Abstract: While the interpretation of the book of Esther has posed many challenges in the past, a key and well-recognized aspect of this text is that it presents a narrative behind one of the most important Jewish holidays, namely, Purim. As such, it also strongly influenced Jewish culture, including similar texts written to cultivate Jewish traditions in the diaspora. In this article, an analysis of possible intertextual connections between Esther and the apocryphal book of 3 Maccabees is presented. The latter was likely written for Jews living in Alexandria. While this topic has been studied in the past by several authors, in this article emphasis is laid on narrative similarity between both books. In particular, five key elements of this similarity have been identified, and additional parallel fragments have been presented. Their distribution and their likely origin from different versions of the book of Esther support claims about the possible origin of 3 Maccabees from a mature version of Esther.

Keywords: book of Esther, 3 Maccabees, intertextuality, common prototypical narrative

Introduction

The intertextual analysis of the texts of the Scripture and other apocryphal works occupies a recognized place among the research methods used in biblical studies. When there are great similarities and connections between texts, we speak of their intertextuality, although, as Steve Moyise writes, “scholars use the term ‘intertextuality’ in very different and, in some cases, incompatible ways.”

However, according to Suzana Jurin and Arijana Krišković, “Intertextuality or a relationship to other texts recognizes text dependence on previously produced texts, and it refers to the interdependence of production and reception of a text with the knowledge of communication participants about other texts.”\(^2\) Even when the interrelationship of two texts is more difficult to assess unambiguously, such an analysis can lead to valuable conclusions about the general characteristics of the stories described.

This article will discuss such possible connections between the book of Esther and the apocryphal book of 3 Maccabees. On a thematic level, both books focus on the rescue of Jews who are in exile, and many further similarities can be identified in both texts. However, the precise interplay between the two books remains difficult to interpret. An important input to such analyses can come from studying narrative connections between the books and how they are distributed over different versions of the book of Esther. This analysis contributes to the discussions about the possible origin of 3 Maccabees.

1. Complicated Origin of the Book of Esther and Its Narrative

The book of Esther has been preserved in several textual versions: Masoretic Text, Greek texts (Septuagint and Alpha Text), Targums, Latin, Coptic, and Ethiopian; it appears in Josephus’ *Antiquities*.\(^3\) This rich set of versions is, on the one hand, an immediate challenge in analysis, but it also provides an opportunity to study connections between the book and other texts, taking into account different redactions of Esther.

The Hebrew version was probably written by a Jew who lived under Persian rule and who was familiar with Susa and the Persian court. Although one can also find in the literature claims that Mordecai himself wrote the book, these are likely misreadings of Esth 9:20.


\(^3\) Holt, *Narrative and Other Readings*, 20.
Moreover, it is also possible that the narrative has been preserved orally for many years before being written down.\(^4\)

The opening of the book (“This is what happened during the time of Xerxes…”) implies that the narrative is being told after the time of Xerxes (mid of fifth century BCE). Currently, most scholars date the writing of the book between 400 BCE and 200 BCE – that is, late in the Persian period or early in the Hellenistic period.\(^5\) According to Markus Witte, the fact that Greek linguistic influences are not visible in the Hebrew book of Esther does not point to an early time of composition, but to a place of origin, namely the eastern Jewish diaspora or the heartland of the Persian Empire.\(^6\) Also noteworthy is the book’s literary genre, which has characteristics of midrash.\(^7\)

The biblical text of the book has survived to our time in three versions: Masoretic Text (MT), Septuagint (LXX), and the so-called Alpha Text (AT). On top of the main, i.e., Hebrew text of the book of Esther (MT), the current version of the text, as considered canonical at least in some communities, such as the Catholic Church, contains also Greek additions.\(^8\) In the following, only the text of the Septuagint for both books will be taken into account in order to allow for a straightforward comparison of the Greek text of Esther with the text of 3 Maccabees, which is known in Greek.\(^9\) Notably, a further analysis can be found in the recent work by Jonathan Thambyrajah who, i.a., compares the Vetus Latina version of the Additions of Esther with the Greek text of the 3 Maccabees and suggests the existence of possible later relationships between the two.\(^10\)

