychicus, hurry to come unto me in Nicopolis, for there I have decided to winter.

The first non-Christian use of the distinct lemma ἀρτέμων / *artemōn* / “foresail” as a common noun, not a proper noun, appears in the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian. After listing words that end in αἰνος / *ainos*, then αἰμων / *aimōn*, all examples written with the diphthong αἰ / *ai*, he then begins to note exceptions, starting with a list of words ending in εμων / *emōn*:

Πλὴν τοῦ ἀρτέμων· ἀκρέμων· Πολέμων· καὶ ἡγεμῶν, καὶ κηδεμῶν· ὁξύνονται.

Excepting: **main pulley|foresail** (*artemōn*); hanging (*akremōn*); Polemon; both hegemon and guardian (*kēdemōn*) are acute-accented.

The next non-Christian author to use the common noun is apparently the 5th or 6th century Hesychius the Alexandrian, in his roughly 50,000 word *Lexicon*.¹⁰³ The LSJ entry for the Greek common noun mentions its derivation from the Latin word *artemon*, used by the mechanical engineer Vitruvius (1st cent. BCE) in his work *De architectura* 10.2.9 to describe a key component of a complex crane.¹⁰⁴

In radice autem machinae conlocatur tertia troclea; eam autem Graeci epagonta, nostri **artemonem** appellant.

Yet at the base of the machine a third pulley-block is affixed; the Greeks call it *epagonta*, but we [call it] **artemon**.

The common noun lemma ἀρτέμων / *artemōn* / “foresail” is an NT *hapax*, appearing only in the sea voyage of Paul in Acts 27:40:

καὶ τὰς ἀγκύρας περιελόντες εἶπον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἅμα ἀνέντες τὰς ζευκτηρίας τῶν πηδαλίων, καὶ ἐπάραντες τὸν **ἀρτέμωνα** τῇ πνεοῦσῃ κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν.

And after discarding the anchors, allowing them [to sink] into the sea, simultaneously releasing the yoke-fittings of the rudders, and hoisting the **foresail** to the wind, they held tight for the shore.

Incidentally, the lemma ζευκτήριος / *dzeukērios* / “yoke-fit”, prior to its single appearance in the NT, only appears in the writings of Aeschylus, and does so at least three different times.¹⁰⁵

The Latin loanword ἀρτέμων / *artemōn* / “foresail” used in Acts apparently crossed into literary Greek usage contemporary or subsequent to the reign of Aurelius. Given the Athenian dramatic sensibilities elsewhere, and Atreidean subtexts throughout, its adjacent term ζευκτήριος / *dzeukērios* / “yoke-fit” likely also reflects a learned allusion to the Aeschylean term.

ἀρχιποίμην / *archipōimēn* / “chief-shepherd” appears just once in the NT, in 1Pet 5:4. Its first occurrence in non-Christian literature belongs to Herodian’s authentic *General Prosody*:

Τὰ εἰς ἡν ἀπὸ ῥητῶν ἦτοι διαλεγομένων τῶν εἰς ἡν βαρύνεται οἶον Ἑλλήν φιλέλλην, Πανέλληνες ὡς Παναχαιοὶ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πᾶν ὡς παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ «Λέλεγας καὶ Τρῶας ἀναίρειν» (*Il.* 20, 96). Ἑλληνες γὰρ παρ’ αὐτῷ οἱ τὴν Φθιῶτιν Ἑλλάδα κατοικοῦντες «Μυρμιδόνες δὲ καλεῦνται καὶ Ἑλληνες καὶ Ἀχαιοί» (*Il.* 2, 684), εἶρην μελλείρην, ποιμὴν **ἀρχιποίμην**, αὐχὴν ἐριαύχην, ῥήν πολύρρην παρὰ τῷ τὰ Ναυπακτικὰ ποιήσαντι (*Pros.cath.* GG 3.1:16)

Words ending with ἡν, whether based on standard terms or discursive ones that end with ἡν, are accented, such as Hellene philhellene, Panhellene as Panachaeans, as the whole derives from the part, as with the poet, “To destroy Leleges and Troy”. For with him the Hellenes are those who inhabit Phthiotin Hellas, “Myrmidons they are called, and Hellenes and Achaeans”, [Lacedaemonian] young-man near-man, shepherd **chief-shepherd**, neck arch-necked, sheep [*rhēn*] Polyrrhenian, with the one who created the *Naupatica*.

The passage is unclear as to whether or not Herodian attests the word **ἀρχιποίμην** / *archipōimēn* / “chief-shepherd” for the largely lost text of the *Naupatica* (6th BCE). Thus we are left with Herodian himself as the first clear, non-Christian witness to the lemma. It also appears in the *Testament of Judah*. Like the other books in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, this one is viewed by experts as a Christian composition of the second half of the 2nd century CE.¹⁰⁶

Ἦν δέ μοι καὶ κτήνη πολλά, καὶ εἶχον ἀρχιποίμενα Ἴραν τὸν Ὀδολαμίτην· (*Test.Jud.* 4.8.1)

Many herds belonged to me, and I had Ira the Adullamite as **chief-shepherd**.

This midrash expands on LXX Gen 38:1–20, where Judah has intercourse with his daughter-in-law, Tamar, and arranges for a goat to be sent to her by way of the Adullamite previously identified as “Ira” (38:1).

In I Peter, the word occurs within a set of moral guidance for leaders in the Christian community. This passage (1Pet 5:2–4) can be found as quoted in the chapter on Philostratus II (222–249 CE) in regard to the *Heroikos*. For two apparent neologisms, one evidenced by Herodian and the other by Philostratus, to appear in close proximity strengthens the case for I Peter being redacted quite late, sometime between the late 2nd century and the second quarter of the 3rd century. While the latter option seems quite late, it is right in the neighborhood of Origen of Alexandria and his commentary on Luke, which is the earliest Christian text to evidence the possible reception of 1Pet 5:2–4.¹⁰⁷ It also happens to align with the mid-3rd century CE dates for three different Greek papyri that contain the lemma.¹⁰⁸

ἐφευρετής / *epheuretēs* / “inventor” has 326 hits in the TLG. Its first potential non-Christian occurrence is within the famous collection of Greek poems known as the *Anacreonta*, specifically in fragment 38, an incomplete drinking song to Bacchus.¹⁰⁹ This collection, however, is certainly not by Anacreon himself, but rather clearly Hellenistic and eclectic, even though “few” of its poems “give any clue to the date of their composition”.¹¹⁰ Based on reception and citation, there was some sort of *Anacreonta* collection of poems circulating in the mid- to late 2nd century CE,

a collection known to Gellius, Clement of Alexandria, and Hippolytus of Rome. But what they attest for that collection bears no match to what remains in today's primary witness, the Palatine manuscript.¹¹¹ Furthermore, in a study of the vocabulary of the Palatine *Anacreonta*, Brioso Sánchez recounted this specific lemma (ἐφευρετής / *eφευρεtēs*) as a sign of late compositional work, since the lemma is not attested before the 1st century CE.¹¹² Other terms in Palatine *Anacreonta* appear nowhere else before the 2nd, 3rd, and even 4th century CE (14). Based on a careful study of vocabulary and syntax, Brioso Sánchez dated fr. 38 to the range 400–600 CE.¹¹³ Thus the *Anacreonta* TLG result is invalidated as a viable neologistic anchor.

The lemma did not turn up in searches of major databases of digitized Greek papyri or Greek inscriptions, but it does occur in two works attributed to Herodian, both likely spurious on the whole. First we will examine the passage from Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ῥήματος / *Excursus de Verbo Magno* / “Excerpts on the Great Verb”. While Dickey catalogues this work under the spuria of Herodian,¹¹⁴ this only reflects the general characterization made by the editor, La Roche, who noted in the introduction that the style is uncharacteristic of Herodian, and thus that the work is generally spurious, likely compiled by a Byzantine grammarian. At the same time, La Roche adds that this epitomizer pulled extensively from Apollonius and Herodian, yet also that any modern effort to extract authentic grains from the chaff inevitably bears little fruit.¹¹⁵

Caveats and uncertainties notwithstanding, the relevant quotation belongs to a section on “Definite Passives” / Ὀριστικὰ παθητικά, where [Ps-]Herodian explores words derived from the stem for the verb “to find” / εὕρισκω / *heuriskō*:

Πόθεν τὸ εὐρέθην; ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐρῶ εὐρήσω εὔρηκα, καὶ συστολῇ τοῦ η εἰς τὸ ε εὐρέθην, ὅθεν τὸ ῥηματικὸν ὄνομα εὐρετῆς καὶ **ἐφευρετής**.¹¹⁶

Whence [comes] “I was found” (*heurethēn*)? From “I find” (*heurō*), “I will find” (*heurēsō*), “I have found” (*heurēka*), and by the contraction of the η into ε, “I was found” (*heurethēn*), whence [comes] the verbal noun “finder” (*heuretēs*) and “**inventor**” (*epheuretēs*).

The other ostensibly Herodian attestation also belongs to a spurious work: *Περὶ παραγωγῶν γενικῶν ἀπὸ διαλέκτων* / *De Derivationibus Genitivis ex Dialectis* / *On Genitive Derivations by Dialect*.¹¹⁷

Πότε τὰ εἰς σ λήγοντα φυλάττουσιν ἐν τῇ συνθέσει τὴν τάσιν τοῦ ἀπλοῦ; ἡνίκα εὐρεθῶσιν ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν· οἷον, ἐρανιστῆς, αὐχερανιστῆς εὐρετῆς, **ἐφευρετής**

When do word endings with *sigma* in the compound keep the pitch of the singular? Whenever they are found with more than one syllable, such as: feast-club-member (*erantistēs*), high-feast-club-member (*aucheranistēs*); finder (*heuretēs*), **inventor** (*epheuretēs*).

The lemma also appears in Alexander Aphrodisias’ late 2nd, early 3rd century CE *Commentary on Aristotle’s Metaphysics*, but apparently in a spuriously attributed portion, at least according to the TLG work breakdown.¹¹⁸ In the mid-3rd century, it is used several times by Origen of Alexandria, and also by Porphyry in his *Contra Christianos* (fr. 15).

The lemma does not seem to appear among digitized Greek papyri or Greek inscriptions. Given the vague or problematic evidence, a precise point of origin is not attainable. Even so, it seems reasonable to suggest that this lemma first emerged in the mid- to late-2nd century, if not the early 3rd century.

Its solitary appearance in the NT is in canonical Romans 1:30, in a portion likely missing from Marcion's *Apostolos*.

παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα, ²⁹ πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ, μεστοὺς φθόνου φόνου ἔριδος δόλου κακοηθείας, ³⁰ ψιθυριστάς, καταλάλους, θεοστυγεῖς, ὕβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνας, **ἐφευρετὰς** κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς

God handed them over to a valueless mind, to do improper things, ²⁹ having been filled with all injustice, evil, malice, avarice, full of ill-will, murder, strife, baiting, evil-disposition, ³⁰ whisperers, slanderers, God-scorns, insolents, super-proud, imposters, **inventors** of evils, disobedient to parents.

This same section has two other potential neologisms noted in the penultimate chapter *infra*: ἀντιμισθία (Rom 1:27, also in Theophilus of Antioch) and κατάλαλος (Rom 1:30, also in *Hermas*). Perhaps the vice list reflected the spontaneous creativity of the editor of canonical Romans. Even so, a mid- to late-2nd century origin best fits the evidence.

ζιζάνιον / *dzidzanion* / “darnel”, according to the LSJ entry, refers to *Lolium temulentum*, a wheat-like grain that inebriates (i.e., poisons) its consumers. Its ancient roots go back to the Sumerian word for wheat, *zizân*. The Greek term may have its first attestation in the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian.¹¹⁹

Τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ζι συλλαβῆς ἀρχόμενα διὰ τοῦ ι γράφεται· οἶον· **ζιζάνιον**, ἢ ἄκανθα· ζιβύνιον, ἀκόντιον ὁλοσίδηρον· καὶ τὰ λοιπά.

[Words] that begin with the syllable *zi* are written with an *iota*, such as: **zizanian**, or weed; *zibunion*, a wholly-iron javelin; and the rest.

A confounding example appears in the *Apocalypse of Moses*, a text in Latin known as the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Here Satan says to the serpent in the garden:

διὰ τί ἐσθίεις ἐκ τῶν **ζιζανίων** τοῦ Ἀδάμ καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου;
(ApMos 16.5)¹²⁰

“For what reason do you eat from the **zizania** of Adam, and not from the [fruit] of paradise?”

The date of the Greek text of ApMos is highly uncertain and speculative. If it was originally a Hebrew composition, as Johnson speculated, then the Hebrew text may have dated between 100 BCE and 200 CE, “but more probably toward the end of the first Christian century”, yet “the Greek and Latin texts” date “between that time and A.D. 400”.¹²¹

Within the canonical NT, the term ζιζάνιον appears eight times, all of them within a canonical Matthean fable (13:25–27, 29–30) and subsequent fable explanation (13:36, 38, 40). This fable lacks an overall parallel in Marcion’s *Ev or the other three NT Gospels. The Matthean examples use the term specifically in relation to an “enemy” who sows *zizania* in the wheat fields of his rival, and the subsequent effort by the field-owner to deal with this problem. The explanation ties the story to final judgment and spiritual actors (God, the evil one, angels).

It appears in other Christian writings sometimes considered to be early, i.e., the 13-letter collection of the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, specifically in Ign13 *Ephesians* 11.9.1, in a portion missing from Syriac Ign3 and Greek Ign7,¹²² and thus likely to date well after the mid-2nd century. A Greek fragment (fr. 28) of the fourth book of Irenaeus’ *Against*

Heresies that quotes the Matthean fable provides possible confirmation of the late 2nd century (ca. 180 CE) Christian usage of the term. The compact clustering of the unusual term in Matthew, its relatively late reception, and the earliest possible non-Christian appearance of the lemma in the Aurelian period, all point to the Matthean usage as a late-Aurelian or post-Aurelian insertion. Metatextually, it may comment on textual contaminations coming up alongside the emerging Christian sacred scriptures themselves, and/or an admission that divinely-oriented patience with heretical enemies, rather than human efforts to control the editing of scriptures, was now the only viable path.

Θρησκος|θηρησκός / *thrēskos* / “religious” only appears 34 times in the TLG. Here again [Ps-]Herodian in the long-form *Partitiones* may provide the earliest attestation to a potential neologism:¹²³

Πλὴν τοῦ θρηῆνος, ὁ κλαυθμός· θρηνωδῶ· θρηνωδία· θρηνωδός· θρηῆνυς, τὸ ὑποπόδιον· Θρήϊκες, οἱ Θραῖκες· θρησκεύω· θρησκεία· **Θρησκος**, ὁ περὶ τι πιστός· καὶ Θρηῆσσα, ἡ Θρακική.

In addition there is lamentation, wailing; to sing dirges; dirge-song; dirge-singer; the *threnus*, a sandal; Thracians, those of Thracia; to be religious; religion; **religious**, one faithful to something; and Thracianne, what is Thrace-like.

The same rare term only appears once in the canonical NT, specifically in the pseudonymous letter of James (1:26):

Εἴ τις δοκεῖ **θηρησκός** εἶναι, μὴ χαλιναγωγῶν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ ἀπατῶν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, τούτου μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία.²⁷ θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὕτη ἐστίν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀρφανούς καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου.

If anyone thinks to be **religious** while not bridling his tongue, but deceiving his heart, the religion of such a one is empty.²⁷ Religion clean and spotless with the God and Father is this, to look after orphans and widows in their affliction, to keep oneself stainless from the world.

The usage of the apparent neologism is interesting, but far more striking is the closely connected, parallel use of a second cognate word, θρησκός / “religious”, just as [Ps-]Herodian used at this precise point in a lexicographical compendium. Indeed, read James 1:27 once more. It is structured like a dictionary entry, is it not? Given that the long-form *Partitiones* derives from around the time of Marcus Aurelius, the most reasonable date for this well-integrated usage in James, together with this entire moral treatise-as-letter, is Aurelian or post-Aurelian.

νομοδιδάσκαλος / *nomodidaskalos* / “law-teacher” first appears in TLG results for non-Christian texts in the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian.¹²⁴

Πᾶσα λέξις ἀπὸ τῆς νο συλλαβῆς ἀρχομένη διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ γράφεται· οἷον· νόμος· νομικός· **νομοδιδάσκαλος**· νομίζω· νόμισμα· νόσος· νοσῶ· νόσημα· νόται, παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τὰ γράμματα, ἐξ οὗ καὶ νοτάριος, ὁ γραμματικός·

Every word that begins with the syllable *no* is written with the short *o*. For example: law; legal; **law-teacher**; to reckon; currency; disease; to be sick; illness; “letters” (*notai*) among Romans, from which also comes notary, the letter-skilled.

The same lemma does not seem to appear in any Greek papyri or Greek inscriptions, but it does appear three times in the NT. First in our list is Luke 5:17, a verse most likely missing from Marcion's *Evangelion*:

Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων, καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** οἱ ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ·

And it happened on one of the days when he was also teaching, and there were seated Pharisees and **law-teachers** who had arrived from every village of the Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem.

Sounds like a Tannaitic council of Rabbis, and similar to the Jerusalem Council described in Acts 15, doesn't it? No surprise, the next occurrence of the lemma is in Acts (Acts 5:34):

ἀναστὰς δέ τις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Φαρισαῖος ὀνόματι Γαμαλιήλ, **νομοδιδάσκαλος** τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ

Then someone, after rising up in the Sanhedrin, a Pharisee, Gamaliel by name, a **law-teacher** esteemed by all the people.

Finally, the same lemma appears in 1Tim 1:6–7:

ὧν τινες ἀστοχήσαντες ἐξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν ⁷ θέλοντες εἶναι **νομοδιδάσκαλοι**, μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἃ λέγουσιν μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται.

Some of them, becoming misaligned, went astray into empty-speech, ⁷ wishing to be **law-teachers**, not understanding either what they are saying or about what they are thoroughly assured.

Previous generations of scholars have found points of commonality between the Pastorals and Acts, or more broadly between the Pastorals and Luke-Acts. Our finding for this lemma fits into those arguments, while pushing the respective dates of all of them to around or after the time of Marcus Aurelius. It should finally be noted that a TLG search of the lemma νομοδιδάσκαλος does indeed turn up one hit prior to Herodian, specifically in Plutarch (*Cato Maior* 20.6), but the stem is distinctive: νομοδιδάκτης / *nomodidaktēs* / “law-taught|law-learned”, not νομοδιδάσκαλος / *nomodidaskalos* / “law-teacher”.¹²⁵

σθενόω / *sthenōō* / “to strengthen” appears just once in the NT, as the closing benediction of I Peter 5:10.

‘Ο δὲ θεὸς πάσης χάριτος, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὀλίγον παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, **σθενώσει**, θεμελιώσει.¹¹ αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν.

Now the God of all favor, who called you into his eternal glory in Christ, after you have suffered a little, will Himself supply, establish, **strengthen**, foundation-set [you].¹¹ To Him [be] the power into the ages. Amen.

The lemma does not occur again in a Christian text until Gregory Nazianzen’s *Orations* 42 (*Supremum vale*), which clearly refers back to the benediction in I Peter. It also does not appear in the major databases of Greek papyri or Greek inscriptions.¹²⁶

The first hit in a non-Christian text is in the authentic *General Prosody* of Herodian, in which he clearly distinguishes between the two cognate and similarly spelled lemmas:

Τὰ εἰς νω παραληγόμενα τῷ ε, περισπᾶται, εἰ προκατάρχῃ ὄνομα, ἐξ
οὗ γέγονε
φρενός φρενῶ,
ένός ένῶ,
ξένος ξενῶ,
ἀσθενής ἀσθενῶ,
σθένος σθενῶ,
στένος στενῶ.

τὸ γὰρ στένω οὐκ ἔχει ὄνομα οὔτε μένω, μεθ' ὧν καὶ φένω τὸ
φονεύω καὶ πένω, ἀφ' οὗ πένομαι, καὶ σθένω καὶ θένω τὸ τύπτω.
(*Pros.cath.*, GG 3.1:449)

Those that end with νω (*nō*) that are preceded with the ε (*e*) are circumflexed if they should first cause a noun. From this came

“mind” (*phrenos*) [from] “to be mindful” (*phrenō*);
“one” (*henos*) [from] “to unify” (*henō*);
“stranger” (*xenos*) [from] “to be a stranger” (*xenō*);
“weak” (*asthenēs*) [from] “to be weak” (*asthenō*);
“strength” (*sthenos*) [from] “to strengthen” (*sthenō*);
“narrow” (*stenos*) [from] “to narrow” (*stenō*).

The [verb] “to narrow” (*stenō*) lacks a noun, as does “to remain” (*menō*). Along with these “to slay” (*phenō*) came “to murder” (*phoneuō*) and “to toil” (*penō*), from which came “to be poor” (*penomai*), and [from] “to be strong” (*sthenō*) and “to smite” (*thenō*) [came] “to strike” (*tuptō*).

Given the rarity of the lemma, the precision of Herodian’s explanation, and his fame and authority as a grammarian in Rome, Herodian is more likely the progenitor or popularizer of this neologism, and I Peter is more likely secondary and subsequent.

σιμικίνθιον / *simikinthion* / “apron” is a loanword from the Latin *semicinctium*. It appears just once in the NT, in Acts 19:12. It provides a bit of dramatic costumery and may reflect the emergence of Christian martyr relics akin to the sort described in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. In its literary context, the term makes vivid the miraculous power of Paul, whose skin merely had to come into contact with ordinary pieces of cloth in order for divine healing to be conveyed through them.

Δυνάμεις τε οὐ τὰς τυχοῦσας ὁ θεὸς ἐποίει διὰ τῶν χειρῶν Παύλου, ¹² ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἀποφέρεισθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ σουδάρια ἢ **σιμικίνθια** καὶ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τὰς νόσους, τὰ τε πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ ἐκπορεύεσθαι.

Powers, and not those by happenstance, God did through the hands of Paul, ¹² so that even when kerchiefs or **aprons** were carried off from his skin [and placed] upon those who were sick, it made the diseases release from them, and also made the evil spirits leave.

It is not until the mid-4th century (Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.illum.* 10.19) that the lemma re-emerges in Christian literature in the TLG. In non-Christian Greek literature in the TLG, this term only occurs in two works, the [post-]Aurelian long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian, and the 5th–6th century lexicon of Hesychius. Hesychius has several additional lemma entries preceding and following **σιμικίνθιον** / *simikinthion* that are not evident in the passage of [Ps-]Herodian. By my lights, though there may be some later word forms and Byzantine glosses mixed among the parallels and definitions, there is no clear indication of Christian interpolation. Quite the opposite, actually, since there are multiple indications of reverence for traditional Greek and Roman divinities.

The line breaks in the following excerpt are ours, meant to facilitate correlation between the Greek *Partitiones* and English translation.

σιγῶ· σιγῇ· σιωπῇ·
 σιδηρος· σιδηρόφρακτος, ὁ ὠπλισμένος·
 Σιδῶν, πόλις, καὶ κλίνεται Σιδῶνος· Σίδης, ἡ πόλις·
 Σιβύλλα, κύριον· σίελος, τὸ σάλος·
 σίκερα, πόμα σκευαστόν· σικινίς, εἶδος ὀρχήσεως·
 σίκυα, τὰ τετράγγουρα, ὅθεν καὶ σικυήλατον·
 σίμβλον, τὸ τῶν μελισσῶν οἶκημα·
σιμικίνθιον, τὸ φακιόλιον·
 σιμὸς, ὁ πατζός· Σιμόεις, ποταμός·
 σίνω, τὸ βλάπτω·
 σίνηπι· Σινώπη, χώρα· Σινωπεὺς ἀνὴρ·
 σιπύη, ἡ ἀρτοθήκη·
 Σιχὰρ καὶ Σισάρα, κύρια· καὶ Σισυφός (Boissonade 1819:124–126)
 To be silent; Silence; Stillness;
 Iron; Iron-clad, one who is armored;
 Sidon, a city, and it is inflected *Sidōnos*; Sides, the city;
 Sibyl, divinity; saliva, the rolling swell;
 Liquor, a crafted drink; Sikinnis, a form of dancing;
 Cucumbers, the large cucumbers, whence also cucumber-bed;
 Beehive, the dwelling of the bees;
Apron, the face-cloth;
 Simian, the snub-nosed; Simoeis, a river;
 To hurt, to damage;
 Mustard; Sinope, a region; Sinopean, a man [from Sinope];
 A meal-tub, a bread-container;
 Sichar and Sisera, divinities; and Sisyphus.

Could the lemma in this context reflect the existence and textual contents of a lexicon in use in Rome around the time of Marcus Aurelius? A few of the terms may be of later provenance, but most were well known by that time. It is difficult to be certain, but it seems reasonable that σιμικίνθιον / *simikinthion* / “apron” appeared in a lexicon in the 170s CE, or not long after. As we stated before, if the *Partitiones* reflect later interpolations, that tends to strengthen the case for a later date for the corresponding NT usage of that word.

