

METRICAL FRAGMENTS IN III MACCABEES.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D., ETC.

IN the fifth chapter of the *Third Book of Maccabees*, where the story, more or less apocryphal, is told of the attempts made by Ptolemy Philopator to destroy the Egyptian Jews in the Hippodrome at Alexandria, and of the various Divine interpositions by which their fate is averted, the religious novelist comes to the point where the tyrant, filled with rage, begins to threaten his unfortunate underlings. He is especially mad with Hermon, the keeper of his elephants, who had been ordered to intoxicate the beasts with wine and frankincense, and then turn them on the unfortunate Jews that they might be trampled to death. The plan had miscarried in various ways through miraculous intervention; amongst other things, the tyrant overslept himself, and lost the memory of what he had ordered: and in the end a Dioscuric epiphany, similar to what occurred in the *Second Book of Maccabees*, in the story of Heliodorus, relieved the strain on the Jews by turning the elephants on the persecutors.

The language in which the tyrant addresses the unfortunate elephantarch is given as follows in the text of Swete's Septuagint:—

- 30 Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ῥηθεῖσιν πληρωθεὶς βαρεῖ χόλω
διὰ τὸ περὶ τούτων προνοία Θεοῦ διεσκεδάσθαι
πάν αὐτοῦ νόημα, ἐνατενίσας μετὰ ἀπειλῆς εἶπεν·
31 Ὅσοι γονεῖς παρήσαν ἢ παίδων γόνου, τήνδε
θηρσὶν ἀγρίοις ἐσκεύασαν δαψιλῆ θοῖναν
ἀντὶ τῶν ἀνεγκλήτων, ἐμοὶ καὶ προγόνου ἐμοῦ
ἀποδεδειγμένων ὀλοσχερῆ βέβαιαν πίστιν
ἐξοχῶς Ἰουδαίων.

It need hardly be said that this is untranslatable Greek and an impossible text. Swete prints from the Alexandrian MS., because this was the only uncial MS. available in facsimile, and gives notes from the Codex Venetus, which is equally an uncial (though the Oxford editors, Holmes and Parsons, did not know it to be such) and a

far better text. It is quite clear that a new edition of this and other Maccabæe texts will have to be produced. Even with the substitution or assistance of the Codex Venetus, the text is not as good as can be obtained from the cursive MSS., and we have often a better text in Holmes and Parsons than in Swete. So we are not yet very far on in the determination of the text of the LXX. Let us, then, examine the text as printed by Swete, and see if we can throw any light upon it. The difficulty of translation begins with the speech of the tyrant : against this I had noted that the first words were an iambic trimeter, and this is also observed by Emmet in Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, as follows : "The first part of the verse (v. 31) is an iambic, apparently an unidentified quotation from a poet" : we must not, however, edit the line in the form given above, but as in Holmes and Parsons,

Εἶ σοι γονεῖς παρήσαν ἡ παίδων γόνοι (1. γοναί)

and then, with the same authorities, making one small correction (ἐσκεύασ' ἄν for ἐσκεύασαν ἄν), we may continue the narration

τήνδε [οἷ τούσδε] θηρσὶν ἀγρίοις ἐσκεύασ' ἄν δαψιλῆ
θούνην ἀντὶ τῶν ἀνεγκλήτων·

i.e. "If parents or family of yours had been here, I would have made this (or those) into a luxurious banquet for wild beasts, instead of the innocent Jews."