The complex origin of the book of Esther is not the only unique aspect of this text. It is one of a few historic books of the Old Testament with a main female character, although the most important topic in the book remains the justification of the Jewish holiday Purim. The book presents a story of a young Jewish girl, who

\(\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\) Holt, Narrative and Other readings, 21.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{6}}\) Witte, Das Esterbuch, 485.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{8}}\) Cf. Harvey, Finding Morality in the Diaspora, 4–8.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{9}}\) Rahlfs – Hanhart, Septuaginta.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{10}}\) Thambyrajah, “Relationship,” 699–700.
became the queen of Persia. When Haman, the king’s right hand, felt offended because Mordecai, the uncle of Esther, didn’t bow to him, he decided to take revenge on Jews living under king Ahasuerus’s rule in Persia. The royal officer persuades the king to kill all the Jews in the kingdom. Queen Esther crossed Haman’s plans and saved the Jews, so they could take an act of revenge on their enemies. In the end, they celebrate their day of salvation: Purim.

The reading of the book has been subject to many challenges over the centuries. While there was no manuscript evidence of the book of Esther among the Dead Sea Scrolls. When Józef Milik published his important work containing an ancient Aramaic text in 1992,¹¹ which could be related to Esther, the idea that such a text, dubbed 4QProto-Esther, laid the foundation for the biblical book was well accepted. As Dwight Swanson noticed, explanations for the absence of Esther in Qumran’s caves left open the possibility that some parts of other texts found there can be recognized as the source of Esther.¹² This supports the aforementioned claims by Józef Milik. Sidnie White Crawford argued against Milik that his conclusions regarding the development of Esther’s text are unjustified, but she does allow for a more general connection between the Aramaic passages and the various witnesses to Esther.¹³ Then, Crawford suggested that behind the book of Esther were similar, earlier stories, which influenced the present form of the book, especially the Additions. The new title given for this original manuscript is “Tales from the Persian Court.”

Already in 1944, Charles C. Torrey noted that the book of Esther is one of the most puzzling biblical texts.¹⁴ This is both because of the themes it addresses and because of the various language versions of which the current canonical text is composed. Torrey recognized that a longer Aramaic text, distinct from the Masoretic text, underlies both Greek versions. His stance laid the foundation for further research, which was explored by Crawford. A half-century

¹² Swanson, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 205.
¹³ Crawford, “4Q Tales of the Persian Court.”
¹⁴ Torrey, “The Older Book of Esther.”
later, she presented a diagram, which is reproduced below, to explain the roots of Esther’s text in the most economical way.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{center}
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As can be seen in her diagram, it is argued by Crawford that the book of Esther originates from the “Tales of the Persian Court,” which was the root for the Proto-Esther in the Hebrew version. This version, in turn, was the source of the Masoretic Text. Proto-Esther was also the basis for the Proto-Alpha Text in the Greek version. This text eventually led to the development of the Lucianic version, i.e., the so-called Alpha Text. However, for the book of Esther, the main text in Greek is the Septuagint, which is translated from the Masoretic Text. In the end, the biggest mystery was the Additions. Crawford argued that the Additions directly derive from “The Tales of the Persian Court,” which were written in Aramaic and are the source for the subsequent daughter versions.

2. The Origin of 3 Maccabees

Different from those for the book of Esther, up-to-date discussions about the apocryphal book of 3 Maccabees tend to identify a much simpler origin of this text. The book has been preserved in the Septuagint manuscripts and its identification does not pose any major difficulties. The most important and best text is that

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Crawford, “Has Esther Been Found,” 325.
of the Alexandrian codex A (mid-fifth century BCE).\textsuperscript{16} The text was very likely written for a Jewish audience living in Alexandria and Egypt.\textsuperscript{17} However, the author probably did not live in Alexandria. His Greek is rich but not as sophisticated as the Alexandrian Jewish intelligentsia. It may be the work of a ‘village cousin’; someone who was tasked with writing down the instruction of the origins of the local Jewish festival.\textsuperscript{18} According to current studies, the book should have been written between the second century BCE and the first century CE. It relates to the time of Ptolemy IV (221–204 BCE) and assumes the existence of a temple in Jerusalem that was destroyed in 70 CE.\textsuperscript{19}