What seems quite reasonable is that Acts is unlikely the earliest extant text to attest this Latin word being imported into Greek usage. It is more likely such a word would be preserved in a Greek grammatical work such as this, one that reflects the enormous breadth of vocabulary in use among Greek-speaking elites. To put a finer point on it, while direct dependence for this word is far from conclusive, it is more likely that Acts was indebted to an introductory/exhaustive word-list similar to that of [Ps-]Herodian than for this rare Latin loanword to have been inserted as a gloss into this text.

σουδάριον / *soudarion* / “towel|napkin” derives from the Latin *sudarium*. It has 279 hits at present in the TLG, but none of these securely precede the 2nd century CE. The lemma occurs twice in the authentic *General Prosody* of Herodian (GG 3.1:365, 534), and is also found in the authentic *Περὶ διχρόνων* / *On Anceps Vowels* (GG 3.2:13). On the latter work, Dyck and Dickey concur that its content was excerpted from the *General Prosody* and is thus authentic to Herodian. Other non-Christian authors around or after Herodian’s work also attest the lemma, including Julius Pollux (*Onomast.* 7.71) and Aelius Promotus (*Potency* 21.1). Pollux specifically distinguishes previous terms for a particular type of garment from *sudarion* as a contemporary term:

τὸ δὲ ἡμιτύβιον, ἔστι μὲν καὶ τοῦτο Αἰγύπτιον, εἴη δ' ἂν κατὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ κωμῳδίᾳ καψιδρώτιον καλούμενον, ὃ νῦν **σουδάριον** ὀνομάζεται (Bethe 1900.2:72)¹²⁷

But the “linen cloth” (*hēmitubion*), while this is also Egyptian; but it might be what is in Middle Comedy called “napkin” (*kapsidrōtion*), which now is called **soudarion**.

In Greek papyri and inscriptions, there are several to consider, but apparently none before 138 CE, or even before Herodian.¹²⁸ The lemma appears twice in the canonical NT, once in Luke 19:20, in the so-called Parable of the Pounds, but specifically in a verse unattested for and likely missing from Marcion’s *Evangelion*. It also appears in John 11:44, in the story of the resurrection of Lazarus.

συκομορέα / *sukomorea* / “sycamore-tree” has 95 hits in the TLG. In Christian tradition, the lemma is famously associated with the diminutive Zacchaeus who climbed this type of tree to get a look at Jesus in canonical Luke 19:4. While that episode is attested for Marcion’s *Evangelion*, this particular lemma is not. In non-Christian texts, it first appears in the authentic work of Herodian *On Orthography*, within the context of an alphabetized list clarifying final vowels:

συβόσιον: ι. **συκομορέα**: ε. συκοφαντία: ι (*Orthog.* GG 3.2:585)

herd of swine (*subosion*): *iota*. **Sycamore-tree** (*sukomorea*): *epsilon*. Brown-nosing (*sukophantia*): *iota*.

The same lemma is also in [Ps-]Herodian, *Partitiones* (Boissonade 1819:217).

In Christian authors, it first appears in Origen, who uses the term twice in reference to the canonical Lukan tale (*Ps.hom.* 24.5), connecting it to the LXX term **σुकάμινος** / *sukaminos* / “mulberry-tree”. LSJ notes

this traditional and more common spelling, as well as *συκόμερος* / *sukomoros*, the latter evident in the 1st century CE in Strabo and Dioscorides Pedanius, and as far back as the 3rd century BCE PCair.Zen. 83.3. Among manuscripts of canonical Luke, there seems to be quite a bit of confusion in spelling, particularly whether to use an *omega* or *omicron* between the *mu* and *rho*, and also whether the penultimate vowel should be an *epsilon* or *alpha-iota* diphthong.¹²⁹ Yet all these variants do not register either of the two traditional forms noted in LSJ. That is to say, canonical Luke almost certainly evidences the new spelling first documented securely by Herodian, around the time of Marcus Aurelius, lending further support to a post-Aurelian date for a major round of editing to canonical Luke.

ὑπερεκτείνω / *huperekteinô* / “to stretch out beyond measure” has 101 TLG hits, but no hits in searches of major databases of Greek papyri or inscriptions. Its first non-Christian occurrence is Herodian’s authentic *Περὶ Ὀδυσσειακῆς προσωδίας* / *On the Prosody of the Odyssey*.¹³⁰ In context, the excerpt attempts to explain an unusual word from the opening of *Odyssey* book 23, specifically *Od* 23.3, where Eurycleia rushes (as much as an old woman can rush) to tell Penelope that Odysseus has returned.

ὑπερικταίνοντο: Ἀρίσταρχος μὲν ἄγαν ἐπάλλοντο καὶ ἐκινούντο προθυμουμένης αὐτῆς βαδίζειν ταχέως, μὴ δυναμένης δέ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ βραχὺ διὰ τὸ γῆρας. οἱ δὲ **ὑπερεξετείνοντο**.

“were hobbling along” (*hyperiktainonto*): Aristarchus¹³¹ interpreted it as “they were quivering” (*epallonto*) and “they were moving” (*ekinounto*), as she [the old woman] was eager to proceed quickly, but was not capable, except little by little due to old age. Others [read] “**were stretching out beyond measure**”.

Herodian goes on to give his preferred interpretation. The anonymous attribution, though, should give us pause to consider whether the word was newly minted by Herodian, or whether it represented one of his contemporary grammarians or perhaps even his grammarian father. In any case, the same unusual, and perhaps new word used by Herodian appears in canonical 2Cor 10:14, in an extended portion absent from Marcion's *Apostolos*.

οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι εἰς ὑμᾶς **ὑπερεκτείνομεν** ἑαυτούς, ἄχρι γὰρ καὶ ὑμῶν ἐφθάσαμεν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ·

For we do not as [if] not reaching to you **extend ourselves beyond measure**, for as far as you we also outran in the evangelion of the Christ.

Against the background of Herodian's comment, the Homeric allusion becomes crystal clear. Canonical Paul (now implicitly picturing himself as elderly, together with his team), takes on the persona of Herodian's Eurycleia and (perhaps satirically) turns the episode into a metaphor of athletic competition.

This new formulation likely helps explain another cognate neologism found just below in canonical 2Cor 10:16, **ὑπερέκεινα** / *hyperekeina* / "beyond measure", which we have listed under Clement of Alexandria in the penultimate chapter. While Clement may well have coined the latter in his editing of canonical 2Cor, he very likely owed his use of the lemma **ὑπερεκτείνω** / *hyperekteinô* to Herodian.

χοϊκός / *choikos* / "dust" appears first in extant texts either in 1Cor 15:47–49 (Marcionite and canonical), [Ps-]Herodian, *Partitiones*, or a Greek inscription: IG II² 13139/42 — PH15633 — Attic — post. mid-2nd century CE. By around 180 CE in Irenaeus' major work, it was popular and core to emerging proto-Orthodox theology of divine incarnation (AH 1.10–11,

14, 16). The lemma also appears in a relatively late (probably ca. 3rd century CE), Christian portion of *SibOrac* 8, at line 460, with an incarnational theology that resonates with that of Irenaeus.¹³²

Galen (ca 168–192 CE)

The most prolific of any ancient Greek author, Galen left behind some four million words of extant works.¹³³ Born in 129 CE in Pergamum, Asia Minor, he moved to Rome around 159 CE, where he did almost all of his writing. The personal physician to Emperor Commodus, he was famous for his medical acumen and infamous for his contentious mannerisms.

ἐπιλείχω / *epileichō* / “to lick” only appears four times in the TLG and does not seem to appear in any extant Greek papyri or inscriptions. Its first non-Christian occurrence in the TLG is found in the voluminous writings of Galen, who uses the term just once. In his work *Commentary on Hippocrates’ on Fractures* / *In Hippocratis librum de fracturis*, Galen describes the procedure for applying a bandage in the area of the spleen:

ὑπὸ δυοῖν ἀρχῶν ἐπίδεσμος ἐπιδεῖται, τουτέστι τῆς μεσότητος τῶν σπληνῶν ... ἐγκλινομένων ὀλίγον ὥς ἀλλήλων συμβαλεῖν κατὰ τὸ ἀντικείμενον μέρος ἢ ὅθεν ἤρξατο καὶ γενέσθαι τὴν συμβολὴν αὐτῷ τῷ χ γράμματι παραπλησίαν, ὅπερ εἰ κυκλοτερῶς ἐπιλειχθήσεται, οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο. συμβαίνει γὰρ τοσοῦτω περιλαμβανομένου ἀπαντᾶν ἀλλήλοις ἄντικρυς. (Kühn 18.2:564)

the bandage is fastened by two starting points, that is from the middle of the spleen with the bandage tails ... inclining a little so that they connect with each other on the opposite side from which it began, and with it making a symbol resembling the letter χ, which if it **were licked** in a circular shape, would not work. For in such manner each joins, being wrapped to meet opposite to each other.

The apparently new lemma appears in canonical Luke 16:21, in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. The vivid description of dogs licking the beggar was most likely not present in Marcion’s *Evangelion*, particularly since it goes unmentioned by Tertullian and Epiphanius, who otherwise confirm many of the basic elements of the story.¹³⁴

πτωχὸς δέ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος ἐβέβλητο πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ εἰλκωμένος ²¹ καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου· ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι **ἐπέλειχον** τὰ ἕλκη αὐτοῦ (Lk 16:20–21)

But a certain beggar, Lazarus by name, had been cast upon his gate, wounded, ²¹ and longing to be filled from what fell from the table of the rich man. But the dogs, coming over, **were licking** his wounds.

It seems an unlikely coincidence for a new, rare lemma to appear near a vivid depiction of a wound-afflicted person. As many *nomina sacra* — the earliest form of Christian art, evident in many early Gospel manuscripts — would indicate, early Christians were fascinated with the letter χ as a symbol, both for “Christ” / Χριστός and the cross. This passage in Galen, referencing the formation of a χ shape as the means of treating an internal wound, would have been a prime candidate for Christian use and comment. This points to the canonical redactor of Luke, most likely sometime after the 160s CE, drawing on Galen’s medical commentary to make the portrayal of the beggar Lazarus (the Greek form of the Hebrew name Eleazar) that much more vivid.

μυλικός / *mulikos* / “pestle|grinding” only appears one time in the NT, in canonical Luke 17:2, but apparently not in its attested parallel in Marcion’s *Evangelion*, canonical Mark, or canonical Matthew, which all apparently reflect an earlier formulation. Compare:

συμφέρει αὐτῷ εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθη ἢ γεννηθέντα μύλῳ ὄνικῳ προστεθῆναι περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῆναι ἐν τῷ βάθει τῆς θαλάσσης (*Ev 17:2)¹³⁵

It is beneficial for him had he not been born, or having been born, for a donkey millstone to be placed upon his neck, and to be thrown down a cliff into the depth of the sea.

καλὸν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὄνικος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. (Mark 9:42)

It is good for him instead if a donkey millstone is put around his neck and he is cast into the sea.

συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὄνικος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης. (Matt 18:6)¹³⁶

It is beneficial for him if a donkey millstone be hung around his neck and he were thrown down a cliff into the high sea.

λυσίτελεϊ αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος **μυλικός** περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ῥριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. (Lk 17:2)

It is profitable for him if a **grinding** stone is wrapped around his neck and he is tossed into the sea.

The first three passages run more closely to each other and to the famous death of Aesop as narrated in the *Life of Aesop*, where the protagonist is hurled off a cliff to his death. Canonical Luke is the outlier in several

respects, especially the substitution of a “grinding stone” in place of a “donkey millstone”.¹³⁷

The first chronologically secure TLG hit for *μυλικός* belongs to Galen, who uses the lemma seven (!) different times in his treatise *De compositione medicamentorum* / *On the Composition of Medicines*.

[**Μυλική** ἀγαθή, ἐπὶ πολλῶν θαυμασθεῖσα.] (C.M. 12:869)

[A good **grinding**, admired for many uses.]

[Τὰ ὑπ’ Ἀνδρομάχου γεγραμμένα πρὸς ἀπάσας ὀδύναις ὀδόντων **μυλική** αὐθωρὸν παύουσα.] (C.M. 12:877)

[The things prescribed by Andromachus for all toothaches, a **grinding** that immediately stops [pain].]

ἄλλη **μυλική** ἐκ τῶν Ἀφρόδα. ... ἄλλη **μυλική** τοῦ αὐτοῦ ... **μυλική** καλή. (C.M. 12:878)

Another **grinding** from Aphrodas. ... Another **grinding** from him. ... A good **grinding**.

μυλική ἄλλη ὡς Ἀριστοκράτης. (C.M. 12:879)

Another **grinding**, as by Aristocrates.

Ἄλλη **μυλική** αὐθωρὸν παύουσα. (C.M. 12:882)

Another **grinding**, quickly stopping [pain].

If we exclude the bracketed notes, which may be supplemental annotations, five hits remain. Galen also uses the term *μυλητική* / “a ground [paste]” (C.M. 12:877) as a topical dental anesthetic.

This lemma does not seem to appear among digitized Greek papyri or Greek inscriptions. The Lukan substitution is likely indebted to Galen in some form or fashion. It essentially repurposes a newly popularized

medicinal lemma associated with the concoction of ground pastes. In doing so, it apparently pictures a smaller, more readily available type of stone than that described in Marcion's *Evangelion*, canonical Mark, or canonical Matthew. One also wonders if the substitution befits the seafaring obsession of the editor(s) of Luke-Acts: painting a plausible scenario of execution at sea with a smaller weight strapped to the victim's neck (perhaps implying a ship's doctor), rather than a land-based setting that would require a beast of burden to transport an inhuman weight of execution.

Maximus of Tyre (172–192 CE)

Maximus of Tyre, or Maximus the Sophist, was a prominent orator in the second half of the 2nd century CE. The *Suda* places him in the reign of Commodus (180–192 CE). Manuscript R of his *Orations* says he delivered them in Rome during his first visit to the city and places the text between works by two mid-2nd century authors, “Alcinuous and Albinus”.¹³⁸ In his *Chronicon* (232), Eusebius of Caesarea describes Maximus becoming prominent as a contemporary of Arrian of Nicomedia, Apollonius the Stoic, and Basilides the Scythian, and claims that all of them were sometime educators of Marcus Aurelius.¹³⁹ This last datum need not require a date in the 140s or even 150s CE for Maximus’s writings, since the emperor was well-known for his lifelong pursuit of learning and affinity for a wide array of educators.

συσπαράσσω / *susparassō* / “to co-tear asunder” is extremely rare, with only 8 hits in the entire TLG. The LSJ entry for this lemma states that it is a later variant of the Attic lemma **συσπαράττω** / *susparattō*, but the only witnesses to the double-tau spelling of this lemma are Maximus of Tyre in the late 2nd century CE and Byzantine authors of the 12th century CE and later (Chrysoberges, Metochites). The first chronologically secure, non-Christian occurrence of either lemma spelling is Maximus of Tyre. The unprefixated corresponding lemmas were both common in Attic composition: **σπαράττω** / *sparattō* (esp. Aristophanes) and **σπαράσσω** / *sparassō* (esp. Euripides). That is to say, while **συσπαράττω** / *susparattō* may have sounded Attic, the **συ**-prefixated lemma (with either spelling) was actually Hellenistic and Second Sophistic in origin.

Apparently absent from the major databases of Greek papyri and inscriptions, this lemma first appears in Maximus' *Dissertationes* 7, an oration whose title is, "Which Illnesses are More Grave, Those of the Body or Those of the Soul?"¹⁴⁰ Maximus begins the oration with an analogical frame, likening the relationship between the ruler and the body politic to the relationship between soul and body (*Diss.* 7.1).¹⁴¹ Diseases of the soul, in the ruler or anyone, are worse in that they have deleterious effects on everyone around them (*Diss.* 7.2). A healthy-souled ruler can keep even a unhealthy, endangered city strong, as Pericles did for Athens during a plague and the Peloponnesian War (*Diss.* 7.3). Pherecydes exemplifies a soul staying healthy even when disease afflicts the body (*Diss.* 7.4). The exemplary, healthy soul of Philoctetes, despite his "diseased body", "brings salvation to his comrades" (*Diss.* 7.5).¹⁴²

In the immediate context of the relevant quotation, Maximus quotes *Od* 18.74, a suitor's taunt about Odysseus' filthy rags. This taunt foregrounds the boxing match that reveals his hidden strength and courage. For Maximus, the taunting suitor by contrast typifies cowardice:

ἡ δὲ δειλὴ ψυχὴ κατορωρυγμένη ἐν σώματι, ὡς ἔρπετον νωθὲς εἰς φωλεόν, φιλεῖ τὸν φωλεὸν καὶ οὐδεπώποτε θέλει ἀπαλλαγῆναι αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἐξερπύσαι, ἀλλὰ καιομένῳ συγκάεται καὶ σπαραττομένῳ **συσπαράττεται**, καὶ ἀλγοῦντι τῷ σώματι συναλγεῖ καὶ βοῶντι συμβοᾷ. ὦ πόυς, ἀφήσω σε;

The cowardly soul, buried down by the body, like a lethargic reptile in a den, loves the den and never ever wishes to be freed from it, nor to creep outside. Instead, as the den is burning, it co-burns, and as the den is torn asunder, it **is co-torn asunder**, and as the body hurts, it co-hurts, and as it cries out, it co-cries. O foot, shall I release you?

This highly rare and evidently new lemma occurs in both canonical Mark 9:20 and canonical Luke 9:42. While surrounding content is attested for Marcion's *Evangelion* (*Ev 9:40, 9:44), this verse was apparently missing. These parallel episodes tell of a boy who is afflicted with a terrible disease, a body whose father implores Jesus to heal.

καὶ ἦνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθὺς **συν-εσπάραξεν** αὐτόν, καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκυλίετο ἀφρίζων. (Mk 9:20)

And they brought him unto him. And seeing him, the spirit immediately **co-tore asunder** him, and falling upon the ground he was rolling, foaming.¹⁴³

ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτόν τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ **συνεσπάραξεν**. ἐπετίμησεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτόν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. (Luke 9:44)

Now while he was being brought, the demon broke him and **co-tore asunder**. But Jesus censured the unclean spirit and healed the child and gave him back to his father.

If the story is merely about a demon-possessed child and an individual healing, the verbs describing the affliction seem overdone. But set against the background of Maximus' oration, both canonical tales read as political fables of a nation's destruction under sick-souled governance, and of Jesus as a healthy-souled leader capable of bringing healing. The broader context deepens the parallels between these texts. In canonical Mark, the ailment and torment of the demon-possessed child sounds similar to a reptile writhing on the ground. A serpentine redaction unique to canonical Luke also likely owes to Maximus' influence. In both Gospels (here shared with Marcion's *Evangelion*), the following exclamation and rhetorical question immediately precedes the miracle:

ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος ἕως πότε ἔσομαι μεθ' ὑμῶν; ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;
(*Ev 9:41 // Mk 9:19)

O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? How long shall I tolerate you?

ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; (Lk 9:41)

O faithless *and twisted* generation, how long shall I be with you and tolerate you?

As LSJ notes, διαστρέφω / *diastrephō* can mean “to turn different ways, to twist about, distort”. Setting this subtle stylistic choice within its broader, diachronic literary contexts suggests it conveys the image of a writhing reptile as well.

Though Marcion’s *Evangelion* bears no indication of Maximus’ influence here, its exclamation, “O faithless generation” / ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος and rhetorical questions likely co-inspired the redactor of canonical Mark and canonical Luke at this point.¹⁴⁴ The supplementation thus made a synthetic association between these prophetic sayings of Jesus in Marcion’s *Evangelion* and Maximus’ closing exclamation and rhetorical question: ὦ πόυς, ἀφήσω σε; / “O foot, shall I release you?”

In a broader perspective, Maximus’ evident affinity for συ-prefixed verbs, particularly in regard to the dependency of the body on the soul, may help account for the gratuitous use of these lemmas (many of them neologisms themselves)¹⁴⁵ in the canonical New Testament and related early Christian literature as products of the Second Sophistic.

Marcus Aurelius (172–180 CE)

Marcus Aurelius, famed as a philosopher emperor, prided himself on his capacity to read and compose Greek. His best known work was entitled *Tὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν* / *Ad se ipsum* / *To Himself*, commonly known in English as the *Meditations*. Originally written as remembrances, or notes to himself, he may not have intended them for publication and distribution. There are some clear indications and faint clues scattered among the twelve books of the *Meditations* as to when some of them were composed. Others lack such references. Generally, all of them fall between the years 172 and 180 CE, spanning his military campaign along the Danube and approaching the end of his life.

περπερεύομαι / *perpereuomai* / “to flaunt oneself” is fairly rare in the TLG, appearing some 117 times. Its first non-Christian occurrence is in book 5 of the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius. While book 5 has some of the most personal reflections, it nevertheless lacks the sort of specific details that might supply a precise date. It is safe to place its composition in modest date range, between 173 and 178 CE.

οὐκ αἰσθάνῃ πόσα ἤδη παρέχεσθαι δυνάμενος, ἐφ’ ὧν οὐδεμία ἀφύιας καὶ ἀνεπιτηδειότητος πρόφασις, ὅμως ἔτι κάτω μένεις ἐκῶν; ἢ καὶ γογγύζειν καὶ γλισχεύεσθαι καὶ κολακεύειν καὶ τὸ σωματίον κατατιᾶσθαι καὶ ἄρεσκεύεσθαι καὶ **περπερεύεσθαι** καὶ τοσαῦτα ῥιπτάζεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ διὰ τὸ ἀφύῳς κατεσκευάσθαι ἀναγκάζῃ; (*Medit.* 5.5.1)

Do you not perceive all that you are capable of providing from your own means, for which there is not any excuse of a lack of natural power or unfitness, nevertheless you still remain below purposely?

Or are you compelled to grumble and to be stingy and to flatter and to blame the poor body and to be complaisant and **to flaunt yourself** and in such ways to be tossed about in soul on account of being uncleverly prepared?

The first occurrence of the lemma in a Christian work is in the famous love chapter of 1 Corinthians, specifically in 1Cor 13:4. While this chapter is attested for the Marcionite version, our team's reconstruction included 1Cor 13:4a but omitted 1Cor 13:4b, where this word occurs.

Ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐ ζηλοῖ, οὐ **περπερεύεται**, οὐ φυσιοῦται, ⁵ οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ, οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς, οὐ παροξύνεται, οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν, ⁶ οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· (1Cor 13:4–6)

Love suffers long; love shows kindness, envies not, **flaunts itself** not, puffs itself up not, ⁵ does not act improperly, does not seek the things of oneself, is not provoked, does not count up the evil, ⁶ does not celebrate over wickedness, but co-celebrates in the truth.

περπερεύομαι / *perpereuomai* has a middle voice and reflexive sense, wherein the self is subject and object. In the sentence in the *Meditations* where this lemma appears, it is one of six middle-voice verbs within a sentence of 25 words, an unusually high ratio in Greek prose. The gratuitous use of reflexive verbs befits a modality wherein the author speaks to himself to chasten himself. The Marcionite *Apostolos* tends to favor simple, active verbs, while middle-voice verbs occur at far higher rates in the canonical Paulines. Along with the broader tendency in canonical 1-2 Corinthians and Romans for the author to use self-implicating language, here we may be witnessing one of its sources of inspiration: the self-chastening philosophical reflections of the emperor himself.¹⁴⁶

This lemma does not seem to appear in any digitized Greek papyri or Greek inscriptions. After 1Cor 3:4, the lemma next appears in Christian writings in the erudite Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the Pauline verse twice (*Paed.* 3.1.3.1, *Quis dives* 38.2), but who also uses it once without reference to that text (*Paed.* 3.11.77.1). The cognate adjective *πέρπερος* / *perperos* / “vainglorious”|“braggart” first appears in the TLG in Polybius’ *Histories* (32.2.5, 39.1.3), written in the 2nd century BCE, an adjective Epictetus seems to have used once (*Diss.* 3.2.15, 108 CE), before Herodian included it in his *General Prosody*.¹⁴⁷ Clement of Alexandria is the first in the TLG to use the cognate noun *περπερεία* / *perpereia* / “vainglory” (*Paed.* 3.1.3). The broader patterns of reception favor *περπερεύομαι* / *perpereuomai* as a neologism that first emerged within, or at least around the time of, the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius, before it entered into Christian literature via the canonical redaction to the Pauline letters.