But here a difficulty arises : the elephants were not going to eat the Jews, as if they were lions' meat or leopards' ; they would, at the worst, trample them to death. So the suggestion arises as to whether the quotation from the unknown poet may not have gone further. The speech of the tyrant is certainly very rhythmic, and if he was talking prose, he was not aware of the fact. He very seldom talks ordinary prose, though he manages to present it in official documents. Let us see whether the speech of Ptolemy Philopator can be brought into verse form, without serious alteration of the text. Our first attempt to find the line divisions results as follows :—

Εἶ σοι γονεῖς παρήσαν ἡ παίδων γόνοι,
Τήνδε θηρσὶν ἀγρίοις ἐσκεύασ' ἄν
Δαψιλῆ θούνην ἀντὶ τῶν ἀνεγκλήτων,
'Εμοὶ προγόνοις τ' ἐμοῖς ἀποδεδειγμένων,
'Ολοσχερῆ βεβαίαν πίστιν ἔξοχῶς
'Ιουδαίων·

It will require a very modest array of changes to make this metrical. It is evident that we are dealing with a genuine tragic fragment, capable of restoration with more or less of exactness. We will leave the final form of the restored passage to a later point in the argument.

We now proceed to inquire (i) whether it is possible to identify the author or the work from whom the Hellenistic author of the *Third Book of Maccabees* has pilfered; (ii) whether there are any other metrical fragments in the rest of the book.

We begin with a tentative solution of the first of these points.

What we have before us is a genuine piece of Greek verse, the language of a tyrant put into the mouth of a tyrant: is it possible to identify the speaker?

The author of *Third Maccabees* definitely compares Ptolemy Philopator to Phalaris, the monster of the ancient world, whom Cicero describes as *crudelissimus omnium Tyrannorum*, e.g. v. 20: "The King *with a rage more fierce than Phalaris* said that (the Jews) might thank his sleep for their day's respite".

v. 42. "On this day the King, a *Phalaris in all respects*, was filled with madness, etc."

We notice that our assumed verses (v. 31) *come between the two references to Phalaris*, and the suggestion arises that they may be taken from some Greek poem, of which Phalaris is the central figure. The argument would hold, if our restoration of all the verses except the first should be deemed unsatisfactory: the opening verse by itself would put in a claim not only for a tragic origin, but for an origin in a play where Phalaris was a leading figure.

Leaving this point with its proper indication of uncertainty, let us see if we can get any further support for our thesis. We are assuming the existence of a Greek play in which Phalaris is the leading figure, but of which we do not appear to have any notice in the Greek literature. Our only Phalaris literature is the fictitious correspondence which Bentley made himself immortal in analysing, and the supposed speeches of the tyrant in Lucian. It is precisely from this apocryphal literature that we learn of the existence of tragedies in which Phalaris figures. It is true that they are made out to be contemporary attacks on Phalaris, and Bentley has shown that such tragedies could not have existed at that time of day, and that the correspondence itself is the artificial product of the Hellenistic age: but the references

are at least sufficient to prove the existence of Greek tragedy in which Phalaris figures.

For example, in Ep. 63 addressed to Aristolochus, we have the following allusions to tragedy of the order indicated above: I quote for convenience from Francklin's translation (a very free and easy rendering, which will, however, serve our purpose):—

“If, because I freely pardoned Stesichorus, whom I had taken prisoner, *you think that you may safely write tragedies against me*, believing I must of course treat all poets with the same lenity, you are greatly mistaken; for I do by no means admire all poets, but good ones only: nor forgive all enemies, but (only) the most brave and honourable: whilst you, who are both a vile poet and a contemptible enemy, would most impudently set yourself on a level with Stesichorus in parts and courage. But you shall quickly discern the difference; *not because you have aspersed me in your verses* (for I were the lowest of mankind if such trash could any ways affect me), but for daring to think yourself of the same honour and regard as Stesichorus.” The translation is, as we said, a very free one; the “trash” referred to is in the original *δράματα*!

Here the false epistle is an expansion of the theme which tradition furnished, that Phalaris the tyrant forgave Stesichorus who had written verses against him. According to the author of the Epistles, Aristolochus as well as Stesichorus had been guilty of anti-Phalaris tragedies. Tragedy against Phalaris is assumed as a theme by the epistolographer.

The same thing occurs again in Ep. 97, as follows:—

TO LYSINUS.