Hugh Anderson identifies the genre of 3 Maccabees as historical romance,\textsuperscript{20} while John J. Collins describes the book as a historical novel with a religious message\textsuperscript{21} and Joseph Mélèze-Modrzejewski prefers the name as a judicial drama in a romanticized form.”\textsuperscript{22}

The author of the current study finds an even more convincing classification proposed by Sara Raup Johnson. Johnson classified 3 Maccabees as a Jewish historical fiction, along with the Esther, Letter of Aristeas, 2 Maccabees, Daniel, Judith, Tobit, the tales of Alexander and the Tobiads embedded in the narrative of Josephus, the fragments of Artapanus, and Joseph and Aseneth. She pointed out the differences in these texts, but she also noticed common factors among them:

[W]e find a multiplicity of different communities, each of which sought to articulate its own unique model of identity in a rapidly changing world where languages, nations, political views and ethical systems jostled side by side, competed, coalesced, influenced each other, and emerged transformed. Every story

\textsuperscript{16} Boyd-Taylor, “3 Makkabees,” 521.
\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Capponi, “Martyrs and Apostates,” 302; Cousland, “Reversal, Recidivism and Reward,” 42.
\textsuperscript{19} Wojciechowski, Apokryfy z Biblii greckiej, 26.
\textsuperscript{20} Anderson, “3 Maccabees,” 510.
\textsuperscript{21} Collins, “3 Maccabees,” 1573.
\textsuperscript{22} Mélèze-Modrzejewski, “Troisième livre des Maccabees,” 39.
was an opportunity for the author and his audience to imagine the community anew.  

Third Maccabees presents a story about Ptolemy IV Philopator of Egypt, who felt offended because he couldn’t enter the Jerusalem temple. He decided to take revenge on the Jews who were living under his rule in Egypt. To this end, he planned to gather all Jews in a hippodrome and kill them, precisely to trample them by drunk elephants. The miracles saved the Jews, and they took revenge on their enemies. In the end, they celebrated their day of salvation.

3. The Relationship Between the Two Books

The relationship between the two books has been the subject of several detailed discussions in the secondary literature. However, the conclusions of these considerations are sometimes contradictory. For instance, Raimondo B. Motzo in 1924 suggested that 3 Maccabees was prior to Esther and could have influenced its text.  

Elias J. Bickermann claims that 3 Maccabees depends on Jason of Cyrene or on 2 Maccabees.  

Instead, other modern scholars tend to put the book of Esther rather as a source for the apocryphal book. André Barucq has called 3 Maccabees a Hellenistic imitation of Esther;  

Philip Alexander claims that the evidence clearly suggests that the author of 3 Maccabees was acquainted with the narrative of Esther.  

Carey A. Moore recognizes the Hebrew Esther clearly antedates 3 Maccabees, and there is nothing to preclude some later influence of 3 Maccabees on the Greek Esther.  

N. Clayton Croy notices that 3 Maccabees has several parallels with Esther, but the dependence of both texts he considers only among decrees.  

Noah Hacham similarly claims that both stories have many parallel

---

24 Motzo, “Il rifacimento Greco di Ester.”
threads, but interpreters can only talk about their intertextual relation in the Greek Additions.  

30 The same holds true for Meredith J. Stone as she admits that the LXX version of Esther has many similarities with the 3 Maccabees.  

31 While many such striking similarities between both texts can be found, they also have clear differences. The question arises then as to whether the book of 3 Maccabees could be influenced by a more prototypical text which also sources the book of Esther. This account could explain some of such key differences between the details of both stories but also justify a remarkable number of parallel narrative units. As mentioned above, 3 Maccabees was also considered to be the source for Esther.  