Julius Pollux (ca 178–192 CE)

Julius Pollux was a rhetorician trained in Athens by Hadrian of Tyre.¹⁴⁸ Early in the singular reign of Commodus, Pollux was “appointed to the Chair of Rhetoric in Athens”.¹⁴⁹ Caught up in the Attic renaissance of his time, he spent several years compiling a massive onomastic dictionary, the *Onomasticon*. It follows a notional rather than alphabetical structure, and at the micro-level “often adopts a format based on parts of speech and the semantic relations of synonymy and antonymy”.¹⁵⁰

σκηνοποιός / *skēnopoios* / “tent-maker” occurs 121 times in the TLG. Its two earliest hits are the canonical Acts of the Apostles and the Athenian rhetorician, Julius Pollux. The usage in Acts is a memorable and well-known characterization of Paul, his hosts Priscilla and Aquila, and their shared vocation, set during his stay in Corinth.

καὶ διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον εἶναι ἔμενεν παρ’ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡργάζετο· ἦσαν γὰρ **σκηνοποιοὶ** τῇ τέχνῃ.

And because of him being the same-craft, he stayed with them and was working. For they were **tent-makers** by craft.

The cognate lemma **σκηνοποιία** / *skēnopoia* / “tent-making”, “scene-making”, “theater-building”, or even “nest-building” (LSJ) has a much older history, first attested in the TLG by the 4th century BCE Aeneas (*Poliorcetica* 8.3), and corroborated by roughly contemporaneous Greek inscriptions.¹⁵¹

The passage in Pollux runs as follows, taken from *Onomasticon* book 7, which was composed between 177 and the early 180s CE.¹⁵² We omit

the embedded scholarly annotations found in the TLG digital text, which provides cross-references to Athenian exemplars, even though below we discuss the most relevant cross-reference. The specific excerpt comes from *Onomasticon* 7.189.¹⁵³

θαυματοποιός θαυματοποιία, θαυμάτων δημιουργοί.
 μηχανοποιός μηχανοποιία μηχανήματα μηχαναί,
 εὐμήχανοι εὐμηχανία, πολυμήχανοι πολυμηχανία,
 ἀμήχανοι ἀμηχανία, βιομήχανοι ὡς Ἀντιφῶν.
 τοὺς δὲ μηχανοποιοὺς καὶ **σκηνοποιούς** ἢ παλαιὰ κωμῳδία ὠνόμαζεν.
 Wonder-worker, wonder-working, creators of wonders.
 Machine-maker, machine-making, machines, mechanisms.
 Inventives, inventiveness, poly-inventives, poly-inventiveness.
 Unskilled, unskillfulness, life-skilled as Antiphon.
 The Old Comedy even called **scene-makers** machine-makers.

As Bethe's shorthand annotation clarifies, the last statement makes a meaningful diachronic linguistic distinction. This is confirmed for fragment 98 of the "Anonymous" / *Adespota* section and "Ancient" / *Archaias* subsection of the *Comicorum atticorum fragmenta* (Kock 1888:417). Kock cites back to this same passage in Pollux:

σκηνοποιούς — τοὺς μηχανοποιοὺς ἢ παλαιὰ κωμῳδία ὠνόμαζεν.
Scene-makers — the Old Comedy called them machine-makers.

Another ancient, cognate word also played this role, a lemma attested by Plutarch (*De musica* 1142B) for Aristoxenus (4th c. BCE): σκηνικός / *skēnikos* / "theatrical" or "actor" (LSJ), perhaps even "stager".¹⁵⁴

Various LSJ entries provide helpful supplemental context about the semantic association between machine-craft and stage-craft. For example, for the term I translated above as "mechanisms" / μηχαναί (s.v.,

μηχανή, -ῆς, ῆ), LSJ notes “theatrical machine by which gods, etc., were made to appear in the air”.

I did not find the main lemma, σκηνοποιός / *skēnopoios* — the one in Acts and Julius Pollux —, in searches of major databases of Greek papyri and inscriptions. Even when Plutarch speaks of the theater and musical production, he does not use this specific lemma. The cumulative evidence thus points to its emergence around the time of Pollux, perhaps first invented, standardized, and/or popularized by him.

This all lends support to the cumulative argument of the book. This portion of Acts likely reflects an historical and literary setting after Pollux, ie., in the 180s CE or afterwards. It also shows by contrast that NT lexica and scholarly works that default to “tent-maker” as the term’s meaning have largely missed the lemma’s clear theatrical domain and significance. Paul, Priscilla, and Aquila in Acts are likely depicted not as mere “tent-makers”, but rather as “scene-makers” or “theater-builders” in Corinth. With a nod to Shakespeare, we might say that Acts and its characters are together engaged in stagecraft.¹⁵⁵

Artemidorus of Daldis (ca 180–200 CE)

Largely known for his *Oneirocritica*, Artemidorus of Daldis likely wrote during the late Second Sophistic. He dedicated numerous books of his extensive work on dream interpretation to his intellectual contemporary, Maximus of Tyre, and makes mention of several other persons known to have lived between the 170s CE and the early Severan period.¹⁵⁶ Enormously influential in modern psychology and dream-analysis, Artemidorus is hardly ever considered as a potential contemporary to New Testament author(s)/editor(s). But in our view, this is prejudicial, and could get in the way of observing historically and literarily secure connections between his works and late editorial stages of New Testament documents.

ἀνένδεκτος / *anendektos* / “inconceivable” appears in two results tied to BCE authors, both found within modern compilations of ancient fragments: Chrysippus, *Frag.* 55 and Aristophanes Gram., *Frag.* 13. The second is clearly part of the secondary wording of Eustathius of Thessalonica (12th cent. CE), who subsequently cites to Chrysippus only in regard to diminutive forms of address for beloved relatives and the like. The other fragment requires a more careful examination. It is annotated as “Diocles Magnes apud Diog. Laërt. VII, 50”, i.e., Diocles the Magnesians within Diogenes Laertius 7.50. Diogenes Laertius wrote in the early 3rd century CE, but Diocles of Magnesia is understood to have lived in the 2nd or 1st century BCE. In the context of the fragment, the lemma is attributed to Diocles of Magnesia, but since we lack any works authored by Diocles to test that attribution, the attestation remains dubious.

διαφέρει δὲ φαντασία καὶ φάντασμα. φάντασμα μὲν γάρ ἐστι δόκησις διανοίας, οἷα γίνεται κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους, φαντασία δέ ἐστι τύπωσις ἐν ψυχῇ, τουτέστιν ἀλλοίωσις, ὡς ὁ Χρύσιππος ἐν τῇ β΄ περὶ ψυχῆς ὑφίσταται. οὐδὲ γὰρ δεκτέον τὴν τύπωσιν οἶονεὶ τύπον σφραγιστῆρος, ἐπεὶ **ἀνένδεκτόν** ἐστι πολλοὺς τύπους κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθαι.

Now fantasy and phantasm are distinct. For phantasm is a fancy of mind, such as occurs according to dreams, but fantasy is an impression in soul, that is, an alteration, as Chrysippus substantiates in book two *On the Soul*. Neither should one understand the impression as akin to the mold of a signet, since it is **inconceivable** that many molds based on the same thing be applied around the same thing.

Thus the first secure non-Christian attestation of this lemma, both in terms of chronology and authorship, is actually by Artemidorus of Daldis. In context, the author discusses how to interpret numbers, as well as the numerical value of words (based on the number of letters in the word). All are calculated or adjusted to correlate with typical human life-spans and reasonable periods of time remaining in a person's life.

ὁ δὲ παραπλήσιος καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁμοίων λόγος τηρεῖσθω, ὅταν ἢ ὁ λεγόμενος ἀριθμὸς τοῦ μὲν ἔμπροσθεν χρόνου ἦττων, πρὸς δὲ τὸν μέλλοντα **ἀνένδεκτος**. (*Oneir.* 2.70)

One must apply the equivalent logic also to other similar ones, whenever a spoken number be less than the preceding time, but would be **inconceivable** for the time to come.

The solitary instance in canonical NT texts is found in Luke 17:1, where the term is missing from close parallels with canonical Matthew, canonical Mark, and Marcion's *Evangelion*.

Ἄνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἐλθεῖν, πλὴν οὐαὶ δι' οὗ
ἔρχεται / **Inconceivable** it is that the scandals not come, however,
woe [to him] through him it comes.

The woe statement not only shares a new/rare lemma with Artemidorus, but also precedes a clear evocation of heinous death (Luke 17:2). In its context, it thus aligns with Artemidorus' thematic concern about the proper interpretation of dreams in relation to human mortality.

βραδυπλοέω / *braduploeō* / “to sail slowly”, “to drift”, or “to be in the doldrums” appears first among non-Christian writings in the *Oneirocritica* of Artemidorus of Daldis. As with the rest of the work of this Artemidorus, the focus here is on the interpretation and meaning of dreams.

Πάντα τὰ περιεκτικὰ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχει λόγον, ἱμάτιον οἰκία τεῖχος ναῦς καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. οἷον ξύλινον ἱμάτιον ἔδοξε τις περιβεβλησθαι. ἔτυχε πλέων καὶ **ἐβραδυπλόησεν**· ἦν γὰρ αὐτῷ ξύλινον ἱμάτιον ἢ ναῦς, (*Oneir.* 4.30)

All things that beset our own selves have the same rationale: garment, house, wall, ship, and the like. Someone thought he was enclothed in some sort of wooden garment. It chanced that while sailing **he sailed slowly**. For the ship was a wooden garment to him.

If the influence of Tolkien's mythical tropes on our thinking isn't yet apparent, let us rephrase a line from the *Fellowship of the Ring*. For Artemidorus, the dream image of a ship as a wooden garment portended bodily ill at sea and conveyed a sense of Moria-like entrapment: “This isn't a ship. It's a casket”. Artemidorus' mention of “sailing slowly” in connection with an individual's forboding dream about a dangerous sea-voyage is fascinating to consider on its own, but even more fascinating to

compare with the solitary use of the same unusual term in the canonical NT. It appears near the start of Paul's extended sea-voyage to Italy (Acts 27), accentuating a slow stretch of sailing near and leading to Knidos (Acts 27:6).

ἐν ἱκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις **βραδυπλοοῦντες** καὶ μόλις γινόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον / Now **sailing slowly** across quite enough days, and with difficulty coming down to Knidos

Knidos was a port city in southwest Asia Minor famed for the ancient Battle of Knidos (394 BCE). It was commonly associated with Artemidorus of Knidos (not Daldis). This Artemidorus was celebrated by Plutarch (*Lives*, Caesar 65) as loyal friend to Julius Caesar. The local games were held in his honor, and he was ritually deified after his death. One Artemidorus deserves another, it seems.

The comparisons become more intriguing in the literary context of Acts, since Paul soon thereafter delivers an evil omen (Acts 27:10).

ἄνδρες, θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τοῦ φορτίου καὶ τοῦ πλοίου ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν. / Men, I perceive that the voyage is about to meet with wanton violence and much damage not only to the cargo and the ship, but also to our very lives.

This omen is said to differ from the professional opinion of the ship's captain and pilot (27:11). As the story in Acts proceeds, Paul not long after has near-death experiences at sea and on the island of Malta.

So, Acts aligns with Artemidorus in several respects, not only a rare and perhaps newly coined and/or popularized term, but also a foreboding omen of dangerous travel at sea. The distinctive parallels multiply

on broader consideration. Acts uses this term just before mentioning Knidos, a city famed for its empire-supporting son, Artemidorus, the same name as the writer in whose work this lemma first appears. Artemidorus was a famous friend of Julius Caesar who informed against Caesar's enemies in regard to an assassination plot. The Paul of Acts is expressly on a journey for a personal audience with Caesar that he requested. Is this all mere coincidence, or is it brilliant literary allusion and strategy on the part of the editor of canonical Acts? If the latter, then this points to the sea-voyages in Acts 27 as very late-2nd or, more likely, early-3rd century creation.

Philumenos (ca 180–220 CE)

Philumenos the Greek medical author lived and wrote around the late 2nd to early 3rd centuries CE.¹⁵⁷

ἐξέραμα / *ekserama* / “vomit” appears only one time in the NT (2Pt 2:22), and only 51 times in the TLG. Its first known appearance in any non-Christian text is in the treatise *On Poisonous Animals and Their Remedies* / *De venenatis animalibus eorumque remediis*. In the section on rabies, or what Greek medical authors called *hydrophobia*, Philumenos records the following treatments:

πρὸς ὑδροφόβας τὸ διὰ πυτίας. πυτίας λαγωῦ, Λημνίας σφραγίδος, ἀρκευθίδων, γεντιανῆς ἀνὰ < δ, δαφνίδων, σμύρνης ἀνὰ < ἡ ἀναλάμβανε μέλιτι. (13) ἡ δόσις κυάμου Αἰγυπτίου τὸ μέγεθος. ἄλλο· | ἐξέραμα κυνὸς ἄρας ξήρανον καὶ λεάνας θες ἐν πυξίδι καὶ χρῶ ὡς καλλίστῳ πρὸς λυσσοδήκτους θαρρῶν. (*venen.anim.* 4.13)

For rabies, the [remedy is made] of rennet: rennet of a hare, with the seal of Lemnia, juniper-berry, gentian root 4 drachms, bayberry, myrrh 7 drachms, mix up with honey. (13) The dose is the size of an Egyptian bean. Another [remedy]: take the dried **vomit** of a dog and grind it, put it in box-wood, and use as is best for those bitten by a rabid dog, taking courage.

The passage in 2 Peter shares several similarities, not just the new/rare lemma ἐξέραμα / *ekserama* / “vomit”, but also its association with dogs, a nearby highly positive/optimistic reference (cp. “for the best” / καλλίστῳ and “better” / κρεῖττον), and especially the vivid and disgusting

image of eating vomit used in combination with the motif of unhealthy human contact with unclean/diseased dogs.

κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς. (22) συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας, Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον **ἐξέρημα**, καί, Ὑς λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

For it were better for them not to have recognized the way of the righteous than, after recognizing it, to turn back from the holy command given over to them.²² The proverb of truth has come together for them: “A dog turning back to its own **vomit**”, and, “A sow has been washed to roll in mud”.

As Neyrey and other commentators have noted, in this slightly larger segment (2:20–22), 2 Peter departs from its source in Jude.¹⁵⁸ Antecedents adduced by commentators include Prov 26:11, and the uncleanness of dogs as scavengers in Jewish and Greek literature is a commonplace.¹⁵⁹ But this passage from Philumenos has apparently gone overlooked in the scholarly literature. The influence of his remedy for rabies, though worthy of ridicule in an early Jehudite-Christian social context, may place the composition/redaction of 2Peter in the early to mid-3rd century.

Philostratus II (213–217 CE)

Philostratus II the Sophist is best known in early Christian studies for his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* / *Vita Apollonii*, which is often seen as a satirical rival to early Christian Gospels. But his *Heroikos*, written between 213–217 CE,¹⁶⁰ has also received some attention by scholars of early Christianity.¹⁶¹ He lived and studied in Athens, taught in elite circles in Rome, and eventually moved to Tyre (modern Lebanon), where he died.

ἀμαράντινος / *amarantinos* / “amaranthine” in TLG results has two candidates for the earliest attestation among non-Christian sources. The first of these is in Ps-Galen, *De succedaneis*, or *On Substitutions*, a text the TLG notes is after the 2nd century CE: “instead of sesamoid, **amaranthine** pulp” / ἀντὶ σησαμοειδοῦς, πίεσμα **ἀμαραντινόν**.¹⁶²

The most chronologically secure instance, despite the difficulties in dating the work precisely,¹⁶³ is in Philostratus II, *Heroikos* 53.9:

κατ’ ἀρχὰς μὲν δὴ τοιάδε ἐγίνετο· ναῦς ἐκ Θετταλίας μέλανα ἰστία ἡρμένη ἐς Τροίαν ἔπλει, θεωροὺς μὲν δις ἑπτὰ ἀπάγουσα, ταύρους δὲ λευκὸν τε καὶ μέλανα, χειροήθεις ἄμφω, καὶ ὕλην ἐκ Πηλίου, ὥς μηδὲν τῆς πόλεως δέοιντο· καὶ πῦρ ἐκ Θετταλίας ἦγον καὶ σπονδὰς καὶ ὕδωρ τοῦ Σπερχειοῦ ἀρυσάμενοι· ὅθεν καὶ στεφάνους **ἀμαραντίνους** ἐς τὰ κήδη πρῶτοι Θετταλοὶ ἐνόμισαν, ἵνα, κἂν ἄνεμοι τὴν ναῦν ἀπολάβωσι, μὴ σαπροὺς ἐπιφέρωσι μηδὲ ἐξώρους.

To begin with, these things indeed happened: a ship from Thessaly, raising black sails, was sailing to Troy, carrying off twice seven spectators, and bulls both white and black, both hand-tamed, and wood from Pelion, so they would need nothing from the city. Fire from Thes-

saly they also brought, and drink-offerings and water drawn from the Spercheios. Wherefore the Thessalians first ordained **amaranthine** crowns for funeral rites, so that, if winds should take away the ship, they would not carry on rotted or too old.¹⁶⁴

In its context, this describes offerings by Thessalians made to the hero Achilles, in conformity with the oracle of Dodona, to travel to Troy to make sacrifices to Achilles and to the dead (*Heroik.* 53.8). The term appears only once in the NT, specifically in a passage from I Peter with guidance for community leaders (1Pet 5:2–4):

ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως κατὰ θεόν, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως, ³ μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου· ⁴ καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος κομιεῖσθε τὸν **ἀμαράντινον** τῆς δόξης στέφανον.

Shepherd the flock of the God among you, over-watching not out of necessity but instead willingly according to God, neither sordidly greedy, but instead devotedly, ³ not as those who over-lord the allotments, but instead becoming models for the flock. ⁴ And when the chief-shepherd is manifested, you will inherit the **amaranthine** crown of glory.

Even beyond the rare word, the similarities are striking. Both use the new/rare term in connection with a crown. But are addressed to leaders of the people in regard to their religious responsibilities. Once these connections are clarified, other elements of I Peter here may hint at the role of Achilles as one who (unlike Agamamnon), did not lord it over his charges, but instead became a model of courage to them. The theme of kings as shepherds is commonplace in Homeric lore; Philostratus

tus pictures Achilles as a model “chief-shepherd” who dies for the flock, one who receives an undying crown of eternal fame and veneration. It thus also locates the emerging cult of Jesus Christ squarely within traditional literary practices of Greco-Roman hero cult. Finally, the usage confirms that I Peter, though securely attested in large part by Irenaeus ca 180 CE, was still being edited well into the early 3rd century CE.

Herodian Hist. (244–251 CE)

As previously noted, Herodian the Historian (early 3rd century CE), should not be confused with Aelius Herodian the Alexandrian Grammarian and son of the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus. The historian claimed to have lived through some 60 or 70 years of events which he narrated in his most famous work, entitled *From the Departure of Divine Marcus [Aurelius] / Ab excessu divi Marci*, written under Philip the Arab (244–249 CE) and/or Decius (249–251 CE).¹⁶⁵

διαγρηγορέω / *diagrēgoreō* / “to keep awake|vigil” appears in Luke 9:32, apparently referring to “Peter” and “those with him” observing a vigil during the transfiguration of Jesus. The earliest non-Christian usage of the term is found in Herodian the Historian, in a scene where the term occurs describes a harrowing civil war battle between Septimius Severus and Pescennius Niger in 193–194 CE.

συνέβη δὲ καὶ τῶν στρατοπέδων τοῦ Σεβήρου τε καὶ <τοῦ> Νίγρου μὴ τὴν σύνοδον μόνον κατ’ ἐκεῖνο γενέσθαι τὸ χωρίον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τύχην ὁμοίαν τῆς μάχης. ἀντιστρατοπεδευσάμενοι γὰρ ἑκατέρωθεν περὶ ἐσπέραν, πάσης τῆς νυκτὸς ἐν φροντίσιν ἑκάτεροι καὶ δέει **διαγρηγορήσαντες**, ἅμα ἡλίω ἀνίσχοντι ἐπ’ ἀλλήλους ἠπεύγοντο, παρορμώντων ἑκατέρωθεν τῶν στρατηγῶν. προθυμία δὴ πάση ἐνέπιπτον ὡς ὑπὲρ λοιπῆς καὶ τελευταίας ἐκείνης μάχης, κακεῖ τῆς τύχης διακρινούσης τὸν βασιλέα.

Now it came about that not only did the assembly of the armies of both Severus and of Niger happen in that very place, but also the same fate of the battle. For after encamping opposite [each other]

on each side for the evening, each of them at attention the whole night and in dread **keeping vigil**, all at once when the sun rose they rushed upon each other, incited from both sides by the commanders. With all intensity they were falling in, as for that last and conclusive battle, e'en there where Fortune would determine the king.

In Luke 9:32, we have yet another example of an unusual term and apparent neologism not present in the substantial parallels in Marcion's *Evangelion*, canonical Mark, and canonical Matthew.

ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ·
διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας
τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ.

Now Peter and those with him had been weighed down with sleep. But **after keeping vigil**, they saw the glory of his and the two men who stood alongside him.

If aware of the carefully crafted imagery of Herodian the Historian, then some mid-3rd century (!) scribal editor of canonical Luke used it to depict Peter and companions not only as heroic in religious devotion, but also as vivid rivals of the vigilant militancy of an ancient Roman civil war. If this reading is valid, then Jesus becomes the bringer of peace amidst ancient military leaders like Moses, lethal prophets like Elijah, and his own militarily overeager yet inept Galilean followers.

There is a variant here to consider, though, since \P^{45} has διεγρηγορήσαντες / *diegrēgorhsantes* from διεγείρω / *diegeirō* / “to wake up”, in a perfect form similar to that attested by Aristophanes Gram. (3rd–2nd c. BCE): διεγρηγόρασι / *diegrēgorasi* (*hist.anim.* 2.306). Otherwise, manuscripts of Luke 9:32 are uniform in using the lemma found first in Herodian the Historian.

[Jehudite-]Christian Neologisms

While this book is not focused on neologisms coined or first popularized by the author(s)/editor(s) of the texts in the New Testament, our research dug up such candidates. Many of these reveal close connections with other early Christian texts, with crossover at the lexical level between canonical and mid-2nd to mid-3rd century pseudepigraphical/apocryphal texts, and between canonical scriptures and known mid-2nd to mid-3rd century Christian writers. These crossovers challenge the common, baseless assumption that canonical texts must be earlier and non-canonical texts later, that authors/editors of non-canonical literature could not have played a part in the authoring/editing of canonical literature, and that Christians writers in the mid-2nd and mid-3rd century had no significant editorial role in the canonical NT texts.

Various early Christian crossover neologisms are saved for later sections in this chapter. For these, we follow the organizing principle of sorting attestations according to the first witness outside the NT texts, whether that be an apocryphal, pseudepigraphal, or early Christian writer. When a term occurs in multiple writings that may be roughly contemporaneous, they are grouped under what is postulated as the earliest text/author outside of canonical candidates. Given the often uncertain dates and textual fluidity of their corresponding texts, these subsequent sections run in alphanumeric order by author or title, not by postulated chronology. Sometimes these crossover neologisms are provided in simple lists, and at other times briefly explored and analyzed. If no apparent usage of a lemma or clear reception of its NT usage is found between the mid-2nd and mid-3rd century, then those lemma entries are placed under the general NT Sprung Neologisms list.

NT Sprung Neologisms

We begin with a list of the strongest candidates for genuine NT neologisms. These lack secure parallels before the mid-3rd century CE. The list is filtered according to the limited research scope described in the introduction, excluding named entities and Hebrew and Aramaic transliterations into Greek. The list provides any NT citation(s), then the next securely dated hit, based on a review of date-sorted TLG search results and filtering out late and/or dubiously dated/attributed hits. Neologisms found in Luke and the Pauline epistles always correspond to the canonical versions, but rarely to their Marcionite counterparts, with a few exceptions in Deutero-Pauline Ephesians (Marcionite Laodiceans) and Colossians. Exceptions in Marcionite Colossians are noted with a leading asterisk, thus *Col.