“Will there never, then, O Lysinus, be an end to thy rashness? O thou most foolish of men; at thirty years of age to have no more regard to thyself than thus to provoke an enemy so much thy superior; *still continuing to write tragedies* (*ἔπη καὶ τραγωδίας*) *against me*, as if such things could give me the least uneasiness! But take heed to thyself of an end more cruel *than any tragedy* thou couldst ever invent.”

Here again the existence of tragedy in which Phalaris is the central figure is assumed; we may add the name of Lysinus to those of Aristolochus and Stesichorus.

The author of the Epistles of Phalaris is then in evidence for the existence of anti-Phalaris tragedies. They are constantly used as motives in his somewhat jejune compositions.

Let us, then, assume that the author of *III Maccabees* had access to such a tragedy, and borrowed from it. Can we find out anything more about the contents? If we look more closely at the text of the fifth chapter of *III Maccabees*, we shall see in the critical apparatus an extraordinary expansion on the part of one of the cursive MSS. (No. 64) at the end of the twenty-ninth verse. It runs as follows:—

“While King Ptolemy was now recognising, under the influence of the sting of Divine Providence, that he ought to pity the Jewish nation, and was eager for the future to release them, and was counselled thereto by the marvels which had occurred in their case, the company of his friends and princes were displeased and took it very ill. And one of the most honourable among them, named Hermon, who was also a foster-brother (σύντροφος) of the King, ventured to say: Did you not, O King, make the plot against them from the first in these particulars? Take and read what you formerly wrote about them. For, with a wise foresight against their becoming naturally hostile behind our backs through their agreement with our adversaries, on that account you made at the first those decrees which you do not now recognise, and which you seek to subvert. By no means, O King: but let us carry out the vote which was so well brought forward against them, and by bringing on the elephants let us fulfil the intention (πρόθεσις) which you had formed against them from the first.”

It is usual to discard all of this as a scribe's gloss, and certainly it presents, at first glance, a good deal of difficulty. A new Hermon is introduced, apparently not the keeper of the elephants, but a foster-brother and intimate friend of the King. We have already had many references to Hermon in the previous chapter, and now we are told of some one, Hermon was his name, who gives the King very frank advice and further encouragement in the persecution of the Jews. It looks as if his name ought not to be Hermon at all. But then, at the close of his speech, he says, “Let us bring on the elephants”; which looks as if it were the very same Hermon. In that case, in spite of the statement that Hermon was the name of the speaker, the story ought to be genuine. Its omission is easily accounted for: the sentence just before

had ended with the word *πρόθεσιν*; the sentence which Cod. 64 adds ends with the same word. Then it might easily happen that the added matter was dropped by an error of the eye.

But here is another extraordinary bit of evidence in favour of the restoration of the missing matter; Hermon is here said to be a foster-brother of the King. If we look a little further forward in the text we find that in v. 32 the King says that "if it had not been that I love you as my foster-brother (*διὰ τὴν τῆς συντροφείας στοργήν*), and because of the exigencies of the situation, you should have paid for this speech with your life" (reading *συντροφείας* for *συστροφείας* of the Alexandrian MS.).

Here the explanation is required that Hermon was foster-brother of the King, and we see why it occurs as a statement three verses earlier. Shall we not then be justified, for the reasons set forth, in regarding the expansion of the cursive MS. No. 64 as a part of the true text? It illuminates and clears the context, and its omission is palæographically explicable. We shall still be in difficulty with the duality of Hermon. Why should the keeper of the elephants in the first part of the story become the King's foster-brother at the end of it, and almost his prime minister? There is not, however, a single person mentioned in the story among the royal party except Hermon. The explanation probably lies in the sources which *III Maccabees* is using: the elephants are certainly not a part of the tragedy on which he was working; he has lugged them in by their broad ears, and set Hermon, who was in the tragedy, to look after them. Later on he wanted Hermon for another purpose, the modification of the King's rage, and the transfer of responsibility from his heavily weighted shoulders: the theme is constant in the Phalaris literature. Probably, then, Hermon was in the original tragedy, and figured there as the foster-brother and evil-counsellor of the tyrant.

We have now gone quite far enough into the field of conjecture, and had better return to our text and see if we can pick up any more iambs from the missing tragedy or from Greek literature elsewhere. In this quest I shall have the assistance of my friends T. R. Glover and A. B. Cook. They know a piece of a trimeter when they see it. When we read the composition with our eyes open to the possibility of extracts and refrains from Greek tragedy, we find to our surprise a multitude of expressions which appear to be metrical

in form and the product of metrical necessity. Suppose we turn to the fourth chapter: we stumble almost at once on such sequences or possible restorations as

IV. 4.

— — ἀδηλον τοῦ βίου καταστροφὴν,
 — — — τὴν δυσάθλιον ἑξαποστολήν,

IV. 6.

αἱ δ' ἀρτὶ γαμικὴν πρὸς βίου κοινωνίαν
 ὑπελληλυθυῖαι παστάδας νεανίδες,
 [οἰκτροὺς] μετέβαλον ἀντὶ τέρψεως γόους.
 κόνει δὲ [πλοκάμους] μυροβρεχεῖς πεφυρμένοι,
 [τοὺς βοστρύχους] σκυλμοῖσιν ἑσπαραγμένοι,
 ἤγοντ' ἀκαλυφεῖς, ἀντὶ δ' ὑμεναίων [βόης]
 ἐξήρχον, ὡς εἰς πλοῖα δεσμίαι βία,
 ἀντὶ στέφρων δὲ περιπεπλεγμένοι βρόχους
 εἴλκοντο

 διήγον ἐν θρηνοῖσιν ἡμέραν γάμων,
 ἤδη τὸν ἄδην παρὰ πόδας [θεώμενοι].
 σιδηροδεσμοῖσιν δὲ θηρίων τρόπον,
 ἤγοντ' ἀναγκαῖς¹ καὶ κατησφαλισμένοι
 πέδαισιν ἀρρήκτοισιν.²

Now if we consider this longer restored passage in relation to the text that is operated on, it becomes perfectly clear that a metrical narrative underlies the text of *Third Maccabees* in this chapter. There will, naturally, be some divergence in the work of restoration according to the taste of the critical artist; but the result will not vary widely from Mr. T. R. Glover's suggestions which are involved in the foregoing. The additions and modifications made in the text are slight. We are able, at certain points, to correct misunderstandings on the part of the Apocryphal writer, as, for example, when σκυλμοῖς has been read as σκύμνοις, and so an expletive was required as to the *heathen dogs*

¹ (cf. *Prom. Vincit.*, 6). ἀνάγκαις ταῖσδ' ἐνέζευγμαι τάλας.
² (cf. *Prom. Vincit.*, 108). ἀδαμαντίνων δεσμῶν ἐν ἀρρήκτοις πέδαις.

The passage is interesting because Milton also imitated it:—
 In adamantine chains and penal fire
 Who durst defy th' Omnipotent to arms.

that tore the poor victims. (We note, however, that the cursive MSS. show that *σκυλμοῖς* is probably the true reading, in which case the expletive has come in by another route : in any case, it does not belong to the original document.) In certain cases, as in reading *μεταβαλοῦσαι* for *μεταλαβοῦσαι* we have the support of the cursive MSS., and so acquire a better basis for intelligent restoration. When we have settled the approximate metrical form from which the text of *III Maccabees*, verse 6, is derived, we conjecture, readily enough, that the original dramatic sequence that has been utilised is a scene from the capture of Troy, or some similar situation. Indeed, it must be Troy, for we read almost immediately, that the wretched Jews were sent off in ships, and the motive for this is plain enough historically. So we go back to verse 2 and restore *Τρῶσι* for *Ἰουδαίοις* ; the text tells us that the Jews were to be sent off into banishment (*εἰς ἔξαποστολήν*) : one thinks at once of the Trojan women and the reason appears for the introduction of the wailing women and brides, with their torn hair and plucked off veils in the sixth verse. Let us see whether, from this point of visual advantage, we can now, with Mr. Glover's aid, restore the rest of the fourth verse. Here we may suggest as follows :—