αἰτίωμα / *aitiōma* / “legal charge” (Acts 25:7; *Corp.Herm.* Stobaeon fr. 23)¹⁶⁶

ἀκατάκριτος / *akatakritos* / “uncondemned” (Acts 16:37, 22:25;
Acts.Chr.Pet. 8.1)¹⁶⁷

ἄλλοτριεπίσκοψ|ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος / *allotriepiskops|allotriepiskopos* /
“another’s overlooker” (1Pt 4:12; *Epiph, Ancor.* 12.5)

ἀνεμίζομαι / *anemidzomai* / “to be wind-blown” (*Jas* 1:6; *BasilC, ep.* 42.4)

ἀνεύθετος / *aneuthetos* / “inconvenient” (Acts 27:12; *JChrys, ActH*
PG60:368–370)

ἀπελεγμός / *apelegmos* / “refutation” (Acts 19:27; *JChrys, ActH* PG60:297)

ἀφθορία / *aphthoria* / “incorruption” (*Tit* 2:7; *Themistius, Arist.phys.* 5.2:82)

ἀφιλάγαθος / *aphilagathos* / “not-good-loving” (2Tim 3:3; *BasilC, Reg.mor.*
PG31:812)

βολίζω / *bolidzō* / “to take soundings”, “to heave the lead”, “to probe|gauge
the depth” (Acts 27:28; *Acts.Chr.Pet.* 8.1)¹⁶⁸

γογγυστής / *gongustēs* / “grumbler” (*Jude* 1:16; *Euseb, Isa.com.* 1.97)

- δεξιολάβος / *deksiolabos* / “spearman” (Acts 23:23; JChrys, *ActH* PG60:340)
- δευτερόπρωτος / *deuteroprōtos* / “second-first” (Lk 6:1; JChrys, *MtHom*90 PG57:433)
- διακατελέγχομαι / *diakatelegchomai* / “to confute totally” (Acts 18:28; JChrys, *ActH* PG60:283)¹⁶⁹
- δισμυριάς / *dismurias* / “the two-thousand” (Rev 9.16; Andreas, *Apoc.* 9.27.9)¹⁷⁰
- ἐκπερισσῶς / *ekperissōs* / “more exceedingly” (Mk 14:31; Ps-Gregentius, *Vit.Greg.* 7)
- ἐμπαίγμονή / *empaigonē* / “mockery” (2Pt 3:3; CyrAlex, *incarn.unig.*)¹⁷¹
- ἐπιδιατάσσομαι / *epidiatassomai* / “to add to a will” (Gal 3:15; *Adv.Cataphryg.* fr. 1)¹⁷²
- ἐπισυντρέχω / *episuntrechō* / “to run together” (Mk 9:25; Ps-Hippolytus of Rome, *consum.mund.* 42)
- ἐτεροδιδασκαλέω / *heterodidaskaleō* / “to teach differently” (1Tim 1:3, 6:3; Ign7, *Poly.* 3.1)
- εὐπροσωπέω / *euprosōpēsai* / “to present well”|“to look good” (Gal 6:12; Euseb, *Gal.fr.* p. 52, JChrys, *Gal.com.* PG61:677–678)¹⁷³
- καταλιθάζω / *katalithadzō* / “to stone to death” (Lk 20:6; Nys, *Eunom.* 1.1.265)
- καταστρηνιάω / *katastrēniaō* / “to behave wantonly toward” (1Tim 5:11; Ign13, *Ant.* 11.1)
- κατεφίσταμαι / *katephistamai* / “to rise up against” (Acts 18:12; JChrys, *ActH* PG60:277)
- μετάλημψις / *metalēmpsis* / “a sharing” (1Tim 4:3; Theon, *Ptol.* p. 879)¹⁷⁴
- ὀλιγόπιστος / *oligopistos* / “mini-faithful” (*Ev 12:28, Mt 6:30, 8:26, 14:31, 16:8; ClemAlex, *Paed.* 2.10b.103.1, *Strom.* 7.42.4)
- ὀρθοποδέω / *orthopodeō* / “to walk straight” (*Gal 2:14; Orig, *Mt.com.* 16.24)
- ὀχλοποιέω / *ochlopoieō* / “to make a riot” (Acts 17:5; JChrys, *ActH* PG60:263)
- παράφρονη / *paraphronia* / “madness” (2Pt 2:16; JChrys, *fr.ep.cath.* PG64:1060)

- πορφυρόπωλις|πορφῦροπώλης / *porphuropōlis|porphuropōlēs* / “purple-dyer”
(Acts 16:14; Epiph, *Pan.* GCS 3:485)¹⁷⁵
- προενάρχομαι / *proenarchomai* / “to begin before” (2Cor 8:6, 10; JChrys, *2Cor.hom.* PG61:515, 518, 529–530)
- προκυρώω|προκυρόομαι / *prokuroō|prokuroomai* / “to ratify before”
(Gal 3:17; Ps-Orig, *Ps.fr.* 77.29–30)
- προμαρτύρομαι / *promarturomai* / “to witness beforehand” (1Pet 1:11; Euseb, *H.E.* 1.3.6)
- προσεάω / *proseaō* / “to suffer going further” (Acts 27:7; JChrys, *Act.cat.*)¹⁷⁶
- πρόσλημψις / *proslēmpsis* / “acquisition” (Rom 11:15; DmC, *Eccl.com.* 7–8.8)¹⁷⁷
- πυρράζω / *purradzō* / “to redden” (Mt 16:2–3, BasilC, *Hexaem.* 6.4)¹⁷⁸
- σιτομέτριον / *sitometrion* / “grain-measure” (*Ev 12:42; Orig, *Jo.com.* 20.2.8)¹⁷⁹
- συγκακοπαθέω / *sugkakopatheō* / “to partake in suffering” (1Tim 1:8, 2:3; Nys, *orat.* 23 PG35:1225)
- συγκακουχέομαι / *sugkakoucheomai* / “to endure adversity with” (Heb 11:25; Nys, *Cant.* PG6:354)
- συμμιμητής / *summimētēs* / “co-imitator” (Phlp 3:17; BasilC, *Reg.Mor.* PG31:848)
- συμπρεσβύτερος / *sumpresbuteros* / “co-elder” (1Pet 5:1; Adv.Cataphyrg. fr. 1)
- συνομορέω / *sunomoreō* / “to border on” (Acts 18:7; JChrys, *ActH* PG60:276)
- σφυδρόν / *sphudron* / “ankle”|“foot-arch” (Acts 3:7; Hesychius, *Lex.* Σ 2931)¹⁸⁰
- ταβέρνα / *taberna* / “tavern” (Acts 28:15; JChrys, *ActH* PG60:374, 376)
- τυφωνικός / *tuphōnikos* / “tempestuous” (Acts 27:14; JChrys, *ActH* PG60:368)¹⁸¹
- ὑπερλίαν / *hyperlian* / “beyond measure” (2Cor 11:5, 12:11; Athan, *Or3Ar.* 24.6)
- ὑπερπερισσῶς / *hyperperissōs* / “beyond all measure” (Mk 7:37; Theophylact, *Enarr.* 2.565)¹⁸²
- φιλοπρωτεύω / *philoprōteuō* / “to wish first-place” (3Jn 1:9; Pallad, *DialChrys* 131)
- χαλκηδών / *chalkēdōn* / “chalcedony” (Rev 21:19; Andreas, *Apoc.com.* 23.67.21,19d)¹⁸³
- χαλκολίβανον / *chalkolibanon* / “fine brass” (Rev 1:15, 2:18; Epiph, *Pan* 51.33)¹⁸⁴

χρυσοδακτύλιος / *chrusodaktulios* / “gold-fingered” (Jas 2:2; CyrAl, *Jo.com.* Pusey 1872:504)¹⁸⁵

χρυσόπρασος / *chrusoprasos* / “chrysoprased” | “golden-green” (Rev 21:20; Oecumenius, *Rev.com.*, Hoskier 1928:240)¹⁸⁶

Summary: Acts, the Pastorals, 2Cor 8–11, the Catholic Epistles, and Revelation are overrepresented in this list. The shared newness/strangeness of their terms and texts reinforce the late 2nd, early 3rd century CE compositional dates for these works demonstrated in the main chapters of this book, as well as the priority of the stylistically simpler and more traditional Marcionite NT to its more innovative, proto-Orthodox canonical counterparts.

I Enoch Graecus

θορυβάζω|θορυβάζομαι / *thorubadzō|thorubadzomai* / “to trouble”|“to be troubled” appears only 13 times in the TLG. The first clear, non-Christian use is by the 4th century CE grammarian Dositheus (*Ars.gram.* 71). This lemma, incidentally, should not be confused with the highly similar θορυβέω / *thorubeō* / “to disturb”|“to raise a clamor”, which was common in Attic Greek and subsequently (3501 TLG hits).

First Enoch, specifically the portion known as the *Book of the Watchers* (IEnoch 1–36), largely relies on a Ge’ez/Ethiopic manuscript for its full text, but portions of it are extant in Greek as well (Black 1970). Among the Greek excerpts is the following, in which the rarer lemma appears:

ἰδοὺ νεφέλαι ἐν τῇ ὀράσει ἐκάλουν καὶ ὀμίχλαι με ἐφώνουν, καὶ διαδρομαὶ τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ διαστραπαὶ με κατεσπούδαζον καὶ ἐθορύβαζόν με, καὶ ἄνεμοι ἐν τῇ ὀράσει μου ἐξεπέτασάν με ⁹ καὶ

ἐπῆράν με ἄνω καὶ εἰσῆνεγκάν με εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ εἰσῆλθον
μέχρις ἡγγισα τείχους οἰκοδομῆς ἐν λίθοις χαλάζης καὶ γλώσσης
πυρὸς κύκλω αὐτῶν· καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐκφοβεῖν με. (*1 Enoch* 14.8–9)

Behold, clouds in the vision were calling and mists beckoned me,
and the courses of the stars and long-lightning deeply concerned me
and **troubled** me, and winds in the vision of mine unfurled me ⁹ and
lifted me up and brought me into the heaven. And I entered until I
was near a wall built with stones of hail, and a tongue of fire [was]
around them. And they began to terrify me.

This portion is extant in the Ethiopic witness, and the phrase
with the relevant verb is translated, “and causing me to desire” (trans.
Isaac).¹⁸⁷ In the footnote, Isaac notes though that “[s]ome think this to
be inaccurate”. While I do not pretend to competence in Ethiopic, the
expression as translated may reflect a causative (*hiphil* or *aphel*) verb in
a Hebrew and/or Aramaic precursor, even if the Ethiopic derives from a
Greek translation. The original may reflect a highly significant Judean
word **חַמַּד** / “to covet|desire”, typically translated by ἐπιθυμέω in Greek.
Such an expression puts Greek *1En* 14.8 close to canonical Rom 7:7–9 and
Rabbinic thought more generally. This quick, initial assessment suggests
that, even if 1 Enoch was translated into Greek prior to the 1st century
CE, the rare Greek lemma θορυβάζω was unlikely part of that text, for
which the earliest Greek fragments date to the 4th century CE.

Whether the rare lemma first appeared in Greek *1En* or canonical
Luke is debatable, but its Lukan usage was almost certainly absent from
Marcion’s *Evangelion*. It appears in a rebuke of Martha given by Jesus as
a guest in the home of Mary and Martha (Lk 10:41):

Μάρθα Μάρθα, μεριμνᾷς καὶ **θορυβάζῃ** περὶ πολλά.

Martha, Martha, you are worried and **troubled** about many things.

If Greek *1En* is the point of origin and influence, then Jesus as guest may speak as an Enoch-like apocalyptic traveler and teacher of wisdom. Given the association of hospitality and divine/angelic visits in traditional Hebrew and Greek thought, this line of interpretation does not seem like a stretch. If canonical Luke is the point of origin and influence, then Enoch imitates Jesus precisely when he is shown hospitality in paradise. Either possibility is interesting, but either way the evidence pushes toward a late provenance for this neologism.

4 Baruch

4 Baruch, also known as the *Paraleipomena of Jeremiah*, was most likely originally written in Greek. It has vexed scholars in terms of its original date of composition, with theories varying from the late 1st century CE to the 130s CE.¹⁸⁸ If the sixty-six year sleep of Abimelech refers back to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, as some scholars surmise, then that brings us to the end of the bar Kochba revolts and close to the end of Hadrian's reign. The irenic focus on remedying relationships between Judeans and Samaritans, as well as Judeans and Romans, favors a context shortly after Hadrian.

ἀλίσγημα / *alisgēma* / “pollution” appears once in the NT, in Acts 15:20, where the Jerusalem council sends out a letter with guidance “to abstain from the **pollutions** of idols” / τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν **ἀλισγημάτων** τῶν

εἰδῶλων. Its earliest appearance and point of origin may well be in 4 *Baruch* 7:37, which may have inspired Acts at this point:

δὲ ἄρας τὰ σῦκα διέδωκε τοῖς νοσοῦσι τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἔμεινε διδάσκων αὐτοὺς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι ἐκ τῶν **ἀλισγημάτων** τῶν ἐθνῶν τῆς Βαβυλῶνος.

But Jeremiah, taking the figs, distributed to the sick among the people; and he remained, teaching them to abstain from the **pollutions** of the gentiles of Babylon.

μισθαποδοσία / *misthapodotēs* / “wage-paying” appears three times in the NT, all in Hebrews (2:2, 10:35, 11:26), two of which are cited explicitly by ClemAlex, (*Strom.* 4.16.101.3, 4.16.103.2). Ps-Clementine literature has two examples (*Recog.* 2.21.2–3; *Epit.* 62), but they are not clearly dependent on any of the three references in Hebrews. 4 *Baruch* may be its earliest attestation, perhaps even its point of origin.

μισθαποδότης / *misthapodotēs* / “wage-payment” appears once in the NT, specifically in Hebrews (11:6). Its next secure attestation is by ClemAlex in the a later book (ca. 203–214 CE) of the *Stromata* (6.9.75.2). 4 *Baruch* may reflect the earliest attestation, and literary point of origin, for this word as well. The lemma does not seem to appear in Greek papyri, and its only apparent attestation in digitized Greek inscriptions is a clearly Christian dedication of the 4th century.¹⁸⁹

4 *Maccabees*

βασανισμός / *basanismos* / “torture” in the TLG has three hits for the 4th–3rd c. BCE playwright, Alexis Comicus. However, these three hits reflect different scholarly editions quoting the same, solitary, second-hand

attestation by the early 3rd c. CE sophist and humorist Athenaeus.¹⁹⁰ According to Athenaeus, Alexis told this joke:

οἶνος ξενικὸς παρῆν· ὁ γὰρ Κορίνθιος **βασανισμός** ἐστὶ.

Foreign wine is available. For the Corinthian [wine] is **torture**.

There is ample reason to doubt the authenticity of this humorous bit placed among the banter of the *Sophists' Banquet*. No other hits for this lemma occur before the 2nd century CE, yet a sudden rash begins to appear in 4 *Maccabees* and Revelation (see below). One wonders whether the joke could have alluded to the famously contentious dealings between the sophist Favorinus and the city of Corinth.

This interpretation must remain tentative, however. Alexis was known for his creative word-play. Even though Alexis was not apparently a resident of Corinth, ruling out the possibility of self-reference, the characters in his comedies could have been set in Corinth. Euripides' *Medea* and *Alcmaeon* made a backdrop of this famous city. Moreover, several cognate lemmas are securely attested quite early:

- βασανίζω / *basanidzō* / “to torture” (Heraclitus, 6th–5th BCE)
- βασανιστής / *basanistēs* / “torturer” (Antiphon, 5th BCE)
- ἀβασάνιστος / *abasanistos* / “not tortured” (Antiphon, 5th BCE)
- ἀβασανίστως / *abasanistōs* / “without pain” (Thucydides, 5th BCE)

Other cognate lemmas, however, are first attested quite late:

- βεβασανισμένως / *bebasanissmenōs* / “with severe scrutiny” (Pollux, ca 178–192 CE; also a favorite of Origen's)
- βασάνισμα / *basanisma* / “torture” (Theodore Studite, 8th–9th c. CE)

Our focal lemma βασανισμός / *basanismos* / “torture” occurs twice in 4 *Maccabees* (9:6, 11:2) and six times in Revelation (9:5 *bis*, 14:11, 18:7,

18:10, 18:15). With this term 4Mac 9:6 describes the torture endured by “elders of the Hebrews”, and 4Mac 11:2 the torture of the “fifth” of the seven sons of an elderly widow, all under the Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Revelation 9:5 repeatedly uses it in regard to a “five month” period of torture of Christian saints by the Roman Empire.¹⁹¹

καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἵνα βασανισθῶσιν μῆνας πέντε· καὶ ὁ **βασανισμὸς** αὐτῶν ὡς **βασανισμὸς** σκορπίου, ὅταν παῖσῃ ἄνθρωπον.

And it was given to them not to kill them, but rather for them to be tortured five months. And the **torture** of theirs was like a scorpion's **torture**, when it strikes a human.

Subsequent uses of the noun (Rev 14:11, 18:7, 18:10, 18:15) reflect karmic reversals whereby the Roman Empire falls divinely subjected to torture.

Acts of Carpus, Papyrus, and Agathonice

ἀπεκδύομαι / *apekdoumai* / “to strip off oneself” (Col 2:15, 3:9; Act.Carp. 9)

καυστηριάζω / *kaustēriadzō* / “to brand” (1Tim 4:2; Act.Carp. 12)¹⁹²

σινιάζω / *siniadzō* / “to winnow” (Lk 22:31; Act.Carp. 17)¹⁹³

Aristides Apol.

προσκυνητής / *proskunētēs* / “worshipper” (Jn 4:23; Frag. 2.2)¹⁹⁴

Athenagoras

θεοδίδακτος / *theodidaktos* / “God-taught” (1Thes 4:9, *Legat.* 11.1, 32.4; *ep.Barn.* 21.6; Theophilus, *Autol.* 2.9; Tatian, *Or.Gr.* 29.2–3)

Clement of Alexandria

ἀπέκδυσις / *apekdusis* / “putting off” (Col 2:11; *Strom.* 3.5.43.3)

ἀρχιτελώνης / *architelōnēs* / “chief-publican” (Lk 19:2; *Strom.* 4.6.35.2)¹⁹⁵

ἀρχιτρικλινος / *architriklinos* / “banquet-chief” (Jn 2:8, 9 (bis); *Exc.Theod.* 3.65.1)¹⁹⁶

ἐθελοθηρησκεία / *ethelothrēskeia* / “voluntary religion” (Col 2:23; *Strom.* 3.6.51.3)

εὐπάρεδρος / *euparedros* / “constantly attending” (1Cor 7:35; *Strom.* 4.5.21.2, 4.23.149.2)

εὐπερίστατος / *euperistatos* / “easily besetting” (Heb 12:1; *Strom.* 4.16.103.1)¹⁹⁷

καλοδιδάσκαλος / *kalodidaskalos* / “well-taught” (Titus 2:3; Orig, *Jo.com.* 32.12.132, 1Cor *fr.* 74)

λογομαχέω / *logomacheō* / “to war over words” (2Tim 2:14; *Strom.* 1.10.49.3)¹⁹⁸

ὀφθαλμοδουλεία / *ophthalmoudouleia* / “eye-slavery” (Eph 6:6, Col 3:22; *ClemAlex, Strom.* 4.8.65.2)¹⁹⁹

πρεσβυτέριον / *presbyterion* / “elder-council” (Lk 22:66, Ac 22:5, 1Tim 4:14; *Strom.* 6.13.106.2, 6.13.107.3), at least according to a scan of the top 100 date-sorted results, only appears in Christian texts during the 2nd through 4th centuries CE. The early Syriac three letter collection of letters attributed to Ignatius of Antioch does not include this term, but

instead only a more generic, less technical reference to πρεσβυτέρους / *presbuterois* / “elders”. Ign7 is saturated with the new lemma: *Eph* 2.2, 4.1, 20.2, *Magn* 2.1, 13.1, *Tral* 2.2, 7.2, 13.2, *Phld* 4.1, 5.1, 7.1, *Smyr* 8.1, 12.2. This bevy of references could cloud the fact that, outside of the NT itself, ClemAlex in one of his late-life books of the *Stromateis* provides the earliest secure authorial and chronological anchor to the technical term, thus locating its emergence between 203 and 214 CE.²⁰⁰ Clement famously delivered a letter from his student Alexander to Antioch around 211 CE, and he may have picked up the term there and/or had a hand in the editing of the Ignatian seven letter collection.

προμεριμνάω / *preomerimnaō* / “to worry beforehand” (*Mk* 13:11;
Strom. 4.9.70.4)

προσωπολήπτης / *prosōpolēmpēs* / “person-respecter” (*Ac* 10:34;
Strom. 6.8.63.5)

συζητητής / *sudzētētēs* / “co-inquirer” (*1Cor* 1:20; *Strom.* 5.1.8.1)²⁰¹
συζωοποιέω / *sudzōopoieō* / “to co-make-alive” (*Eph* 2:5, **Col* 2:13;
Protr. 2.27.2)

συναρμολογέω / *sumarmologeō* / “to co-fit” (*Eph* 2:21, 4:16;
Strom. 6.11.95.2)²⁰²

συνεκλεκτός / *suneklektos* / “co-chosen” (*1Pet* 5:13; *Fragmenta* 9)
συσταυρόομαι / *sustauroomai* / “to be co-crucified” (*Mt* 27:44, *Mk* 15:32,
Jn 19:32, *Gal* 2:19, *Rom* 6:6; *Strom.* 3.11.75.3)

ὑπερέκεινα / *huperekeina* / “beyond” (*2Cor* 10:16; *Strom.* 6.18.164.4)²⁰³
ὑπερεκχύννω / *huperekchunnō* / “to pour out over” (*Lk* 6:38; *QDS* 33.5)²⁰⁴
ὑπερεντυγχάνω / *huperentugchanō* / “to intercede over” (*Rom* 8:26;
Paed. 6.47.4)²⁰⁵

Summary: ClemAlex has an affinity for certain prefixes (ἀρχ, εὖ, συ, ὑπερ), and longer than usual adverbs, tendencies our team has documented in the redactions of canonical Luke and the canonical Paulines. This makes Clement among the strongest candidates of known writers to have contributed to editing the proto-Orthodox, canonical compositions.

Clement of Rome

δίψυχος / *dipsuchos* / “double-minded” (Jas 1:8, 4:8; 1Cor 11:2, 23:2)

Didache

διώκτης / *diōktēs* / “pursuer” (1Tim 1:13, *Didache* 5.2, *ep.Barn.* 20.2)²⁰⁶

ἐπιούσιος / *epiousios* / “daily|necessary” (*Ev 11:3, Mt 6:11;
Didache 8.2)²⁰⁷

κατάθεμα / *katathema* / “accursed” (Rev 22:3; *Didache* 16.5, *Asc.Isa.* 3.18;
Ps-Clem, *Contest.* 4.3)²⁰⁸

Gospel of Peter

ἐπιφώσκω|ἐπιφωσκέω / *epiphōskō|epiphōskeō* / “to be near dawn”
(Mt 28:1, Lk 23:54; *EvPet* 5; Ps-Clem., *hom.* 3.1.1, 3.58.2) ²⁰⁹

Hermas

ἀνακαίνωσις / *anakainōsis* / “renewal” (Rom 12:2, Tit 3:5; *Herm.* 16.9)²¹⁰

βιβλαρίδιον / *biblaridion* / “small roll” (Rv 10:2, 9, 10; *Herm.* 5:3, 8:3)²¹¹

καρδιογνώστης / *kardiognōstēs* / “heart-knower” (Acts 1:24, 15:8;

Herm. 31.4; *Ps-Clem.*, *Hom.* 10.13.3; *ActPaul* 24; *Vit.Carp.* 23)

κατάλαλος / *katalalos* / “slanderer” (Rom 1:30; *Herm.* 65, 73, 103;

ActAndr 62)

πολύσπλαγχνος / *polusplagchnos* / “greatly merciful” (Jas 5:11;

Herm. 31.5, 57.4, 60.4)

πρωτοκαθεδρία / *prōtokathedria* / “first-public-seat” (Mt 23:6,

Mk 12:39, Lk 11:43; *Herm.* 43.12)

Hippolytus of Rome

ἐνταφιασμός / *entaphiasmos* / “entombment” (Mk 14:8, Jn 12:7; *Cant.* 26.3)

ῥέδη / *hredē* / “carriage”|“wagon” (Rev 18:13; *Antichr.* 41)²¹²

Irenaeus

αὐτοκατάκριτος / *autokatakritos* / “self-condemned” (Titus 3:11,

AH 1.9.3, 3.5)²¹³

ὀκταήμερος / *oktaēmeros* / “eighth-day” (Phlp 3:5; *AH* 1.11.2)

συγκοινωνός / *sugkoinōnos* / “co-partner” (Rom 11:17, 1Cor 9:23,

Phlp 1:7, Rev 1:9; Irenaeus, *AH* fr. 10)

σύσσωμος / *sussōmos* / “co-bodied” (Eph 3:6; *AH* 1.4.1)

Summary: though he does not attest to nearly as many NT neologisms as ClemAlex or Origen, these examples cluster in the canonical Paulines; Irenaeus may well have had a hand in their editing.