ὥστε τῶν ἐχθρῶν τινές
 ἐν ὄμμασίν τ' ἔχοντες ἐξάλλους [τύχας]
 καὶ τὴν ἄδηλον τοῦ βίου καταστροφὴν
 [νοοῦντες], ἔλεον εἶχον, ἔξαποστολήν
 [κλαίοντες] αὐτῶν δάκρυσι τὴν δυσάθλιον.

The fifth verse describes the fate of the hapless old men who are hustled out of the city to the sea-shore, white-haired, bent double and stumbling as they go. The text of *III Maccabees* at this point is very uncertain, and the restoration is affected by the uncertainty : the cursive MSS. do not come to our aid as clearly as in some other cases. The following restoration suggests itself :—

γέρων
 πολιᾷ πυκασθεῖς κἀπίκυφος ἤγετο
 καὶ νωθρότητι τῶν ποδῶν ζ - - | - - ||
 ὀρμῇ βιαίας ἀνατροπῆς αἰδοῦς δίχα.

In all probability, then, verses 2-9 of the chapter before us are an adaptation from a Greek play, dealing with the capture of Troy.

In the fifth chapter we come to the supposed Phalaris fragment ; whether we are right in the assumption of the existence of a Phalaris tragedy or not, it is quite evident that the chapter is strewn with metrical fragments, not necessarily the *disjecta membra* of a single poet, for the author is constantly dropping into metre, or employing half-disguised poetical language. We shall find, for instance, in the sixth chapter, that the pious Jew Eleazer, in a prayer which is conventional in form and Hebrew in substance, cannot avoid the rhythm of Greek poetry. He is in religion what "ancient Pistol" is in military life : he will be metrical or nothing (one wonders what Pistol would have perpetrated if he had prayed). Thus in VI. 12 we have an actual trimeter,

ὁ πᾶσαν ἀλκὴν καὶ δυναστείαν ἔχων

and in VI. 32 we easily restore

ἀνέλαβον ὧδῆν πατριον αἰνοῦντες θεόν ·

A similar effect is produced in VII. 16,

παμμέλεσιν ὕμνοις εὐχαριστοῦντες θεῶ ·

The manner of the artist is sufficiently disclosed.

Our chief interest, however, is with the fourth and fifth chapters, where we have long tragic extracts recovered ; the fourth chapter has been sufficiently explored ; we return to the fifth and to Phalaris. In this chapter, Mr. A. B. Cook points out the following tragic phrases that catch the eye.

V. 2. δαψιλέσι δράκεσι (perhaps the original had the sing. δαψιλῆϊ δράκει¹)

≡ - | ~ πόματος ἀφθόνῳ χορηγιά

5. οἷ τ' ἐξιόντες τὰς τάλαιπύρων χέρας (may be accidental)

6. σκέπης ἔρημοι

7. τὸν παντοκράτορα κύριον ≡ - | ~ - (accidental ?)

10. τοὺς ἀνηλεεῖς

11. ὕπνου μέρος

ἔστειλε πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ≡ - | ~ -

12. ≡ - | ~ - | ≡ καὶ βαθεῖ κατεσχέθη

13. ὤραν προσημανθεῖσαν - | ≡ - | ~ -

¹ Clearly not an ordinary prose word, for it is explained by Hesychius as τῆς παλάμης, τῆς χειρός.