Justin Martyr

διακαθαρίζω / *diakatharizō* / “to purge fully” (Mt 3:12; *Tryph.* 49.3)²¹⁴

καταθεματίζω / *katathematidzō* / “to curse down” (Mt 26:74;

Tryph. 47.4 (bis); Irenaeus, *AH* 1.7.3, 1.9.3)

μοσχοποιέω / *moschopoieō* / “to calf-make” (Acts 7:41, *Tryph.* 19.5,

102.6, 132.1).²¹⁵

πρόσχυσις / *proschusis* / “pouring upon” (Heb 11:28; 2*Apol* 12.5)²¹⁶

ψευδαπόστολος / *pseudapostolos* / “false-apostle” (*2*Cor* 11:13;

Tryph. 35.3)²¹⁷

ψευδοδιδάσκαλος / *pseudodidaskalos* / “false-teacher” (2*Pet* 2:1;

Tryph. 82.1)²¹⁸

ψευδόχριστος / *pseudochristos* / “false-messiah” (Mt 24:24, Mk 13:22;

Tryph. 35.3, 82.2)²¹⁹

Summary: like Irenaeus, Justin only attests a hand-full of NT neologisms, but even this small sample shows only one overlap with the Pauline epistles that happens to match Marcion’s text at this point. Justin perhaps borrowed this term from Marcion’s Pauline letters while rejecting them, perhaps because the proto-Orthodox were still in the process of deciding whether to appropriate them or not. He may also have coined the term **ψευδοδιδάσκαλος** / *pseudodidaskalos* / “false-teacher” and to rebut Marcion, and either composed, or more likely inspired 2*Pet* 2:1 at this point. Likewise, **ψευδόχριστος** / *pseudochristos* / “false-messiah” was likely minted by Justin, but in this case inserted into the canonical redactions of two Gospels. Justin’s similarly patterned neologisms point to his role as an editor of canonical Matthew.

Origen of Alexandria

ἀγενεαλόγητος / *agenealogētos* / “without genealogy” (Heb 7:3;
Jo.com. 1.4.21)

ἀποκαραδοκία / *apokaradokia* / “earnest expectation” (Rom 8:19,
Phlp 1:20; *Cels.* 5.13, 7.65, 8.5)

ἀποσυνάγωγος / *aposunagōgos* / “excommunicated” (*Jn* 9:22, 12:42,
16:2; *Ps.hom.* 25.3)

βαττολογέω / *battologeō* / “to prattle” (*Mt* 6:7; *orat.* 2.2, 19.1, 21.1–2)²²⁰

γυμνιτεύω / *gumniteuō* / “to go naked” (*1Cor* 4:11; *Io.com.* 13.2.12)

διερμηνευτής / *diermēvutēs* / “master-interpreter” (*1Cor* 14:28;
1Cor.cat. 25)

ἐδραίωμα / *hedraiōma* / “support” (*1Tim* 3:15; *Cels.* 5.33)

ὀλιγοπιστία / *oligopistia* / “mini-trust” (*Mt* 17:20; *Cels.* 1.49;
Mt.com. 10.19, 11.5–6, 12.6; *ActThom* 65)

πατρολῶος / *patrolōos* / “parricide” (*1Tim* 1:9; *Luc.fr.* 87; *Mat.fr.* 44)²²¹

πειθός / *peithos* / “persuasive” (*1Cor* 2:4; *Cels.* 1.62, 6.2, etc.)²²²

περικρύβω / *perikrubō* / “to hide entirely” (*Lk* 1:24; *Luc.hom.* 6.33)²²³

προαιτιάομαι / *proaitiaomai* / “to pre-accuse” (*Rom* 3:9; *Rom.com.* 3.9)²²⁴

προσωποληπτέω / *prosōpolēpteō* / “to person-respect” (*Jas* 2:9;
Prov.cat. PG17:208)

συμμορφίζομαι / *summorphidzomai* / “to be co-conformed” (*Phlp* 3:10;
Cels. 2.69)

τροποφορέω / *trophophoreō* / “to bear a mood” (*Acts* 13:18; *Cels.* 4.71)²²⁵

ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ / *huperekperissou* / “superabundantly” (*Eph* 3:20,
1Th 3:10, 5:13; *Orat.* 6.4)

ὑπερπερισσεύω / *hyperperisseuō* / “to super-abound” (*Rom* 5:20;
2Cor 7:4; *Rom.com.* 5.21)²²⁶

φραγέλλιον / *phragellion* / “whip” (Jn 2:15; *Jo.com.* x15 (!); *Ps.hom.* x2)²²⁷

φραγελλώ / *phragelloō* / “to flagellate” (Mt 27:26, Mk 15:15;

Frag.EvJo 121)²²⁸

χρηστολογία / *chrēstologia* / “fair-speaking” (Rom 16:18; *Lam.fr.* 56;

Prov.exp. PG17:173)

Summary: Origen was prolific commentator on Jewish and Christian scriptures, but that does not adequately explain the breadth of neologisms he attests. More than merely attesting them, he regularly uses many of them even when not referring directly to NT wording. Origen shows an easy familiarity with many of these lemmas, even to the level of them being habitual. Given his education under ClemAlex, and the NT editorial role that Clement’s many neologisms suggest for him, we also suggest that Origen should be considered as a notable and influential editor of the proto-Orthodox Gospels, Acts, and the Pauline letters.

Papias of Hieropolis

εὐαγγελιστής / *euangelistēs* / “evangelist” (Acts 21:8, Eph 4:11,

2Tim 4:5; Ign13, *Ant.* 9.4.1, Papias, *fr.* 2.5, 7.1, 9.1)

Polycarp, *Philippians*

ἀντίχριστος / *antichristos* / “antichrist” (1Jo 2:18, 22, 4:3, 2Jo 1:7;

Phlp 7.1)²²⁹

ἄρσενokoίτης / *arsenokoitēs* / “man-bedder” (1Cor 6:9, 1Tim 1:10;

Phlp 5.3; *Ps-Clem, Recog.* 9.23; *ActJo* 36; Ign13, *Tars.* 7.2)

δίλογος / *dilogos* / “double-tongued” (1Tim 3:8; *Phlp* 5.2)

προσωποληψία / *prosōpolēmpsia* / “person-respect” (Rom 2:11, Eph 6:9, Col 3:25, Jas 2:1; *Phlp* 6.1)

ψευδάδελφος / *pseudadelphos* / “false-brother” (*Gal 2:4, 2Cor 1:26; *Phlp* 6.3)

Summary: based on this small sample of NT neologisms, Polycarp is a possible candidate as one of the redactors of the canonical Pauline epistles, including the Pastorals. The solitary neologism tied to the Johannine epistles could reinforce the traditional narrative of Polycarp as a receiver of a distinctive and earlier Johannine literary tradition. Also, Polycarp is the most likely among known authors to have coined or first popularized the Greek word for “homosexual”. Given the apparent novelty of the lemma “false-brother” in Marcionite Galatians, Polycarp’s use of it may reflect the inversion of the insulting label back upon his famous rival.

Protoevangelium of James

ἐραυνάω / *eraunaō* / “to search out” (Jn 5:39, 7:52, Rom 8:27, 1Cor 2:10, 1Pet 1:11, Rev 2:23, *ProtJas* 39)²³⁰

σιρικός / *sirikos* / “silken”|“Seric”|“Seresian” (Rev 18:12; *ProtJas* 22)²³¹

Ps-Clement

διαπατριβή / *diaparatribē* / “constant wrangling” (1Tim 6:5; *ep.virg.* 1.8.2)

κερματιστής / *kermatistēs* / “money-changer” (Jn 2:14; *Recog.* 9.24)

οἰκουργός / *oikourgos* / “working at home” occurs only one time in the NT (Titus 2:5), and that term does not occur again in the entire TLG! A closely related term — οἰκουργέω / *oikourgeō* / “to work from home” — also occurs only once in the entire TLG, specifically in Ps-Clem, 1Cor 1:3, apparently revealing a unique connection between the two. It is not until the 7th century CE that another lemma with the same stem occurs, yet another TLG *hapax*: οἰκουργία / *oikougria* / “home-work” (Pisides, *Hexaem.* line 684). None of these three lemmas seem to appear in any digitized Greek papyri or inscriptions. Another closely related term, just without the medial *gamma*, οἰκούρος / *oikouros* / “keeping-house” | “house-keeper”, was more traditional (Sappho, Aeschylus, et al) and commonplace (255 TLG hits).

Sibylline Oracles 5

The *Sibylline Oracles* were an evolving and eclectic collection. For book five in particular, I follow the early Hadrianic date (117 CE) reached in the careful analysis by Vargas.²³²

παμπληθεί / *pamplēthēi* / “altogether” is an adverb, and must not be confused with the cognate adjective παμπληθής / *pamplēthēs* / “in multitude” | “very numerous”, even though the latter can function adverbially, e.g., παμπληθές / *pamplēthēs* / “entirely” (LSJ). A lemma search of the major Greek papyri database produces a single hit, dated between 1–50 CE, on the main adverb, but it is most likely an adjective: “with multitudinous silver” / ἀργύρῳι(*) πανπλήθει(*).²³³ Thus the first TLG hit, *Sib.Orac.* 5.99, seems to be the earliest extant hit outside the

NT. It next appears in Justin’s *Dial. Trypho* 107.2 (ca 155–167 CE) and/or *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian, Antonine at the earliest.²³⁴ The use of the adverb in Luke 23:18, in a portion missing from Marcion’s *Evangelion*, associates the term with Barabbas. This may reflect the military import of *Orac.Sib.* 5 (there, in reference to the Parthians), or more likely, Cassius Dio (*H.R.* 75.9.1). The usage points to canonical Luke being edited after Hadrian, and quite possibly in the 2nd quarter of the 3rd century.

Tatian

αἱματεκχυσία / *haimatekchusia* / “blood-shedding” (Heb 9:22;

Or.Gr. 23.2, 23.5)

κατεξουσιάζω / *kateksousiadzō* / “to exercise authority over” (Mt 20:25,

Mk 10:42; *Or.Gr.* 15.3, 9)

συλαγωγέω / *sulagōgeō* / “to carry off as booty” (Col 2:8;

Or.Gr. 22.2, 4)

Testament of Abraham

ἀνέλεος / *aneleos* / “merciless” (Jas 2:13; *TestAbrA* 16)²³⁵

Theophilus, Autolycum

ἀντιμισθία / *antimisthia* / “recompense” (Rom 1:27, 2Cor 6:13;

Autol. 2.9)²³⁶

ἐπιχορηγία / *epichorēgia* / “provision” (Eph 4:16, Philp 1:19;

Autol. 1.6, 2.14)²³⁷

Valentinus?

While it is quite speculative at this point, Valentinus and/or his students may have composed the early version of the Deutero-Paulines that ended up in the Marcionite 10 letter collection. His greater familiarity with astrological texts likely explains how several of those previously documented neologisms made it into the texts that eventually became canonical. By my lights, on one occasion, Valentinus may have even coined a new term of his own.

ἀποκαταλλάσσω / *apokatallassō* / “to reconcile back” (Lao|Eph 2:16,
*Col 1:20, 22; Irenaeus, *fr.deperd.* 38, AH 5 fr. 15)

Summary

These various, apparently Christian neologisms reveal individual tendencies by authors, but also show in the aggregate that early Christians focused their creativity on developing new terms not for medicine, biology, agriculture, politics, architecture, or even scribal materials, but instead for speaking and speech-acts, internecine religious rivalry, financial matters, ecclesiastical authority, monotheistic piety, internal reflection, and divine insight into others.

By our count, in the main chapters of this book, we have surfaced and explored 42 total non-Christian neologism candidates. In this chapter we identified over 140 total early Christian neologisms. This should put to bed the notion that this book presents an argument against the literary and intellectual creativity of early Christians and their writings. Quite the opposite. These compositions show considerable literary cre-

ativity and novelty. Christians invented many new words, but they did not invent all of the new words.

Christian writers were products of their time, picking up and imitating words used by their contemporaries. But those contemporaries were not merely the likes of Josephus or other late 1st century authors. They were instead imitating the leading authors of the Second Sophistic. This finding effectively synthesizes the work of several scholars on the coordinated creation and/or editing of the texts of the New Testament around the mid-second century,²³⁸ and on the character of NT texts as exercises in elite literary education, networks, and collaborations.²³⁹ In other words, the literary tendencies uncovered in this book reveal a relatively small, yet still significant and cogent movement of religious Sophists. Would we expect anything else of a post-temple Judahite-Greco-Roman religion?

Conclusion

As the dictum goes: failures are as important, perhaps more important, than successes in the progress of Science. By way of transparency and recognition of the potential pitfalls of research into the origin points of Greek neologisms, here I list words I initially identified as post-Hadrianic neologisms based on TLG queries, but later had to discount because of results from queries against databases of Greek papyri and Greek inscriptions. If this book is published in a second, corrected edition, this section provides a ready-made place to move lemmas from previous chapters when and if they are later confirmed as false positives.

Out of all of the neologism candidates proposed in the first edition, undoubtedly some will be disproven as post-Hadrianic. How many is difficult to say, but I am cautiously optimistic that the false positive error rate will be 20% or less. If 80% of these remain and stand the test of time and scrutiny, that should suffice to shift the Overton window on the compositional and/or redactional dates of most of the texts in the NT. It is also possible that some neologisms currently in the penultimate chapter under the NT and early Christian writers will later shift to be classified as non-Christian, post-Hadrianic neologisms, if and when they turn up in new editions and additional works by post-Hadrianic Greek authors folded into later releases of the TLG, OGA, and GLAUx.

Flushing False Positives

ἀνακαινῶω / *anakainōō* / “to renew|renovate” (Rom 12:2, 2Cor 4:16, Col 3:10) originally fell under the *Acts of Carpus* (*Act.Carp.* 9) in the previous chapter. It was later assessed as a false positive post-Hadrianic neologism because the verb clearly registers in an inscription from the famous Dura-Europos archeological site (SEG 37:1442, PH322184, c. 116–117 CE), specifically used by the patron (Alexander, son of Epinikos), to claim that he had [ἀν]ακαινίσας / “renovated” τὸν ναὸν / “the temple” that his father had built. Even so, this finding may point to a late Trajanic or early Hadrianic *terminus post quem* for *2Cor 4:16 and *Col 3:10 (Marcionite and canonical), and for canonical Rom 12:2.

ἀρχισυνάγωγος / *archisynagōgos* / “synagogue-chief” (Mk 5:22, 35–36, 38; Luke 8:49, 13:14; Acts 13:15, 18:8, 17), outside of the NT, is first used in the TLG by Justin Marytr (*Tryph* 137.2), and next by Irenaeus (*AH* 1.1.16). Justin intriguingly used the term just before, yet syntactically disconnected from, a loose allusion to a “maiden’s” / κόρης healing. By contrast, Irenaeus, Origen, and later readers tend to use it clearly in reference to a “synagogue-chiefs daughter” / ἀρχισυναγωγου θυγάτηρ, perhaps reflecting the later standardization and stabilization of the overlapping canonical Markan-Lukan narrative. While these earliest Christian attestations may be valuable to show the textual instability of Gospels and Gospel-like traditions in the mid-2nd century, they do not actually establish a genuine neologism. The term was determined to be a false positive on the basis of the inscription JERU0591, Jerusalem, 100BCE–70CE, in which the patron uses the lemma twice in quick, genealogical succession: ἀ[ρ]χισυνάγωγος, υἱὸς ἀρχισυν[αγώ]γ[ο]υ / “synagogue-chief, son of a synagogue-chief”.²⁴⁰ This title was common-

place in Jewish epitaphs both within and beyond the city of Rome,²⁴¹ and office-holders could include women.²⁴²

ἄφεδρών / *aphedrōn* / “privy” (Mt 15:17, Mk 7:19), based only on TLG results, was initially assessed as having its earliest possible non-Christian occurrence in the *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian.²⁴³ This lemma was subsequently determined to be a false positive on the basis of OGIS 483 — MDAI(A) 27 (1902) 47,71 — Mys. Pergamon — 199–133 BCE, which mentions the management of ἀφεδρώνων / “privies”.²⁴⁴

θεατρίζω / *theatrizō* / “to be on stage” (Heb 10:33) was initially assessed, based on TLG results alone, as a Christian neologism in the neighborhood of ClemAlex (*Strom.* 4.16.101.2). It was subsequently shown to be a false positive for a post-Hadrianic neologism on the basis of an inscription: Jerash or Gerasa 192, in the Syrian Decapolis; the inscription dates between 106 and 117 CE.²⁴⁵

ἱματίζω / *himatidzō* / “to clothe” (Mk 5:15, Lk 8:35) was initially assessed as a post-Hadrianic neologism tied to one likely authentic fragment from Herodian’s treatise *On Orthography* (Lentz 1867b:500), and from another attestation in the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian (Boissonade 1819:48). This was subsequently classified as a false positive on the basis of a Greek inscription from Crete dated to the end of the 1st century BCE (IG II xi 3 — PH199880 — Diktyннаion).

καταγγελεύς / *katangeleus* / “declaimer” ostensibly has 40 hits in the TLG, but these often conflate the noun καταγγελεύς with the verb καταγγέλλω / *katangellō* / “to declare|recite|declaim|denounce”.

The apparent hit in Epictetus/Arrian is just such a verb, thus leaving only Christian attestations to the lemma in the entire TLG! It therefore seemed reasonable to conclude that Act 17:18 coined or first popularized the term and that Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 6.18.166.5) followed suit. Despite this initial finding, queries of databases of Greek inscriptions turned up a 1st c. BCE hit: IG XII,8 190 — PH79375 — Samothrace.²⁴⁶

νιπτήρ / *niptēr* / “wash-basin” was initially thought, based on TLG results, to be a post-Hadrianic neologism that appeared first in the *Testament of Abraham* and in the long-form *Partitiones* of [Ps-]Herodian. But later database searches of Greek inscriptions found a clear hit around 200 BCE in ID 372 — PH62846 — TM47818 — Delos.²⁴⁷ The related lemma, **ποδανιπτήρ** / *podaniptēr* / “foot-wash-basin”, appears explicitly in two Attic inscriptions (IG2 1424a and 1425, or PH3641 and PH3642), and is also restored for a third (IG² 1427 — PH3644). While this finding disqualifies the key lemma of the famous Johannine foot-washing scene, it strengthens the case for the influence of Attic Greek inscriptions on the literary artistry of the canonical Gospels.

ὄνικός / *onikos* / “of, for, or like a donkey” (Ev 17:2, Mk 9:42, Mt 18:6; Origen, *Mt.com.* 13.17) originally seemed to be a post-Hadrianic neologism according to TLG results. Later queries of Greek papyri turned up an occurrence ca. 57–56 CE: bgu.8.1782 — TM 4863.²⁴⁸

ὁροθεσία / *horotheresia* / “boundary-fixing” (Acts 17:26) initially seemed to be a post-Hadrianic neologism, first appearing in non-Christian writings in the TLG in the late 2nd or early 3rd century. But the lemma is attested in a Greek inscription at Delphi (FD III 4:42) at the end of

the 2nd century BCE. There are, however, several Greek inscriptions in Greece and Macedonia spanning from late in Trajan's reign to that of Hadrian, which may suggest an increased popularity around that time.

πληροφορία / *plērophoria* / “full-assurance|full-satisfaction” (Col 2:2, 1Thes 1:5, Heb 6:11, 10:22; Ps-Clem, 1Cor 42.3, Ign13 *Magn.* 3.11; Irenaeus, *Fr.deperd.* 27) initially seemed to be a genuine Christian neologism. The lemma, though supplied/reconstructed, was later confirmed as a highly likely reading in P. Giss. 1 87, lines 25–26, which dates ca. 113–120 CE.²⁴⁹ The verbal lemma πληροφορέω / *plērophoreō* / “to satisfy fully” was apparently attested as far back as the 5th or 4th century BCE in Ctesias.²⁵⁰ πληρ- / *plēr-* prefixes are largely absent from the Marcionite texts, but prevalent in the canonical texts, on which see the independent, mutually confirmatory findings in IDD and CPCNT. Even so, the canonical redactors here apparently did not invent a new term so much as borrow one known and used in Roman Egypt, in the well-known archive of the governor Apollonius, with a late Trajanic or early Hadrianic date. The novelty of the canonical Christian usage was perhaps in the appropriation of a clearly financial term for religious and philosophical discourse.

πολιτάρχης / *πολιτάρχης* / “civic magistrate” (Acts 17:6, 8; 4th–5th c. varia) seemed, on initial review of TLG results, to be a genuine Christian neologism. It appeared twice in Acts and subsequently in various 4th and/or 5th century compositions.²⁵¹ πολίταρχος / *politarchos*, the second declension noun, had appeared in the 4th c. BCE Aeneas, *Poliorcetica* 26.12.²⁵² However, a search of digitized Greek papyri turned up various pre-1st century CE examples of the first declension lemma.²⁵³

ποταμοφόρητος / *potamophorētos* / “carried off by a river”, according to TLG results, appears first in the Greek magical compilation known as the *Cyranides* 1.20 (late 4th or 5th century CE, though possibly reliant on late 2nd century sources), as well as in the NT Revelation (12:15). LSJ cites a couple of papyri, including a Greek magical papyrus (PMag.Par.1.876 — PGM IV.876, early 4th century, but again possibly reliant on 2nd century material), as well as PStrassb.5.10 (3rd c. CE). But another Greek papyrus (p.hib. 2 265 — TM 8292), dated between 204 and 203 BCE, already contained the lemma.

πρόκριμα / *prokrima* / “prejudgement”, based only on TLG results, appears first in 1Tim 5:21, and next in ClemAlex, *Strom.* 1.1.4.4. While the term only seems to appear in Greek papyri during the 4th century (8 hits), it is attested in an inscription from 42–30 BCE (IGSyr 3,1 718, PH242797), as well as an inscription from 44 CE in Ephesus (Ephesos 227 — Ephesos 228; PH247934 — PH247935).

πρωτοκλισία / *prōtoklisia* / “first-seat” first seemed to be an NT neologism (*Ev 11:43, Mt 23:6, Mk 12:39, Lk 14:7–8, 20:46), followed by ClemAlex, *Paed.* 2.1.4.5. A search of Greek inscriptions, though, returned ID 1520 — PH63945 — AGRW 224 — AGRW 1576 — Delos — post 153/152 BCE. A Greek papyrus has a supplied instance: sb 6 8993 — p.harr.1.61 — TM 5720 — pos. from Oxyrynchus — 176–175 BCE.

τεκνογονέω / *teknogoneô* / “to bear children” (1Tim 5:14), has 109 TLG hits in total, no Greek papyri or inscriptions listed as such in LSJ, and my searches of major databases also turned up empty. It thus first seemed to me a non-Christian, post-Hadrianic neologism found in an extant fragment of *Basilica*, book one of Appian’s *Historia Romana*.

Πρόκας καὶ τρισκαιδέκατον Νεμέτωρ καὶ Ἀμούλιος. τούτων ὁ πατὴρ Νεμέτορι ὡς πρεσβυτέρῳ τὴν ἀρχὴν κατέλιπεν· Ἀμούλιος δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς παρωσάμενος αὐτὸν ἐβασίλευσεν· ὑποπτεύων δὲ τὴν τίσιν Ἔγεστον μὲν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀπωσμένου ἀναιρεῖ ἐν κυνηγεσίῳ, τὴν δὲ ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ δεδιὼς παῖδα εἰ **τεκνογονήσοι**, ἰέρειαν καθίστησιν. (*H.R. Basilica*, fr. 1a.6)²⁵⁴

Procas and Numitor the 13th and Amulius. Their father left the rule to Numitor as the eldest. But Amulius, his brother, reigned after pushing him aside. Then suspecting payback, he took out Aegestus, the son of the exiled [ruler], on a dog-hunt. Dreading that his daughter **might child-bear** a child, he ordained her a priestess.

LSJ also cited an excerpt from the *Anthologia Graeca*, specifically Epigram 9.22 attributed to “(Phil.)”, a citation that I initially overlooked. Subsequent research confirmed its attribution to the mid-1st century CE epigram compiler, Philip of Thessalonica.²⁵⁵ As Plastira-Valkanou notes, Philip of Thessalonica compiled his *Garland* of epigrams in “emulation of Meleager” and has proven to be an “underestimated”, “creative poet”. Philip was particularly known for coining new words, “mostly compound nouns, adjectives, and verbs”.²⁵⁶ And while “some of these” may have originated in earlier texts, “100 of Philip’s neologisms do not reappear in later authors”.²⁵⁷

τεκνογονέω / *teknogoneō* may well be one of these neologisms, and Appian may well have picked up this neologism from Philip or one of his subsequent imitators. This exploration invalidated the lemma as post-Hadrianic. However, the question remains, where did canonical 1Tim pick up the rare/new lemma? Was it directly from Philip’s epigrams? From one of his unknown imitators? Or was it still by way of Appian’s famous and enormously popular *Historia Romana*? My wager is on the

latter, both for the NT usage and for its occurrence in the famous *Epistle of Diognetus*. I reproduce the quotation of the Pastoral epistle to invite your pondering of the question.

βούλομαι οὖν νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, τεκνογονεῖν, οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν·

Therefore, I counsel younger women to marry, to bear children, to house-master, giving no occasion at all to the opposer as a sake of slander.

φρεναπάτης / *phrenapatēs* / “soul-deceiver”, an NT *hapax*, first seemed a post-Hadrianic neologism. The quotation of Tit 1:10 follows:

Εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ [καὶ] ἀνυπότακτοι, ματαιολόγοι καὶ **φρεναπάται**, μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς / For many are unrestrained, empty-talkers and **soul-deceivers**, especially those of the circumcision

It also appears in a fragment of Herodian’s authentic *Peri figura*,²⁵⁸ whose quotation follows (*fig. GG 3.2:848*):

καὶ εἰ μὲν ἡ ἐπιφερομένη λέξις ἄρχεται ἀπὸ συμφώνου, ἀποβάλλει ἡ γενικὴ τὸ ς οἷον φρήν φρενός φρενοβλαβής ... ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ φωνήεντος ἄρχηται, ἀποβάλλεται καὶ τὸ ο καὶ τὸ ς οἷον φρήν φρενός **φρεναπάτης**
And whenever the compounded word begins with a consonant, the genitive casts off the final *sigma*, such as: mind (*phrēn*), of mind (*phrenos*), deranged (*phrenoblabēs*) ... but if it should begin with a vowel, both the *omicron* and the *sigma* is cast off, such as: mind (*phrēn*), of mind (*phrenos*), **soul-deceiver** (*phrenapatēs*)

LSJ cited the 6th century CE PLond.5.1677.22 for the lemma. The next results in the TLG were Origen's responsive comments in *Cels.* 3.48, where it perhaps alludes to Tit 1:10. It also appears in Ign13, *Trall.* 6.2, which quotes Tit 1:10. The LSJ also cited Lyr.Alex.Adesp.1.18, which I initially dismissed, since it was not listed near the top of the date-sorted TLG hits. (I honestly have no idea why this happened. Try the lemma search yourself and see what you find! Could it perhaps be a software bug or perchance an incorrect bit of metadata?) I supposed that its anonymous authorship reflected a situation comparable to the various strata of late love poetry found in the *Anacreonta*.

Further research led down quite an enjoyable, poetic rabbit-hole. In Powell's edition (1925:177–178) and in the TLG, Lyr.Alex.Adesp.1.18 was eventually found and confirmed as an anonymous, fragmentary Greek lyrical song with the heading, Παρακλαυσίθυρον / *Paraklausithyron* / “Standing outside Door”, a motif in Latin known as *Exclusus amator* / “the Shut-out Lover”, one quite developed in Ovid's Latin poetry (Copley 1956). According to Copley, Plutarch was the first to use this specific Greek word as a classification for a type of song that in classical sources was simply called κῶμος / *kōmos* / “revel”, i.e., a song sang by intoxicated men at the conclusion of or subsequent to a symposium, often in front of the homes and doors of available women.²⁵⁹ This to me suggested a 2nd century CE date at the earliest for this particular fragment, and its use of the rare and apparently new lemma φρεναπάτης / *phrenapatēs*.

However, further research confirmed that this song, including its lemma φρεναπάτης / *phrenapatēs*, are both explicitly attested by a 2nd century BCE papyrus. This papyrus is known alternatively as the *Fragmentum Grenfellianum*, after its discover who first published the *Oxyrynchus papyri*, or as P. Dryton 50, after the name of the Roman Egyptian officer of the 2nd century BCE who transcribed these lines.²⁶⁰ All

of this confirmed the lemma was a false-positive post-Hadrianic neologism. This research adventure may also be something of a cautionary tale, a summons to humility instead of hubris about all the knowledge inaccessible to the composer of this volume, and a reminder that this scientific quest (or is it a musical apocalypse?), even if it has stumbled upon some forty-odd beacons of authentic light, may be little more than the rantings of a blind fool fumbling around in the dark.

Endnotes

1. Among recent major studies on postclassical Greek neologisms, see: Domazakis 2018, focusing on 2 Maccabees in particular, but with connections made to related neologisms in Polybius, the LXX, and apocryphal/deuterocanonical books.
2. Here and elsewhere, English translations are mine unless otherwise noted.
3. See the various introductions in Musurillo 1972, and more recently and especially, Moss 2013.
4. Vinzent 2024; Bull 2023.
5. For example, hits found in the corpora of letters of Ignatius of Antioch tend to appear in the quite late 13 letter collection, rarely in the 7 letter collection, but never in Cureton's 3 letter collection. In the analysis, I label citations to the Ignatian corpora as Ign3, Ign7, for precisely this reason.
6. E.g., γέεννα / *gehenna* / "valley of Hinnom" or "hell" (see also *Orac.Sib.* 4.187); σπεκουλάτωρ / *spekoulatōr* / "executioner" (Mark 6:27; cp. *Act.Paul*, fr. 10, *Mart.Paul.* 5); λεγιών / *legiōn* / "legion".
7. On the influence of Josephus on NT texts, see esp. Mason 2003, Pervo 2006, 2009, and the ambitious exploration of Josephan intertextuality in Adamczewski 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2018, 2023.
8. The opening example in the chapter on Aretaeus of Cappadocia is a good case in point. What might appear at first glance to be a mere spelling variation should be considered a neologism, not in the sense of coining a brand new word, but rather as a new manifestation of a previously known and used word.
9. Syme 1982:209.
10. This approach dovetails with the retrospective methodology detailed and recommended in Vinzent 2019.
11. Bobson 1976:x says 147 CE; Leon 2021:118.
12. Book 2Frag. col. z2.
13. Syme 1982:209.

14. Stadler 1980.
15. Moles 1986:168 points to an identical phrase in the *Cynegeticus* / *On Hunting-Dogs*, which was composed after 140 CE in Athens, as well as to the “tremendous self-confidence” and sense of literary legacy conveyed in the preface.
16. Leon 2021, esp. the appendix, “The Date of the Anabasis”.
17. Bosworth 1982.
18. *H.R.* 36.39.1, 38.13.5, 39.31.1, 40.32.3, 42.32.3, 46.40.2, 59.21.2.
19. For an expansion of the thesis of Paul as Apollo-theophore, contrasted with the villainous Apollonius of 4 Maccabees, see Bilby 2026, chp. 8.
20. Robbins 1964:vi.
21. Robbins 1964:vi, viii.
22. 1.2:581.
23. Milet VI,2 565 — PH351291 — TM947458 — Ionia, Miletus, Kalabaktepe — limestone sarcophagus epitaph.
24. *PLRE* 1:70.
25. IGLSyr 4 1593 — PH243843 — Apamene; see epigraphy.packhum.org/text/243843.
26. Montanari & Montana 2022:1082.
27. Montanari & Montana 2022:1083.
28. Montanari & Montana 2022:1083.
29. *GG* 2.1:197.
30. *GG* 3.1:436–437.
31. Boissonade 1819:11.
32. Ps 34:16, 36:12, 111:10, Job 16:9, Lam 2:16.
33. *GG* 2.2:400. Note that this sentence is placed in parentheses in the critical edition, and that manuscript B omits the second occurrence of the lemma and the preceding four words, i.e., γάμου μεταλαμβάνω τὸ δὲ γαμίζω.
34. Unattested by any witnesses, yet restored for *Ev 17:27 by HZKN, but not VTsB, and possibly attested and restored at *Ev 20:35 by ZVBRKN, but not by H. As with *Ev 20:35, *Ev 20:34 hinges on Tertullian’s attestation, both passive constructions: “The sons of this age marry and are married” / *fili huius aevi nubunt*

et nubuntur (Marc. 4.38.8).; “neither marry nor are married” / *neque nubere neque nubi* (Marc. 4.38.5). Neither attestation establishes the lemma γαμίζω, contrary to CPCNT, which claims it is attested for *Ev 20:35.

35. Missing from CPCNT.

36. GG 2.2:429.

37. Cureton 1849:43.

38. Available at www.oxfordreference.com/display/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095353509.

39. Ihm 1995; Salazar 1998.

40. The city name spelled with the *upsilon* is also noted by Herodian in his likely authentic work *On Orthography* (orth. GG 3.2:480.) Regarding the authenticity of *Orthog.*, see Dyck 1993:788–789 and Dickey 2014:337–338.

41. Aland et al 2012:753.

42. E.g., Herodotus, (*Hist.* 8.115). Plato, *Timaeus* 89a. Hippocrates, *passim*.

43. Barigazzi 1966; Amato 2005.

44. Hense 1909:38.

45. The *Suda* entry is s.v., ὑφίσταται, and references *Exc. de virt.* 9, p. 221.

46. About this public scandal, see Favorinus’ *Corinthian Oration*, later wrongly attributed to Dio Chrysostom as *Orat.* 37.

47. Tekiner 2015:508.

48. The antonym adjective ἀβίαστος also appears in Hellenistic Greek inscriptions, e.g., I. Aeg. Thrace E205, mid-2nd to early 1st BCE.

49. Justin Martyr’s *Dial. Trypho* 51.3 only attests the adjective βιαστός. On the date of this text, see *infra*, chapter on Valens, s.v., ἰσαγγελος.

50. “The law and the prophets until John and everyone forcibly enters it” / ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται (*Pan.* 42.11.6 μγ (43); 42.11.17 Σχ. μγ (43); cf. 42.11.17 Ἑλ. μγ (43); GCS 31:113, 142); “Saying, ‘The law and the prophets were until John, from which the kingdom of god is announced’” / *dicens lex et prophetae usque ad Ioannem ex quo regnum dei adnuntiatur* (Marc. 4.33.7; SC 456:406, 408; Evans 446).

51. TLG 0719.002, ed. Hude 1958.

52. I.Cilicie 36 — Andana Mus. — 6th c. CE — Syria 2.1921.207,1 — cf. SEG 37.1340.
53. Preface 6–7; White 1912:8–11. His chronological estimates subdivided into three major epochs (500+200+200) from Rome’s founding until his composition. The self-reference as a procurator concludes the preface at section 15; White 1912:24–25.
54. E.g., the reintroduction by Marcus Aurelius in 162 CE of proconsuls ruling parts of Italy goes unmentioned in *Roman History* 13.38. See Livius.org, s.v., “Ap-pian”.
55. Oudot 2008:32n7, with further literature.
56. Behr LCL 533:3.
57. *Ibid.*, 4.
58. *Ibid.*, 5.
59. LCL 533:158.
60. The lemma is repeated in the second narration of Saul’s Damascus Road encounter at Acts 22:6: περιαστράψαι / *periastrapsai*.
61. van der Horst 1980:34.
62. There is an occurrence in one notable manuscript tradition (cod. Mar-cianus 408) of the *History of Alexander the Great* (Reichmann 1963), but the term is absent from the older, overlapping manuscript traditions that may trace back to a mid-1st century CE textual form.
63. Popescu 2016:219.
64. Popescu 2016:219–221.
65. Popescu 2019:222.
66. Fowler & Fowler 1905, 1:xvi.
67. *Idem.*
68. Page et al, 1959:138.
69. Page et al 1959:108. Poor writers got double during Saturnalia, O Patrons!
70. On a passing note, for scholars such as Klinghardt who have researched meals and feasts in canonical Luke, there are many other parallels with Lucian’s *Saturnalia* that are worth exploring!

71. Heilan 2015:1.
72. Heilan 2015:2.
73. A fragment attributed to Ctesias (5th–4th cent. BC) is the topmost hit in the date-sorted list of results, but it is used within a phrase with overt Christian language, and is thus not a viable attestation or candidate for the lemma’s point of origin.
74. Kroll 6:68.
75. Kroll 6:68.
76. 4:568, s.v., “Charax of Pergamum”.
77. Zahn 1880:156.
78. A summary conclusion often used in manuscripts to distinguish the previous work from the following one.
79. Pingree 1986:413.
80. Cp. SGC at Lk2 20:35–36. Tertullian attests: “Those whom god has made worthy of that age, for inheritance and resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are married, for neither yet do they die, since they are equals of angels of God, having been made sons of resurrection” / *quos vero dignatus sit deus illius aevi possessione et resurrectione a mortuis neque nubere neque nubi, quia nec morituri iam sint, cum similes angelorum sint dei, resurrectionis filii facti* (Marc. 4.38.5); “Whom yet god has made worthy of that age, to God they join themselves” / *quos autem dignatus est deus illius aevi, deo adiungant* (Marc. 4.38.7.)
81. See chapter 2, *infra*, s.v., γαμίζω, on this lemma choice.
82. E.g., *Paed.* 1.6.36.5; *Strom.* 6.13.105.1, 7.10.57.5, etc.
83. Eusebius claimed Justin wrote this Socratic dialogue in Ephesus shortly after Hadrian’s reign, but that claim is viewed as completely unreliable in recent scholarship. See Bagatti 1979, Hamman 1995, and Slosser 2003:xii. Recent scholars concur that *Dial. Trypho* refers back to his *I Apol.* But there is some quibbling and ambiguity over the exact year(s) of both texts: Minns & Parvis (2009:33) 153 CE and sometime subsequent; Allert (2005:32–34) 151–154 CE and 155–167 CE; Rokéah (2002:2) ca 155 CE and ca 160 CE.
84. Cumont 1929:167.

85. For an example of using Herodian's *General Prosody* as an historical reliable source for onomastics, see Bremmer 1998:156, who finds the proper name Aëtius stemming originally from Pausanias, yet still trustworthy as an attestation in Herodian's *Pros.Cath.* 1.119.35–120.6, a conclusion with which Mansfeld 2016:166 concurred.
86. Dickey 2014:329.
87. Boissonade 1819, based only on codd. Paris 2543 and 2570. Pinakes currently lists 21 extant manuscripts.
88. Dyck 1981:225 noted the weakness of this argument.
89. Dyck 1981.
90. Dyck 1993:792.
91. Dyck 1993:793.
92. Forbes et al 2016.
93. Smith 2004.
94. Kučera 2025:268, citing to Dickey 2014 and Dyck 1981.
95. The earlier form is used by Attic Xenophon (*Anab.* 5.4.29), Antiphanes (fr. 312), et al.
96. *Vit.contempl.* 33.
97. Boissonade 1819:209. Note that several other forms also appear in Herodian's *De orthographia* (Lentz 1870), such as ἀνόκαιον (p. 476), ἀνώγαιον (p. 596), ἀνώγειος (p. 440, 477), and ἀνώγεων (p. 440, 476).
98. E.g., ἀνώγειον is found in Γ Δ Ω 2 157 f¹ of Mark and Γ 1 118 of Luke.
99. The violence of the young Jesus in *InfThom* recension 3, 9.1 *bis* is interesting to compare here, since it is from a level “above-ground” / ἀνωγαίου|ἀνώγαιον that a childhood rival is killed by Jesus.
100. Boissonade 1819:188, 269.
101. In the papyri.info results view, P.Herc. 1044 does not quote the specific form, but it is Ἀρ-τέμ[ω]νι (fr. 33, lines 6–7).
102. “Of Gaius, of Artemon, Berenikaian” / Γαίου Ἀρτέμωνος Βερνικέος; see [se arch.inscriptionsisraelpalestine.org/inscriptions/jeru0139](http://arch.inscriptionsisraelpalestine.org/inscriptions/jeru0139).
103. On the date of the work, see Dickey 2007:88.

104. OLD gives the definitions: 1. The main block of a tackle. 2. A jib or foresail. LSJ, s.v. ἐπάγων, cites to Hesychyus the Alexandrian lexicographer, who equates this term to ἡάφνηδιος / *ēafnēdios* and κασσάνδρα / *kassandra*, both of which are apparently Byzantine, rather than ancient or late ancient terms.
105. *Fragmenta*, Tetralogy 44 play A, fr. 736a // fr. 382 addressing “Father Wine-God” / πάτερ Θέοινε as “yoke-fitter of the frenzied” / μαινάδων ζευκτήριε. *Persae* 736, where a Messenger tells Darius that Xerxes was “glad to cross the bridge, one a dual yoke-fitting” / ἄσμενον μολεῖν γέφυραν, ἐν δυοῖν ζευκτήριον. *Agam* 529, describing Agamemnon as:

he who a yoke-fitting cast around Troy
 the elder Atreides ruler, fortunate man
 τοιόνδε Τροίαι περιβαλὼν ζευκτήριον
 ἄναξ Ἀτρεΐδης πρέσβυς εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ.

106. De Jonge 1985:85.

107. Preserved in a catena fragment as *Luc.cat.* fr. 58a–c (GCS 49:251): Ποιμέσι πρῶτον ἀποκαλύπτεται τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὑμνούμενον μυστήριον οἷτινες τύπον ἐπέχουσι τῶν τὰς ἐκκλησίας μελλόντων ποιμαίνειν. καὶ μάλα εἰκότως. (58b) αὐτοὺς γὰρ ἔδει τό· <Ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη> κατὰ τὴν πρώτην τάξιν ἀκούειν, οἷτινες ἤμελλον τὴν εἰρήνην ἐπιφωνεῖν παντὶ τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρώματι. τὸ δὲ τῶν ποιμένων πρόσωπον καὶ ἡ δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως αὐτοῖς γενομένη χαρὰ σημαίνει σαφῶς, ὡς ἐπὶ <τὸ πλανώμενον πρόβατον> ἦλθεν <ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός>. (58c) ποιμένας γὰρ οὐδὲν οὕτως εὐφραίνει, ὡς ἡ τοῦ ἀπολωλὸτος βοσκήματος εὗρεσις, ὅπερ οὐκ ἦν ἐτέρου τινὸς εὐρεῖν ἢ <τοῦ ἀρχιποιμένος Χριστοῦ>.
108. sb 8 9908 (267 CE); sb 8 9909 (267 CE); p.prag. 2 126 (166–269CE), written by a secondary hand at the later end of the date range.

109. West 1984, fr. 38, line 3:

Ἰλαροὶ πίνωμεν οἶνον,
 ἀναμέλψομεν δὲ Βάκχον,
 τὸν ἐφευρετὰν χορείας,
 τὸν ὅλας ποθοῦντα μολπάς,

τὸν ὁμότροπον Ἑρώτων,
 τὸν ἐρώμενον Κυθήρης
 Cheerful let us drink wine,
 we shall raise a strain to Bacchus,
 the inventor of choral dance,
 he who craves all songs,
 the same manner of Lusts,
 which is lusted by Cytherea.

110. Campbell 1988:10.
111. Campbell 1988:12–13.
112. Campbell 1988:14, n18; Brioso Sánchez 1970.
113. Campbell 1988:17; Brioso Sánchez 1970.
114. Dickey 2014:330.
115. La Roche 1863:3.
116. Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ῥήματος in La Roche 1863:24.
117. Dickey 2014:338.
118. Under the heading Book N of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* in Hayduck 1891:794.
119. Boissonade 1819:40.
120. Text from Tromp 2005:138.
121. Johnson 2005:252.
122. For the Syriac three letter collection at this point, see Cureton 1849:23–26.
 For the Greek seven letter collection at this point, see Ehrman 2003:230–231.
123. Boissonade 1819:59. The cognate term θρησκεία appears in several Greek papyri dating from 41 CE (p.lond. 6 1912) through the 6th century, as well as in a Greek inscription later falsely ascribed to Nazareth, NAZA0002 (27 BCE – 100 CE, slab, imperial edict, on which see search.inscriptionsisraelpalestine.org/inscriptions/naza0002)
124. Boissonade 1819:92.
125. The late 2nd c. Artemidorus of Daldis also uses νομοδιδάκτης (*Oneir.* 2.29).

126. Note that IG II² 4514 — IG II³,4 837, Attica, Athens, mid-2nd century, hymn to Asclepius, clearly attests σθένω / *sthenō* / “to have strength”, not σθενόω / *sthenōō* / “to strengthen”.
127. Citing III 466.325 Ko. to confirm the Middle Comedy term.
128. LSJ lists Corpus Papyrorum Raineri [CPR] 1.27.7 (ii A.D.), which is stud.pal.20.15 — SPP 20 15 — chrest.mitt.289 — TM 15012 — Oct 27, 189 CE, or “AD 190 Arsinoite” in chrest.mitt.289. LSJ also lists Supp.Epigr.7.417 (Dura), which in SEG online is SEG 50-1394 — Dura-Europas. The ‘archive’ of the merchant Aurelius Nebouchelos, 235–240 A.D., and in PHI is PH320658 — SEG 7:417 — Syria-Middle Euphrates — Dura-Europos (Salhiye, nr.) — 235–240 AD — Excav. Dura-Europos 4 (1933) 98, 227. Another Arsinoite/Fayum fragment is also from 230 CE: SPP 20 31 — CPR 1 124 — Stud. Pal. 20 31 — TM 15019.
129. Swanson 1995:320.
130. On its authenticity, see Dickey 2014:337 and Dyck 1993:786.
131. Aristarchus of Samothrace.
132. The early history of this lemma requires more thorough research than can be covered here in the first edition.
133. The word count comes from the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article on Galen: plato.stanford.edu/entries/galen/
134. It is possibly attested here in the *Adamantius Dialogue*, book 5, but scholars have often challenged the reliability of that work and particularly called into question the reliability of its attestations to Marcion’s *Evangelion*, especially book 5.
135. For attestations and critical reconstruction, see Bilby 2020/2025 vol. 2 at Lk2 17.1–2.
136. Note also that the saying in Ev 17:2 that “had he not been born” is separated out and attached to Judas in canonical Matthew 26:24.
137. See the concluding chapter for ὀνικός / *onikos* / “of, for, or like a donkey” as a false positive post-Hadrianic neologism. In the Gospels, its use likely derived from the primary source behind Marcion’s *Evangelion*.
138. Race 2023:ix–x.

139. Race 2023:x.
140. Race 2023.
141. This and the following section summaries are modest rephrasings of the overview provided by Race 2023:142–143.
142. Race 2023:143.
143. This characterization may have been partly inspired by the Euripidean depiction of the Fury-plagued Orestes being thrown to the ground and foaming in *IphTaur* 307–308. On the import of this passage for canonical Acts, see Bilby 2026, chp. 6.
144. My previous research on redactions to canonical Mark and canonical Luke has established numerous, distinctive overlaps between the two, lending support to a shared redactor of both canonical texts. See Bilby 2020/2025, *passim*.
145. See the penultimate chapter, *infra*.
146. 1Cor 13:3 should probably be omitted in a future edition of the Marcionite reconstruction, based on the prevalence of middle voice verbs, self-implicating language, and the theme of voluntary martyrdom, which was typical of Ignatius and early Christian martyr acts.
147. GG 3.1:194.
148. Chronopoulos & Spöri 2023:30.
149. *Ibid*.
150. *Ibid*.
151. E.g., τὴν σκηνοπο[ιία]ν / *tēn skēnopo[iia]n* in TAM I 65 Lycia, Ctr. — Isinda (Belenli) — late 5th–mid 4th c. BC?. τὴν ἄλλην σκηνοποιίαν / *tēn allēn skēnopoian* in Hatzopoulos, Mac. Inst. II 12 σκηνοποιίαν Mak. (Edonis) — Amphipolis — ca. 200 BC — ISE II 114 — SEG 40.524. LSJ, s.v., σκηνοποι-ία, ἡ, provides additional references, noting its usage in regard to the building of theaters and nests, both interesting to consider in relation to the passage in Acts 18:1–3.
152. Chronopoulos & Spöri 2023: 30–31.
153. Bethe 1900.2:104.
154. Aristoxenus fr. 76; Wehrli 1967:30.

155. On the literary and mythological theatricality of Acts 19 (which has the only occurrence of the word “theater” in Acts), and for further literature on the theatricality of canonical Acts, see esp. Bilby & Lefteratou 2022.
156. Bowersock 2004:54–56.
157. Bouras & Zipser 2019:42, 96; Diller 1941:209 notes that Philumenos cites Archigenes, Soranus, and Marcellus, and makes use of the Pneumatist Herodotus, but is not cited by Galen.
158. Neyrey 2021:220.
159. Neyrey 2021:221–222.
160. Jones 2001:143.
161. See esp. Berenson Maclean & Aitken 2001.
162. Kühn 1830 19:742.
163. Berenson Maclean & Aitken 2001:xlii–xlv.
164. Berenson Maclean & Aitken translate ἀμαραντίνους as “unfading”. Our translation is more literal, somewhat akin to the custom in English to speak of an “evergreen” wreath or tree. For this naturalistic usage, “unfading” is not inaccurate, and yet is too generic.
165. Baumann et al 1025:1n2, with further literature.
166. Nock 4:12, Litwa 2018:118 translates it here as “blame”.
167. *The Acts of Christ and Peter* (ECCA 956, CANT 198), also known as *Acta fabulosa* (BHG 1485f), which Snyder and Čéplö (2023:440–441) tentatively date between the 4th and 6th century CE. The term is clearly in evidence in late 4th century Greek works, most securely Chrysostom, *ActH*
168. As with the lemma ἀκατάκριτος, βολίζω also may well next appear securely in Chrysostom’s late 4th century *ActH* (PG60:369). In Paul’s sea-voyage in NT Acts, the verb appears twice in quick succession:
- Ὡς δὲ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ νύξ ἐγένετο διαφορομένων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίᾳ, κατὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτὸς ὑπενόουν οἱ ναῦται προσάγειν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν.
²⁸ καὶ **βολίσαντες** εὗρον ὀργυιὰς εἴκοσι, βραχὺ δὲ διαστήσαντες καὶ πάλιν **βολίσαντες** εὗρον ὀργυιὰς δεκαπέντε

Now on the fourteenth night it happened as we were passing through the Adriatic, at midnight the sailors suspected approaching some land for themselves.²⁸ And **depth-probing** they found twenty fathoms, but after observing a brief interval and again **depth-probing**, they found fifteen fathoms.