13. = - | - - | τὸν εὐκατάλλακτον | - -
 14. = - | ὁ πρὸς ταῖς κλήσεσιν τεταγμένος
 14. = - | - - | = ἀθρόους κλητοὺς ἰδῶν
 ἔνυξε
 20. τὴν ὠμότητα χείρον' ἐσχηκῶς ἔφη (accidental ?)
 21. ὁμοῦ συναινέσαντες εἰς οἶκον | - -
 22. τὸ μηχανᾶσθαι τοῖς τάλαιπῶροις | - -
 24. ἤθροιστο πρὸς τὴν - | - - | θεωρίαν
 26. = - | - οὐπω δ' ἡλίου = - | - -
 βολαὶ κατεσπείροντο καὶ = - | - -
 Ἐρμων παραστάς - | - - | τὴν ἔξοδον
 28. = - | - πάντα δεσποτεύοντος θεοῦ
 28. = - | - - | = πρὶν μεμηχανημένον
 30. = - | - - | = - | - πληρωθεὶς χόλω
 30. θεοῦ προνοία - | - - | = - | - -
 30. διασκεδάσθαι πᾶν τὸ - | = - | - -
 31. The Phalaris passage, which Mr. Cook restores as follows :—

εἶ σοι γονεῖς παρήσαν ἢ παίδων γοναί
 τήνδ' ἀγρίαις ἂν δαψιλῇ θοίνην [γνάθοις]
 ἐσκεύασ' ἀντὶ τῶν ἀνεγκλήτων ἐμοί
 καὶ τοῖσι προγόνοις ἀποδεδειγμένων ἀεὶ
 πίστιν βέβαιαν ἐξοχῶς = - | - -

and notes that ἀγρίαις γνάθοις is found in *Æsch.*, *Prom. vinct.*, 368 and *Chæph.*, 280. 'Ολοσχερῆ is evidently a late word which may be discarded, and for the order of the words note that one cursive MS. actually shows πίστιν βέβαιαν πίστιν (*sic*). If the Phalaris origin of the fragment were established, it might be proper to restore τοῦδε in the second line, sc. τοῦ ταύρου.

32. ἀπροσδόκητον κάπικίνδυνον | - -
 33. καὶ τῷ προσώπῳ - | - - | συννεστάλη
 42. = - | - - | = θηρίων ἠκισμένους
 43. τὸν ἄβατον ἡμῖν ναὸν ἐν τάχει | - -
 45. = - | - - | = πόμασιν εὐωδιστατοῖς
 47. = - | ἀτρώτῳ καρδίᾳ τε καὶ κόραις
 49. = - | - - | = ὑστάτην βίου ροπήν
 αὐτοῖς ἐκείνην - | - - | = - | - -
 49. = - | ἐς οἶκτον καὶ γόους = - | - -

49. γονεῖς τέκνοισι, μητέρες νεάνισιν
 ἕτεραι νεογνὰ - | - πρὸς μαστοὺς βρέφη
 ἔλκοντα - | = - | ∩ τελευταῖον γάλα
51. = - | - ἤδη πρὸς πύλαις ἄδου | - -

The foregoing metrical fragments show conclusively that the author of *III Maccabees* is familiar with the Greek tragic literature. Just as in the previous chapter we can see one particular play upon which he has been drawing. But this time it cannot be the *Fall of Troy* that furnished the material: it appears to be, as we stated at the first, a play in which Phalaris, or some similar tyrant, had the title-rôle, unless we find it a more suitable hypothesis that there was reference to Phalaris in some play which provoked the allusion.