The description of measuring sea-floor depth seems ordinary enough, but the verb is evidently new, missing even from the extensive lexicographical works of Dyscolus and Herodian, which sometimes covered domain-specific (including nautical) terminology.

βολίζω apparently derives from βολίς / *bolis* / “missile”, “javelin”, “sounding-lead” (LSJ), but may also closely relate to βόλος / *bolos* / “cast”, “throw with a casting-net”, “catch” (LSJ). Traditional and more commonplace Greek verbs for assessing water depth at sea are καταπειράζω / *katapeiradzō* / “to probe”, “to test depth” (e.g., Polybius, *Hist.* 4.11.6), ἀναμετρέω / *anametreō* / “to measure up” (Agatharchides, *mar.Eryth.* 83; Posidonius, fr. 9), both often with ὄργυια / *orguia* / “fathom”, “six feet”. Sometimes εὐρίσκω / *heuriskō* / “to find” is used on its own for this purpose (Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl.hist.* 3.40.3). The same unusual verb also appears in the *Acts.Chr.Pet.* 8:1:

Τριήμερον δὲ **βολίσαντες** ἀγκύρας ἑορτὴν ἀπετέλουν. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἡγαλλιᾶτο δοξάζων τὸν Θεόν.

Now after three days of **depth-probing** by anchor, they were performing festival. But Peter was rejoicing greatly, glorifying the God.

While the verb is strange, the usage seems ordinary enough, until the broader narrative unfolds. To Peter the “shipmaster” / ναύκληρος (Christ in disguise) offers his son (also Christ in disguise), a mere “lad” / μειράκιον, as a slave (8:2). Peter objects, since Jesus forbade him from carrying gold or silver, and thus he lacks the means to buy the lad (8:3). The shipmaster then offers Peter ten gold coins so that Peter can complete the transaction (8:4), persuading him to accept the monetary and human gift, and even providing a bill of sale (8:5–6). The bill stipulated that the lad, here named “Messias” / Μεσσίας, would serve Peter until Peter died, and thereafter would be returned to his father. In view

of the broader narrative, one wonders whether the use of the unusual word βολίζω / “depth-probing”, particularly in connection with a “festival”, might have disturbing connotations associated with enslavement.

169. The lemma appears in one Greek papyrus (michigan.apis.1470, but it is a witness to Acts 18–21).
170. The noun form (δισμυριάς, -άδος, ἡ) is only used in Revelation and commentators who quote it. The adjective (δισμύριοι, -αι, -α; δισμύριος, α, ον) is sometimes substantival, and consistently used from the 5th c. BCE to the late Byzantine era.
171. Durand SC97:240, Aubert, p. 695.
172. *Adv. Cataphrygas* is CPG1328 and TLG1131.001, with the digital text from Routh 1846:183.
173. This term is unattested but restored for Marcion’s *Apostolos* in our TANZ edition, but should be removed in light of this finding.
174. The Attic form, μετάληψις, lacked the medial μ, and remained commonplace throughout the Christian era. The form μετάλημψις appears in 1Tim in mss 01 02 etc, but is also missing from many early mss.
175. LSJ cites IG Rom.4.1071 (Cos) for the feminine, yet notes that the masculine first declension πορφύροπώλης / *porphuropōlēs*, is attested in the inscription. See Humann 1898:121, no. 156. The inscription reads ἡ σορὸς Μ(άρκου) Αὐρ(ηλίου) Ἀλεξάνδρου Μοσχianoῦ βουλευτοῦ πορφυροπώλου / “The sacrophagus of M(arkus) Aur(elius) Alexander Moschianos, council-member, purple-dyer”. This inscription is also classified as IHierapJ 156 — PH271772 — AGRW 10527 at www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=10527. See also IHerapP 37 — PH268802 — AGRW 10581 at www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=10581. Harland dates both inscriptions between 212–300 CE. The cognate lemma πορφυροπωλική / *porphuropōlikē* / “purple-dye craft” is attested by the grammarian (and tutor to emperor Lucius Verus) Harpocration, *Lexic.*, s.v., Ἀλουργοπωλική, p. 13. Recent scholarship, drawing mainly on biographical evidence found in Greek papyri, has Harpocration flourishing from the late 2nd to early 3rd century (Keaney

- 1991). A search of the common stem on papyri.info turns up 13 hits, but all of them are 4th century CE or later. While Harpocration is not the clear basis for the term in Acts, the confluence of evidence suggests a late 2nd or early 3rd century setting for this characterization of the Lydia character of Acts 16.
176. See Cramer 1938, 3:397 for the text. LSJ notes that PLond.5.1790.7, 5th–6th CE, attests the lemma. It did not appear in any of my searches of digitized Greek papyri or inscriptions.
177. Kramer & Kribber 1972:222. Previous instances of the lemma in the TLG, digitized Greek papyri, and Greek inscriptions omit the medial μ .
178. A search of the major database of Greek papyri turns up seven hits for this lemma, but these are all incorrectly tagged as verbs, when they all reflect the adjective πυρρός, -ά, -όν, or else the noun πύρρα, -ας, ἡ.
179. The lemma appears after 152 CE in an inscription in Lycia, Asia Minor: FdX-anthos VII 67, Lycia, W. — Xanthos (Kınık) — Letoion (Bozoluk) — SEG 30.1535 — PH283274. This lemma, or a close cognate, also appears on an 2nd century CE inscription in Aegean Kos, IKosS EF SEG 57 (2007), no. 788 — PHI 318205 — AGRW ID 23353: “Boundary marker of the grave of the society (*thiasos*) of grain-measurers (?) (*sitometrai*)” / ὄρος θηκείων | θιάσου σιτο|με[τρῶν ? — —]. See philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/grave-boundary-marker-of-a-society-of-grain-measurers-ii-ce/.
180. A late derivation from the Homeric and subsequently commonplace σφυρόν / *sphuron* / “ankle”.
181. The adjective corresponding to a named entity, Typhonian, has the same spelling, but Acts is apparently the first extant example of the adjective lemma based on a common noun.
182. Excepting NT catena, this puts the earliest reception of this lemma in the TLG in the 11th–12th century CE!
183. The lemma occurs as a named entity noun, Chalcedon, and as an adjective corresponding to that noun, in *SibOrac* 3, Herodian and Ps-Herodian, et al, as well as Greek papyri, most notable and earliest among these, p.oxy. 11 1380 — TM 63688 — 98–136 CE. Besides Revelation, other candidates for the earliest

- use of the adjective not evoking the named entity are: Perinthos-Herakleia 124 — PH167335 — Thrace — Perinthos-Herakleia — Marmara Ereğlisi — 2nd c. CE, like Revelation, also in reference to stones. It does not seem to re-emerge until the first major commentary on Revelation, that by Andreas of Cretensis, in the 6th–7th century CE.
184. Holl & Dummer 1980:308 — GCS 31:308.
 185. Canadian costumery and Scottish voiceover courtesy of Mike Myers.
 186. There are two dubiously dated hits in the TLG in the so-called *Seniores Alexandrini*, citing Ps-Xenophon, *Lithognomon*; see Pitra 1884:342.
 187. Trans. E. Isaac in OTP1 20.
 188. Jones 2011:148–156, with literature.
 189. SGLIBulg 207 Thracia — Philippopolis (Plovdiv) — 4th c. AD — SEG 14.486 — PH167766. See epigraphy.packhum.org/text/167766
 190. *Deipn.* 1.56 (Kaibel 1887 1:71), quoted as Frag. 290 in Kock 1884:401; Play FIF fr. 23 in Meineke 1840:515; Austin & Kassel 1991, Play 139, fr. 292.
 191. This begs the question, could Revelation interpret the seven Maccabean martyr brothers as cryptic references to temporal sequences of salvation-historical events?
 192. The lemma appears without the initial sigma first in Strabo, *Geog.* 5.1.9, Aelius Promotus, *Potency* 61, then Iren, *AH* 1.7.6, 1.20.4
 193. Ign13, *Smyrn.* 7.1.
 194. Besides the *Vita Capri* 7, which closely parallels the text of Jn 4:23, the next earliest parallel is in ClemAlex *Protrep.* 9.88.1, 10.96.4, 10.97.3. The noun lemma does not appear in the major database of Greek papyri, and only seems to appear in Greek inscriptions starting around 259–260 CE, namely in IGLSyr 7 4028 — PH245340. The adjectival cognate lemma προσκυνητός, -ή, -όν, appears in the 2nd–3rd century CE PH267844 — AGRW 13515 and the undated (but likely 3rd century or subsequent) St.Pont. III 20 — PH265863. Additional examples of the noun and adjectival lemma appear in post-4th century Christian artifacts.
 195. Using the term in reference to the Lukan Zacchaeus, and equating him with the evangelist Matthew.

196. Outside of Christian sources, the lemma first appears in Heliodorus' 3rd or 4th century *Aethiopica* 7.27.7, also in reference to wine and a feast!
197. The next hits are not until the late 4th century with Nyssen, Ps-Macarius, Evagrius, et al.
198. The verbal lemma was apparently secondary to, and perhaps derived from, the noun lemma that Pomponius Porphyryon, even while writing in Latin, attributed in Greek to Varro, λογομαχία / *logomachia* / "word-war". See Chrysippus, *Fragmenta moralia*, fr. 449 in Arnim 1903:109.
199. The lemma is most likely missing from Marcion's Lao 6:6 and *Col 3:22.
200. For an accessible and succinct summary of scholarship about the pre-Severan (190–202 CE, Books 1–5) and post-Severan (203–214 CE, Books 6–8) dates of the *Stromateis*, see Itter 2010:33–34.
201. Also in Ign7 *Eph* 18.1.
202. This lemma is not attested for Lao 2:21 and should be considered a candidate for removal from the TANZ edition.
203. Also in Orig, *Cels.* 6.26.10, without direct reference back to 2Cor 10:16, perhaps suggesting Origen as the progenitor of the lemma.
204. The older and commonplace lemma spelling is ὑπερεκχέω / *huperekcheō*, attested in Straton (3rd BCE) and the LXX. Origen also quotes and confirms with ClemAlex yet another unusual form, here at *Exh.mart.* 10. Though I had previously thought this lemma was attested for *Ev, but Tertullian's *fluentem* does not establish the prefixed and oddly spelled form, and *Adamantius* book 5 is likely not reliable here, so this should be adjusted accordingly. Vinzent already adroitly noted this in *CPCNT* 525, "Tert. seems to read the *verbum simplex: pressam ac fluentem*". Vinzent did not propose an alternative reconstruction, though. The traditional refrain of the land "flowing" / ῥέουσιν (Jer 39:22 LXX) with milk and honey is as good a candidate as any.
205. Origen quotes and obsessively uses yet another *huper*-prefixed lemma (9 distinct TLG hits!).
206. A misspelled form of this word (δηόκτης *dēoktēs*) may appear once in Greek papyri: SEG 30:1625 Cyprus Lythrodontas 3rd CE RDAC (1980) 260,1.

207. This is one of the rare instances where a potential neologism appears in Marcion's *Evangelion*. Here it happens to appear in the Lord's Prayer, in a phrase commonly attributed to the Q Gospel. One wonders whether this neologism was coined by Jesus himself, or one of his early followers.
208. This lemma appears in a Greek inscription, but it dates to the 5th or 6th century: IG II² 13517 — Attica Paiania (Liopesi) — SEG 29.250 — E. Sironen, *Inscriptions* (1997) 258, 226 — SEMA (2006) 2747 — PH345748.
209. Not to be confused with ἐπιφάυσκω / *epiphauskō* / “to shine out”, found in LXX Job 25:5, 31:26, 41:9, Eph 5:14. On the *Gospel of Peter* was composed after, and depending on, Marcion's Gospel, see Vinzent 2014:272–274; Bilby SGC at *Ev 23:32–33, Lk2 23:39–43. being earlier than canonical Luke (and likely also canonical Matthew), but not (as Crossan would have it), the *Ur-Gospel*, see Bilby 2013:29, 39–43, 336–337.
210. Thereafter in ClemAlex, *Strom.* 2.9.41.4, 6.15.131.
211. Not to be confused with βιβλίδιον / *biblidion* / “little book”, attested in PLille1.7.7 (3rd c. BCE), according to the LSJ entry, and also used by Ps-Demosthenes (*Dionysodorum* 1), Antiphanes, and other ancient Greek authors.
212. The lemma is a loanword from the Latin *raeda*. In the TLG results, this lemma appears together with a named entity used by the astrologer and geographer Ptolemy in his *Geographia* (6.7.41; Grasshoff & Stückelberger 2:634–635). Ptolemy presents Παῖδα (Ῥέδα) / *Hraida* (*Hreda*) as the name of a city, together with its coordinates, located in the southern Arabian peninsula, in what is today Yemen. After Hippolytus' close parallel with Revelation, the Latin loanword in Greek does not appear again until John Lydus, *De mensibus* 1.32, in the 6th century CE.
213. Origen subsequently and repeatedly comments on Titus 3:11.
214. Next quoted by Irenaeus, *AH* 1.1.6. The generally accepted form is διακᾱθαίρω, a form that goes back to Pherecydes, Aristophanes, and Plato, and continues well into the Common Era, including Luke 3:17.
215. μοςχοποιέω / *moschopoieō* does not appear in any digitized Greek papyri or inscriptions, strengthening the case for Justin as the lemma's originator.

216. Among other texts with possible roots in the 2nd century CE, it also appears in Ps-Clem, *Hom.* 2.44.2.
217. Also attested in: a fragment attributed by Eusebius to Heggesippus (Diekamp & Funk 1913:216); Ps-Clem, *Hom.* 16.21.4; ClemAlex, *Strom.* 3.1.3.4; Ign13, *Philad.* 5.2.
218. Also attested four times by Origen.
219. Attested also by Hippolytus, *Cant.* 20.1, *Dan.* 4.18, and Origen, *Cels.* 2.49.
220. Note that several cognate words appear in the *Fabulae* of Aesop. Note also that Klinghardt is the only editor to restore this word for Marcion's *Evangelion*, a position that my stylometric research has found to be highly unlikely.
221. The Attic and far more commonplace Hellenistic lemma is spelled πατραλοίας / *patraloias*. Only apparently with Origen around the mid-3rd century CE does the new spelling in the Pastorals come into wider use.
222. This new, abbreviated spelling for πιθάνος / *pithanos* seems to appear first in canonical 1Cor 2:4, whereas Marcionite 1Cor 2:4 uses πειθῶ / *peithō* / "persuasion" (as art rather than as Goddess), a usage in evidence as early as Aeschylus, *Fragmenta* Tetralogy 36 play B fr. 394. It is possible that the canonical redactor introduced the new form as a spelling mistake, using πειθοῖ[ς] instead of πειθανοῖς as the dative plural adjective. πειθός as a misspelling of πίθος / *pithos* / "jar" is attested in 201 CE at Oxyrhynchus, *psi.13.1328*.
223. This derives from περικρύπτω / *perikruptō*, but the traditional spelling remained common in Late Antiquity.
224. προαιτίαομαι / *proaitiaomai* appears only 20 times in the entire TLG, all apparently by Christian authors, and most of which are quotations of Rom 3:9.
225. Derived from the previous lemma spelled τροφοφορέω / *trophophoreō*, evident in LXX Deut 1:31 *bis*, 2Mac 7:27. Origen interestingly used the τροπ- / *trop*-spelling when quoting LXX Deut 1:31 in his polemic against Celsus, which could be worth considering as a tell of his editorial work on Acts, particularly given his particular affinity for this lemma (19 TLG hits!)
226. ὑπερπερισεύω / *hyperperisseuō* does not occur prior to canonical NT texts, and is first confirmed and received by Origen in *Rom.com.* 5.21. Our team re-

stored this in our TANZ edition, following the initial assessment of the lemma in CPCNT 526. Tertullian attests *superabundaret* in (*Marc.* 5.13.10), so this lemma on its face makes sense. However, based on broader diachronic patterns, it is less likely than another candidate. ὑπερπλεονάζω / *hyperpleonadzō*. In CPCNT, the latter lemma was indexed, but only for 1Tim 1:14. However, it is also clearly used in the *Psalms of Solomon* 5.16 (1st BCE – 1st CE), Heron Mech., *Pneum.* 1.10 (1st–2nd CE), *Hermas* 34.6, and Valens, *Anthol.* 2.22, 3.9, App 11.1 (152–165 CE). Neither lemma is evident in searches of major databases of Greek papyri and inscriptions. Given the preponderance of evidence, greater weight should be given to the second lemma and thus to an alternative reconstruction: ὑπερπλεόνασεν / *huperepleonasen*. This happens to be the exact form found in 1Tim 1:14 and *Hermas* 34.6, both of which make sense as downstream receptions of Marcionite Rom 5:21.

227. Among the canonical Gospels, this word appears only in the frontloaded Johannine temple cleansing and is an NT *hapax*. As LSJ notes, it is a loanword from the Lat. *flagellum*, and later came to mean the “name of a weight”, citing φ. σιδαρᾶ β΄ Petersen-Luschan Reisen in Lykien No.77a (iv A. D.). The word may appear, but has to be partly supplied, in SEG 7:372 – PH320613 – Dura-Europos – 2nd CE. Origen’s obsession with this lemma makes him a prime candidate as the redactor who added it.

228. *Test.Benj.* 12.1 is another possible candidate for the earliest use of this lemma and/or earliest reception of an NT usage. The preceding cognate term, over which Origen was apparently obsessed, favors this classification. The usage in *Test.Benj.* is dramatic. Joseph tells Benjamin about his brothers, that “[o]ne of them, stripping me of my tunic, gave me a loin-girdle, and flagellating me, said to walk” / εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποδύσας με τὸν χιτῶνα ἔδωκέ μοι περιζῶμα, καὶ φραγελλώσας με εἶπε τρέχειν (De Jonge 1978:168). Note that the translator of OTP 2:825, H.C. Kee, either uses a wildly text or badly mistranslates the subject, having one of the Ishmaelites beat Joseph, not one of his brothers. The lemma is also used in *Act.Paul.Thec.* fr. 1 and sec. 21, and also may be partly attested in one Greek papyrus, bkt 9 60 – TM 63371 – 100–199 CE.

229. The term also occurs in chronologically uncertain texts: *Apoc.Elij.* fr. c; *Apoc.Esdr.* 4.31; *Ps-Clem, hom.* 2.17.5; *Ign13, Ant.* 9.5.
230. The common spelling from Homer through Late Antiquity is ἐρευνάω / *ereunaō*. LXX Deut 13:14[15] in Ralphs's edition has a form with this spelling, ἐραυνήσεις / *eraunēseis*, but there are variants here: ἐκζητήσεις / *ekdzētēseis* and ἐτάσεις / *etaseis*. See Wevers 1978:17, 124. Given the peculiarity of the spelling, its prevalence in the canonical redaction, and the theme of searching the scriptures for Jesus (Jn 5:39), this seems to me a highly likely proto-Orthodox revision to LXX Deut that creates a lexical bridge between NT and OT. The same spelling shift is also evident in the lemma ἐξερευνάω (standard) to ἐξεραυνάω (canonical NT). Perhaps a play on words with the verb "to strike with thunderbolts" / κεραυνόω / *keraunoō* was involved.
231. Variants in spelling and gender, as well as overlapping noun and adjective lemmas make this a bit complex. Σηρικός as a masculine noun is first attested three different times in the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* (39, 49, 64), which dates "without any doubt to the middle of the first century A.D.", specifically, "between A.D. 40 and 70", based on direct knowledge of the sequence of Nabatean kings (Casson 2012:7). Σηρική as a feminine noun is first attested by Teucer of Babylon, (duodecim signis, Boll 1908:204). σηρικός as an adjective probably occurs first in Strabo, *Geog.* 15.1.20 (early 1st century CE), afterwards in Josephus (*bell.* 7.127), Plutarch (*conjug.prae.* 145E; *Pyth.orac.* 396B), and other pre-Hadrianic texts. But σιρικός as an adjective apparently first occurs in either Revelation or *ProtJas*, whichever comes first.
232. 2022:184.
233. p.oxy 9 1184, letter 6a. See papyri.info/dclp/60175. Greek inscriptions with the adverbial lemma do not seem to be in evidence.
234. Boissonade 1819:255.
235. This work is known in two major recensions, Recension A, or the longer recension, and Recension B, or the shorter recension. Scholars are mixed about which recension is earlier, or whether both deviate from an older original. See the summary of the history of scholarship in Alison 2003:12–16. It is quite in-

triguing in this regard that only recension B has several striking parallels with canonical Luke; see Heide 2014:40. Even while favoring the view that Recension A is generally older than Recension B, Alison details an extensive list of words and phrases in Recension A that show that its Greek idiom is “on the whole later” than its counterpart, and possibly “Christian and/or medieval” (Alison 2013:16–19).

236. Both Pauline verses are missing from Marcion’s *Apostolos*. The word also appears in the insecurely attributed and dated Ps-Clem, 2Cor 1.3, 1.5, 9.7, 11.6, 15.2, and ActsJohn 81, before appearing three times in ClemAlex’s *Stromateis*.
237. Both canonical Pauline uses are missing from Marcion’s *Apostolos*.
238. See esp. Klinghardt 2021; Trobisch 1989, 2000, 2023; Vinzent 2023.
239. See esp. Walsh 2021.
240. The inscription can be confirmed at search.inscriptionsisraelpalestine.org/inscriptions/jeru0591.
241. van der Horst 1991:92–93
242. *Ibid.*, 105–106
243. Boissonade 1819:199.
244. PHI316381, line 233.
245. JRS 18.1928.153,14 — SEG 7.825.
246. A second inscription, Lesbos — Mytilene — ca. 29 BC — PH74715, also seems to use the noun lemma, not the verb.
247. It also appears in a late, Christian (501–700 CE) Greek papyrus, sb 26 16576, on which see papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;26;16576.
248. See papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;8;1782.
249. TM 19474 — papyri.info/ddbdp/p.giss;1;87.
250. *Fragmenta*, Jacoby 3c,688,F, frag. 14, line 75. It also made a pre-1st century CE appearance in LXX Ecclesiastes 8:11.
251. The first of these is difficult to determine without further research: Acts of Phillip 46–50; Symeon the Mesopotamian, *hom.* 26.1.9; twice in the *Epistula canonica* associated with Peter I of Alexandria, and 12 times (!) in the Acts of

John by Prochorus, which Spittler (2023:272–273) dates between the early 5th and early 7th century.

252. But not subsequently in the TLG until 9th century CE and later!

253. E.g.: EKM 1 1 — SEG 27.261 — SEG 43.381 — PH149475; Mel. 11 44,A2 — SEG 42.558 — PH152405.

254. Viereck & Roos 1962:16.

255. anthologiagraeca.org/passages/urn:cts:greekLit:tlg7000.tlg001.ag:9.22. The excellent Anthologia Graeca website has a cropped manuscript image preview and link to Cod. Palatinus 23, p. 361, along with a transcription and several translations. It confirms this lemma in the TLG text from Beckby 1968, vol. 3.

256. Plastira-Valkanou 2023.

257. *Ibid.*

258. See Dickey 2014:340 on the authenticity of the first *Περὶ σχημάτων* / *Peri figura* / *On Compounding*, which is preserved only in fragments and should not be confused with the longer form work of the same name, but which is about rhetorical figures.

259. On Plutarch's attestation, see Copley 1942:97, citing *Amat.* 8.753B.

260. Battezzato 2009:404.

Bibliography

- [1] Adamczewski, Bartosz. 2013. *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels*. European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions, vol. 3. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- [2] Adamczewski, Bartosz. 2014. *The Gospel of Mark: A Hypertextual Commentary*. European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions, vol. 8. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- [3] Adamczewski, Bartosz. 2014. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Hypertextual Commentary*. European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions, vol. 16. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- [4] Adamczewski, Bartosz. 2016. *The Gospel of Luke: A Hypertextual Commentary*. European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions, vol. 13. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- [5] Adamczewski, Bartosz. 2018. *The Gospel of John: A Hypertextual Commentary*. European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions, vol. 17. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- [6] Adamczewski, Bartosz. 2023. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Hypertextual Commentary*. European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions, vol. 31. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- [7] Aland, Kurt et al. 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- [8] Allert, Craig D. 2005. *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. 64. Leiden: Brill.
- [9] Amato, E., ed. 2005. *Favorinos d'Arles. Œuvres. Introduction générale. Témoignages. Discours aux Corinthiens. Sur la fortune*. Trans. Y. Julien. Paris.
- [10] Arnim, J. von. 1903. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner.
- [11] Austin, C. and R. Kassel. 1991. *Poetae Comici Graeci (PCG)*. Vol. 2. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- [12] Bagatti, B. 1979. "San Giustino nella sua patria". *AugR* 19 319–331.

- [13] Barrett, C. K. 2002. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Shorter Commentary*. London: Continuum.
- [14] Barigazzi, A. 1966. *Favorino di Arelate. Opere*. Florence.
- [15] ———. 2004. *The Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- [16] Battezzato, Luigi. 2009. “The *Fragmentum Grenfellianum*: Metrical Analysis, Ancient Punctuation, and the Sense of an Ending”. Pages 403–420 in *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*. Edited by J.C.R. Cousland and J. Hume. Mnemosyne, Supplements, vol. 314. Leiden: Brill.
- [17] Baumann, Mario, Kemezis, Adam M., and Maria-Eirini Zacharioudaki, eds. 2025. *Herodian: Historiography and Literature at the End of the High Empire*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- [18] Beckby, H. 1965/1968. *Anthologia Graeca*. 4 vols. 2nd ed. Munich: Heimeran.
- [19] BeDuhn, Jason D. 2013. *The First New Testament*. Salem: Polebridge. ARK: [13960/s2m7q24b0n0](#)
- [20] Bekker, Imanuel. 1833. *Harpocraton et Moeris*. Berlin.
- [21] Berenson Maclean, Jennifer K. and Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, ed. and trans. 2001. *Flavius Philostratus: Heroikos*. SBLWGRW 1. Atlanta: SBL Press.
bibitemBethe-1900-1901 Bethe, Ericus. 1900/1901. *Pollucis onomasticon*, 3 vols. Lexicographi Graeci 9.1–9.3. Leipzig: Teubner.
- [22] Bilby, Mark G. 2013. *As the Bandit Will I Confess You: Luke 23, 39–43 in Early Christian Interpretation*. Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 13. Strasbourg: Strasbourg UP.
- [23] Bilby, Mark G. 2020/2025. *The First Gospel: The Gospel of the Poor*. 5 vols. Kansas City, KS: Clavis Consulting, LLC, Kansas.
- [24] Bilby, Mark G. 2026. *Apostle Paul Atrides*. Kansas City, KS: Clavis Imprints.
- [25] Bilby, Mark G. & Anna Lefferatou. 2022. “A Dramatic Heist of Epic Proportion: Iphigenia among the Taurians in the Acts of the Apostles”. *HTHR* 115.4 495–516. DOI: [10.1017/S0017816022000293](#)
- [26] Black, Matthew. 1970. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. PVTG 3. Leiden: Brill.

- [27] Blank, D.L. “Apollonius Dyscolus”. Pages 708–730 in *Sprache und Literatur (Einzelne Autoren seit der hadrianischen Zeit und Allgemeines zur Literatur des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts)*. ANRW 34.1. Edited by W. Haase. Boston: de Gruyter. ISBN 9783110103762.
- [28] Boissonade, Jean François. 1819. *Herodiani partitiones*. London. Handle: [2027/hvd.hxj9az](#)
- [29] Boll, F. 1908. *Codices Germanici*. Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum, vol. 7. Brussels: Lamertin.
- [30] Bosworth, A.B. 1972. “Arrian’s Literary Development”. *Classical Quarterly* 22.1 163–185.
- [31] Bosworth, A.B. 1982. “Review of *Arrian of Nicomedia*, by Philip A. Stadter”. *Phoenix* 36.2 176–180.
- [32] Bouras-Vallianatos, Petros and Barbara Zipser. 2019. *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Galen*. Brill’s Companions to Classical Reception Series, vol. 17. Leiden: Brill.
- [33] Bowersock, Glen W. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- [34] Bowersock, Glen W. 2004. “Artemidorus and the Second Sophistic”. Pages 53–64 in *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Edited by B. E. Borg. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- [35] Bremmer, Jan N. 1998. “Aëtius, Arius Didymus and the Transmission of Doxography”. *Mnemosyne* 51 .
- [36] Brioso Sánchez, Miguel. 1970. *Anacreonta: Un ensayo para su datación*. Salamanca.
- [37] Bull, Jack. 2023. “A Textual Analysis and Comparison of the Various Textual Witnesses of Ignatius’ Letters to Polycarp, the Ephesians and the Romans”. PhD thesis. King’s College London.
- [38] Burke, Tony. 2010. *De Infantiae Iesu Evangelium Thomae Graece*. CCSA 17. Turnhout: Brepols.
- [39] Campbell, David A., ed. and trans. 1988. *Anacreon. Greek Lyric, Volume II: Anacreon, Anacreontea, Choral Lyric from Olympus to Alcman*. LCL 143. London: Harvard UP.

- [40] Casson, Lionel. 2012. *The Periplus Maris Erythraei: Text with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- [41] Charlesworth, James, ed. 1983. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1. New York: Doubleday.
- [42] Charlesworth, James, ed. 1985. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2. New York: Doubleday.
- [43] Chronopoulos, Stylianos & Dirk Spöri. 2023. "Citations in Pollux' Onomasticon: Annotation, Visualization, Interpretation". *Digital Classics Online* 9 30–50.
- [44] Collins, John. 1983. "The Sibylline Oracles". Pages 317–472 in OTP2.
- [45] Copley, Frank Olin. 1942. "On the Origin of Certain Features of the Paraclausithyron". *TPAPA* 73 96–703.
- [46] Copley, Frank Olin. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. American Philological Association Monographs, vol. 17. New York.
- [47] Cramer, J.A. 1838. *Catena Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- [48] Crismani, D. 2002. *Elio Promoto Alessandrino, Manuale della salute (Δυναμειρόν)*. Hellenica: Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica 9. Alexandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- [49] Cumont, F. 1929. *Codices Parisini*. Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 8.1. Brussels: Lamertin, 1929.
- [50] Cureton, William. 1849. *Corpus Ignatianum: A Complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles*. Berlin: Asher and Co. ARK: [13960/t9n30r86s](#)
- [51] De Jonge, Marinus. 1978. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG, vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.
- [52] De Jonge, Marinus. 1985. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill.
- [53] Dickey, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises*. New York: Oxford UP.

- [54] Dickey, Eleanor. 2014. "A Catalogue of Works Attributed to the Grammarian Herodian". *Classical Philology* 109 325–345.
- [55] Dickey, Eleanor. 2023. *Latin Loanwords in Ancient Greek: A Lexicon and Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- [56] Diekamp, F. & F.X. Funk. 1913. *Patres apostolici*, vol. 2. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Laupp.
- [57] Diller, H. 1941. "Philumenos 7". Pages 209–211 in *Real-Encyclopadie* 20.2. Edited by A. Paul and G. Wissowa. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.
- [58] Dindorf, Guilielmi. 1823. *Herodianus V Arietas Lectionis ad Arcadium; Favorini Eclogae*. Grammatici Graeci 1. Leipzig. [13960/t1sf36d34](#)
- [59] Domazakis, Nikolaos. 2018. "The Neologisms in 2 Maccabees". *Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia* 23. PhD diss. Lund University.
- [60] Durand, Georges-Matthieu de, ed. 1964. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie: Deux dialogues christologiques*. SC 97. Paris: Éditions du Cerf. ARK: [13960/t1fk2rk0f](#)
- [61] Durling, R.J. 1993. *A Dictionary of Medical Terms in Galen*. Leiden.
- [62] Dyck, Andrew R. 1981. "Notes on the Epimerismoi Attributed to Herodian". *Hermes* 109 225–235.
- [63] Dyck, Andrew R. 1993. "Aelius Herodian: Recent Studies and Prospects for Future Research". Pages 772–794 in *Sprache und Literatur (Einzelne Autoren seit der hadrianischen Zeit und Allgemeines zur Literatur des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts)*. ANRW 34.1. Edited by W. Haase. Boston: de Gruyter. ISBN 9783110103762.
- [64] Ehrman, Bart D. 2003. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 1. LCL 24. CambBriosio Sánchezridge: Harvard UP.
- [65] Elliott, J.K. 1993. *Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- [66] Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1985. *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV*. Anchor Bible, vol. 28a. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- [67] Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2010. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

- [68] Forbes, Peter Barr Reid, Robert Browning, & Nigel Wilson. “Herodian (1), grammarian”. Oxford Classical Dictionary. [10.1093/acre-fore/9780199381135.013.3064](https://doi.org/10.1093/acre-fore/9780199381135.013.3064)
- [69] Fowler, H.W. and F.G. Fowler. 1905. *The Works of Lucian of Samosata*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- [70] Glover, Daniel. 2025. *Jesus and Other Sons of God*. Waco, TX: Baylor UP.
- [71] Grasshoff, G. & A. Stückelberger. 2006. *Klaudios Ptolemaios Handbuch der Geographie*. 2 vols. Basel: Schwabe.
- [72] Haenchen, Ernst. 1971. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- [73] Hahn, Augustus. 1832. “Evangelium Marcionis ex Auctoritate Veterum Monumentorum”. Pages 401–486 in *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*. Edited by J.C. Thilo. Lipsius: F.C.G. Vogel. ARK: [13960/t23b6zq5d](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:5:1-3960-t23b6zq5d)
- [74] Hamman, A. 1995. “Essai de chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres de Justin”. *AugR* 35 231–239.
- [75] Harnack, A. von. 1924. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- [76] Hayduck, M. 1891. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis metaphysica commentaria*. Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 1. Berlin: Reimer.
- [77] Hegedus, Tim. 2007. *Early Christianity and Ancient Astrology*. Patristic Studies, vol. 6. New York: Peter Lang.
- [78] Heide, Martin. 2014. *Das Testament Abraham: Edition und Übersetzungen der arabischen und äthiopischen Versionen*. Aethiopistische Forschungen, Band 76. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- [79] Heilan, Stephan. 2015. *Hadriani genitura — Die astrologischen Fragmente des Antigonos von Nikaia*. Band 1: Edition und Übersetzung. TKAR 43. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- [80] Hense, O. 1909. *Teletis reliquiae*. 2d ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1909.
- [81] Hilgard, Alfredus. 1889. *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones; Georgii Choerobosci Scholia; Sophronii Patriarchae Alexandrini Excerpta*. Grammatici Graeci 4.1. Leipzig: Teubner. ARK: [13960/t4bp4pb24](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:5:1-3960-t4bp4pb24)

- [82] Holl, Karl, and Jürgen Dummer, ed. 1980. *Epiphanius II: Panarion haer.* 34–64. GCS 31. 2nd ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- [83] Hoskier, H.C. 1928. *The Complete Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P.
- [84] Hude, Karl. 1958. *Areataeus*. 2nd ed. Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- [85] Humann, Carl, et al. 1898. *Judeich Altertümer von Hierapolis*. Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. 4th supplement. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer.
- [86] Ihm, Sibylle. 1995. Der Traktat περὶ τῶν ἰοβόλων θηρίων καὶ δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων des sog. Aelius Promotus. Serta Graeca. Beiträge zur Erforschung griechischer Texte 4. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- [87] Ihm, Sibylle. 1996. “Archigenes als Verfasser des Traktates περὶ τῶν ἰοβόλων θηρίων καὶ δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων? Eine Antwort auf Erwin Rohdes These”. *Sudhoffs Archiv* 80.2 220–228.
- [88] Isaac, E. 1983. “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch”. Pages 5–90 in OTP1.
- [89] Itter, Andrew C. 2009. *Esoteric Teaching in the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, vol. 97. Leiden: Brill.
- [90] Johnson, M. D. 1985. “Life of Adam and Eve”. Pages 249–295 in OTP2.
- [91] Jones, Christopher P. 1966. “Toward a Chronology of Plutarch’s Works”. *Journal of Roman Studies* 56 61–74.
- [92] Jones, Christopher P. “Philostratus’ Heroikos and Its Setting in Reality”. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 121 141–149.
- [93] Jones, Ken. 2011. *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70: Apocalypses and Related Pseudepigrapha*. Boston: Brill.
- [94] Jones, A.H.M., Martindale, J.R., and J. Morris. 1971. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Vol. 1: A.D. 260–395. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- [95] Kaibel, George. 1887. *Athenaei Navcratitae Dipnosophistarvm*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner. ARK: vol. 1 [13960/t7vm4m300](#); vol. 2 [13960/t9s18b37n](#); vol. 3 [13960/t1wd46p9k](#)

- [96] Keaney, J.J., ed. 1991. *Harpocraton: Lexeis of the Ten Orators*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- [97] Keener, Craig S. 2013. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- [98] Kirkland, N. Bryant. 2023. “‘The Friend-Making Table’: Variety and the Definition of Friendship in Plutarch’s *Table Talk*”. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 143 96–104.
- [99] Klinghardt, Matthias. 2021. *The Oldest Gospel*. 2 vols. Leuven: Peeters.
- [100] Kock, Theodor. 1880, 1884, 1888. *Comicorum atticorum fragmenta*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner. ARK: vol. 1 [13960/t2t43m69s](#); vol. 2 [13960/t5w66cm06](#); vol. 3 [13960/t1zc7tw4q](#)
- [101] Kramer, J. & B. Krebber. 1972. *Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes, pt. 4*. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, vol. 16. Bonn: Habelt.
- [102] Kroll, W. 1900. *Codices Vindobonenses*. Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 6. Brussels: Lamertin.
- [103] Kroll W. & A. Olivieri. *Codices Veneti*. Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum 2. Brussels: Lamertin.
- [104] Kučera, Peter. 2025. *Looking for the Bethsaida of the Gospels*. Leiden: Brill.
- [105] Kühn, Karl Gottlob. 1821–1833. *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*. 22 vols. Leipzig: Knobloch.
- [106] La Roche, J. 1863. *Παρεκβολαὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ῥήματος ἐκ τῶν Ἡρωδιανοῦ*. Jahresbericht über das k.k. akademische Gymnasium in Wien, 1862–63. Vienna.
- [107] Lehrs, Karl. 1848. *Herodiani scripta tria emendatiora*. 2d ed. Königsberg.
- [108] Lentz, Augustus. 1867a. *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae*. Grammatici Graeci. Vol. 3.1. Leipzig: Teubner. ARK: [13960/t8pc3kx9m](#)
- [109] Lentz, Augustus. 1867b. *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae*. Grammatici Graeci. Vol. 3.2. Leipzig: Teubner. ARK: [13960/t4sj2345r](#)

- [110] Leon, Daniel W. 2021. *Arrian the Historian: Writing the Greek Past in the Roman Empire*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- [111] Litwa, M. David. 2018. *Hermetica II: The Excerpts of Stobaeus, Papyrus Fragments, and Ancient Testimonies in an English Translation with Notes and Introductions*. New York: Cambridge UP.
- [112] Livesey, Nina. 2024. *The Letters of Paul in their Roman Literary Context: Re-assessing Apostolic Authorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- [113] Ludwich, Arthur and August Lentz. 1905. *Herodiani Technici Reliuiarum Supplementum*. 2d ed. Königsberg. ARK: [13960/t0sr3kk28](#)
- [114] MacDonald, Dennis R. 2015. *Luke and Vergil: Imitations of Classical Greek Literature*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- [115] Mansfeld, Jaap. 2016. “Theodoret of Cyrrhus’s *Therapy of Greek Diseases* as a Source for the Aëtian *Placita*”. Pages 151–169 in *Studies in Philo in Honor of David Runia*. Edited by G.E. Sterling. *Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*. Vol. 28. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- [116] Mason, Steve. 2003. *Josephus and the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- [117] Meineke, A. 1840. *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*. Vol. 3. Berlin: Reimer. ARK: [13960/t3xs5z18q](#)
- [118] Minns, Dennis & Paul Parvis. 2009. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. OECT. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- [119] Moles, J.L. 1985. “The Interpretation of the ‘Second Preface’ in Arrian’s *Anabasis*”. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105 162–168.
- [120] Montanari, Franco and Fausto Montana. 2022. *History of Ancient Greek Literature*. 2 vols. New York: Routledge.
- [121] Candida, Moss. 2013. *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom*. San Francisco: HarperOne.
- [122] Moyer, Ian S. 2015. “A Revised Astronomical Dating of Thessalus’s *De virtutibus herbarum*”. Pages 437–449 in *The Frontiers of Ancient Science: ESsays in Honor of Heinrich von Staden*. Edited by Brooke Holmes. Berlin: de Gruyter.

- [123] Musurillo, Herbert. 1972. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. OECT. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- [124] Nasrallah, Laura Salah. 2008. "The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Cities, and Hadrian's Panhellenion." *JBL* 127 533–566. DOI: [10.2307/25610139](https://doi.org/10.2307/25610139)
- [125] Neugebauer, Otto. 1954. "The Chronology of Vettius Valens' *Anthologiae*". *HTHR* 47.1 65–67.
- [126] Neyrey, Jerome H. 2021. *2 Peter, Jude*. Anchor Bible, vol. 37C. New Haven: Yale UP.
- [127] Nicolotti, Andrea. 2019. "Il Vangelo di Marcione". Pages 1–233 in *Il Vangelo di Marcione*. Edited by C. Gianotto and A. Nicolotti. Turin: Einaudi.
- [128] Obbink, Dirk. 2006. *Anubio, Carmen astrologicum elegiacum*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Munich: K.G. Saur.
- [129] Oudot, Estelle. 2008. "Aelius Aristides and Thucydides: Some Remarks about the Panathenaic Oration". Pages 31–49 in *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome, and the Gods*. Edited by W.V. Harris and Brooke Holmes. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, vol. 33. Leiden: Brill.
- [130] Page, T.E., et al, ed. 1959. *Lucian*. Vol. 6. Trans. K. Kilburn. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann.
- [131] Pervo, Richard. 2006. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge.
- [132] ———. 2009. *Acts: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- [133] Pingree, David. 1976a. *Dorothei Sidonii carmen astrologicum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- [134] Pingree, David. 1976b. "Thessalus Astrologus". Pages 83–86 in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations*. Edited by Paul Oskar Kristeller. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America P.
- [135] Pingree, David. 1986. *Vettii Valentis Antiocheni anthologiarum libri novem*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- [136] Pitra, J.B. 1884. *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, vol. 2. Paris: Tusculum.

- [137] Plastira-Valkanou, Maria. 2023. “Weaver of Words: A Self-referential Reading of Anthologia Palatina 6.247”. In “Τέρα: Studies in honor of Professor Menelaos Christopoulos.” Edited by A. Papachrysostomou, A.P. Antonopoulos, A-F Mitsis, F Papadimitriou, and P. Taktikou. *Classics@ 25*, special issue. nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HLNC.ESSAY:103900197
- [138] Pomeroy, Sarah B. 1999. “Reflections on Plutarch, Advice to the Bride and Groom: Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed”. Pages 33–58 in *Plutarch’s Advice to the Bride and Groom and a Consolation to His Wife: English Translations, Commentary, Interpretive Essays, and Bibliography*. Edited by Sarah B. Pomeroy. New York: Oxford UP.
- [139] Popescu, Valentina. 2016. *Lucian’s Saturnalia: Rewriting the Literary Nomoi*. *Illinois Classical Studies* 41.1 219–228.
- [140] Powell, John U. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae, 323–146 A.C.* Oxford: Clarendon. ARK: [13960/t74v47583](https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HLNC.ESSAY:13960/t74v47583)
- [141] Race, William H., ed. 2023. *Maximus of Tyre: Philosophical Orations*. LCL 553. London: Harvard UP.
- [142] Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. 1979. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- [143] Reichmann, S. 1963. *Das byzantinische Alexandergedicht nach dem codex Marcianus 408 herausgegeben*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 13. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain.
- [144] Robbins, F. E., ed. 1964. *Ptolemy: Tetrabiblos*. LCL 435. London: Harvard UP.
- [145] Rokéah, David. 2002. *Justin Martyr and the Jews*. JCP 5. Leiden: Brill.
- [146] Roth, Dieter T. 2015. *The Text of Marcion’s Gospel*. Leiden: Brill.
- [147] Routh, M.J. 1846. *Reliquiae sacrae*. 2nd ed. Vol 2. Oxford: Oxford UP. ARK: [13960/t08w44247](https://nrs.harvard.edu/URN-3:HLNC.ESSAY:13960/t08w44247)
- [148] Salazar, C.F. 1998. “Greek Toxicology. Review of *Der Traktat περί τῶν ἰοβόλων θηρίων καὶ δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων* des sog. Aelius Promotus”, by Sibylle Ihm. *The Classical Review* 48.1 153–154.
- [149] Sanders, E.P. 1983. “Testament of Abraham”. Pages 871–902 in OTP1.

- [150] Schnabel, Eckhard J. 2012. *Acts*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 5. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- [151] Schneider, Richard and Gustav Uhlig. 1878. *Apollonii Dyscoli Quae Supersunt. Grammatici Graeci*. Vol. 2.1. Leipzig: Teubner. ARK: [13960/t7cr6f087](#)
- [152] Schneider, Richard and Gustav Uhlig. 1910. *Apollonii Dyscoli Quae Supersunt. Grammatici Graeci*. Vol. 2.2–3. Leipzig: Teubner. ARK: [13960/s278b0bxxrw2](#)
- [153] Slusser, Michael, ed. 2003. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. Trans. Thomas B. Falls. Rev. and intro Thomas B. Halton. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- [154] Snyder, Julia A. and Slavomír Čéplö. 2023. “Acts of Christ and Peter in Rome.” Pages 435–464 in vol. 3 of *New Testament Apocrypha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*. Edited by Tony Burke with Brent Landau. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- [155] Spittler, Janet E. 2023. “The Acts of John by Prochorus.” Pages 262–361 in *New Testament Apocrypha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, vol. 3. Edited by Tony Burke. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- [156] Stadter, Phillip A. 1980. *Arrian of Nicomedia*. Chapel Hill: UNC P.
- [157] Swanson, Reuben J., ed. 1995. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus. Luke*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P.
- [158] Syme, Ronald. 1982. “The Career of Arrian”. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86 181–211.
- [159] Talbert, Charles H. 1997. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Reading the New Testament Series. New York: Crossroad.
- [160] Tekiner, Halil. 2015. “Aretaeus of Cappadocia and His Treatises on Diseases”. *Turk Neurosurg* 25.3 508–512. DOI: [10.5137/1019-5149.JTN.12347-14.0](#)
- [161] Tischendorf, Constantine von, ed. 1869–1872. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient.
- [162] Trapp, Michael B. 1994. *Dissertationes*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana Series. Stuttgart: Teubner.

- [163] Trapp, Michael, ed. 2017. *Aelius Aristides: Orations*. Vol. 1. LCL 533. London: Harvard UP.
- [164] Trobisch, David. 1989. *Die Entstehung der Paulusbriefsammlung: Studien zu den Anfängen christlicher Publizistik*. NTOA 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- [165] Trobisch, David. 2000. *The First Edition of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- [166] Trobisch, David. 2023. *The Origin of Christian Scripture: The Evolution of the New Testament Canon in the Second Century*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- [167] Tromp, Johannes. 2005. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*. PVTG 6. Leiden: Brill.
- [168] Tsutsui, Kenji. 1992. "Das Evangelium Marcions: Ein neuer Versuch der Textrekonstruktion". *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 18 67–132.
- [169] van der Horst, Pieter W. 1980. *Aelius Aristides and the New Testament*. *Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, vol. 6. Leiden: Brill.
- [170] van der Horst, Pieter W. 1991. *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An Introductory Survey of a Millenium of Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 BCE – 700 CE)*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- [171] Viereck, R., A.G. Roos, & E. Gabba, ed. *Appiani Historia Romana*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner.
- [172] Vinzent, Markus. 2014. *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*. *Studia Patristica Supplements*, vol. 2. Leuven: Peeters.
- [173] Vinzent, Markus. 2019. *Writing the History of Early Christianity: From Reception to Retrospection*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- [174] Vinzent, Markus. 2023. *Christ's Torah: The Making of the New Testament in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- [175] Vinzent, Markus, with Mark G. Bilby, Jack Bull, and K. Lance Lotharp. 2025. *Die älteste Sammlung der paulinischen Briefe und die Entstehung der kanonischen Paulusbriefsammlung*. TANZ 72.1–3. Tübingen: Narr Franke.

- [176] Walsh, Robyn Faith. 2021. *The Origins of Early Christian Literature: Contextualizing the New Testament within Greco-Roman Literary Culture*. New York: Cambridge UP.
- [177] Wehrli, Fritz. 1967. *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*. Vol. 2: Aristoxenos. 2nd ed. Basel: Schwabe. ARK: [13960/t52g59b73](#)
- [178] West, Michael L. 1984. *Carmina Anacreonta*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- [179] Wevers, John William. 1978. *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- [180] White, Horace, ed. 1912. *Appian's Roman History*. 4 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann.
- [181] Zahn, Theodor. 1888/1892. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. 2 vols. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert. ARK: [13960/t8cf9s958](#)