Mr. Cook thinks it not impossible that Æschylus himself may be the author of the missing play in the fifth chapter. He reminds me that in 476 B.C., Hieron of Syracuse founded Ætna and invited Æschylus over for the occasion. He went there and he wrote the *Αἰτναῖαι*. Mt. Ætna had recently been in eruption and Æschylus gleaned on the spot the details of his description in *Prom. vinct.*, 351 ff. Again, Hieron heard of Æschylus' success with the *Persians* and invited the poet for a second time to Sicily. He went over and performed the play there between 472 and 468. Finally in 458 he left Athens, and withdrew to Gela where he lived till his death in 456. Cf. Athen., 402 c. :—

ὅτι δὲ Αἰσχυλος διάτριψας ἐν Σικελίᾳ πολλαῖς
 κέχρηται φωναῖς Σικελικαῖς οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν

Mr. Cook infers accordingly that Æschylus had every opportunity of becoming familiar with the fame of Phalaris.

There will, perhaps, be objections raised to this. For example, Ptolemy, posing as Phalaris, says in our recovered fragment that the Jews (*quaere* originally Himeraeans or the like) had always been conspicuous for loyalty to himself and his *forbears*. It does not appear that Phalaris, according to the tradition, had any Sicilian forbears; perhaps, as a political adventurer, he had no predecessors at all. It does not, however, follow that the literary Hellenists who discoursed of Phalaris, or made him discourse of himself, took this view of his origin. Lucian, for example, makes Phalaris address the people of Delphi as one who belonged to the first families of Agrigentum, in which case a

reference to his predecessors would be quite in order. There is no need to decide the point of Phalaris' ancestors prematurely; in any case they are literary creations.

When we turn to the seventh chapter we find Ptolemy producing a rescript in the conventional manner on behalf of the Jews. He cannot, however, keep his hand off the poetry which he has worked over c. 4 and c. 5. The enemies of the Jews have dragged them down in bonds, pulling them by the hair, as if they were slaves (οἱ καὶ δεσμίους καταγαγόντες αὐτοὺς μετὰ σκύλων ὡς ἀνδράποδα); the passage shows that we were right in reading σκύλοις against the uncial MSS. In the next verse Ptolemy dismisses the persecutors of the Jews with their bare lives; μόγις τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῖς χαριζόμενοι which is an echo of ζῆν ἀντὶ τούτων ἐστερήθης ἄν or some similar arrangement of the previous text (e.g. σύ γ' ἀντὶ τούτων ἐστερήθης ἄν βίου). In the seventh verse he speaks of the constant goodwill of the Jews towards himself and his ancestors:—

τὴν τε τοῦ φίλου ἦν ἔχουσι βεβαίαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς
καὶ τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν εὖνοιαν,

which is again an adaptation of the versified story in c. V. So we see that the metrical section on Phalaris was a sort of *pièce de résistance* to the author of *III Maccabees*.

At this point another difficulty emerges; we have pointed out that in two of Mr. Glover's cases of metrical fragment the text has been influenced by the *Prometheus Vincetus*; and when we examine more closely the lines to which we have attached the name of Phalaris, we find that the versifier, whoever he was, has been imitating the *Hecuba* of Euripides. Compare the sentence

τῆνδε θηρσὶν ἀγρίοις ἐσκεύασ' ἄν δαψιλῆ θοίαν

with

θοίαν ἀγρίων τιθέμενος θηρῶν

Eur., *Hec.*, 1073.

and the dependence of the former on the latter will be evident. This appears definitely to negative the idea that the Phalaris fragment can be due to Æschylus, as Mr. Cook suggested, unless it should be maintained that Euripides, whose diction is often Æschylean, got the phraseology of *Hec.*, 1073 from Æschylus. It is the work of a

centoist, probably of the Hellenistic age. This does not mean that the fragment with which we started our inquiry may not belong to a Phalaris drama ; only if it does, it is a late drama belonging to an artificial school.

Reviewing the preceding arguments, we may claim that a number of fragments from Greek tragic literature are embedded in the *Third Book of Maccabees*. Of these, the principal are a fragment dealing with the *Fall of Troy* and another fragment dealing with the *Tyranny of Phalaris*. There are also traces of the use of the *Prometheus Vincetus* and the *Hecuba*.