Alternatively, one could claim that it is rather the book of Esther which is the primary text from which the apocryphal book originated after adapting the narrative to the new context of Egyptian diaspora. In particular, Aaron Koller argues for this view and mentions that a narrative similar to that of Esther is found in many other texts, including 3 Maccabees, which is secondary to Esther.  

32 It is also a common view among scholars nowadays, as mentioned above. In the following, the author will further support such claims by analyzing the distribution of the key parallels between both texts in Esther.  

4. The Key Parallels in Esther and 3 Maccabees  

While a large number of parallels between the books can be noticed when reading them carefully, the author would like to first identify five major pillars of both stories that create the main core of their similarity. These pillars are presented in the table and discussed below.

\[\text{4. The Key Parallels in Esther and 3 Maccabees}\]

While a large number of parallels between the books can be noticed when reading them carefully, the author would like to first identify five major pillars of both stories that create the main core of their similarity. These pillars are presented in the table and discussed below.

\[\text{30 Cf. Hacham, “3 Maccabees and Esther,” 772.}\]

\[\text{31 Stone, Empire and Gender in LXX Esther, 188.}\]

\[\text{32 Koller, Esther in Ancient Jewish Thought, 141.}\]
Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main core</th>
<th>Esther</th>
<th>3 Maccabees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jews live in exile</td>
<td>2:5–6</td>
<td>3:3–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion of the Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>termination of the Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Celebration of salvation</td>
<td>9:20–32</td>
<td>6:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, it is hard to dispute that the root of the problems discussed in both stories is a difficult situation of the Jews leaving in foreign lands. In these unfavorable circumstances, Jews struggle with their longing, their cultivation of faith, and native traditions. This does not mean that Jews in the diaspora led only poor and difficult lives. Jewish diasporan literature excels in its expressions of loyalty to the host government, which was highlighted by Noah Hacham. One also finds confirmation of this in the apocryphal text:

The Judeans, for their part, maintained their good will and unwavering loyalty towards the royal house; at the same time, they continued to revere God and live in accordance with his law and so kept themselves apart with respect to their diet, on account of which they appeared hateful to some. (3 Macc 3:3–4)

This challenging situation is worsened by royal decrees against the Jews, which remain the turning points in both books urging the Jews to react and to try to change their unfortunate fate. Eventually, this situation leads to other royal decrees that cancel the previous ones. Such a change can then be identified as the main

---

34 Humphreys, “A Life-Style for Diaspora,” 216; Yoo, “Desiring the Empire,” 32–33.
aim and achievement of the Jews supporting the legacy of the books preserved for future generations.

Because of the significance of these decrees in both stories, the author identifies them as two of the five subjects in the main core. Notably, many similarities can be identified between the decrees in the biblical and apocryphal texts. Cyril W. Emmet recognized the style of the Additions B and E as the most analogous to the 3 Maccabees and described it as a product of Alexandrian literature. Among seven Additions (A–F) to the book of Esther, Carey A. Moore noticed that four of them (A, C, D, and F) give clear evidence of having a Semitic Vorlage meanwhile B and E are unquestionably Greek compositions.

Following the second royal decree, one can observe yet another crucial and meaningful part of both stories which is related to Jewish revenge. Although vengeance is never an easy topic to consider in the biblical and parabiblical texts, for the readers of both books it remains intuitively understood that the happiness of salvation would not be possible if there was still a potential threat affecting the Jews. The revenge then also plays a crucial role in describing the final success of the Jews and in stressing their elevated position in society as a result of the actions described in the books. Quite strikingly, in both stories we find the significant number of three hundred people killed by the Judeans:

The Judeans in Susa gathered also on the fourteenth day of the month of Adar, and they killed three hundred men, but they did not plunder. (Esth 9:15)

[And thus set about punishing every defiled fellow national who fell in their path and slaying them as an example to all. On that day they slew more than three hundred men, a day which they also celebrated as one of merriment, seeing that they had overpowered the profane with joy. (3 Macc 7:14–15)

37 Moore, “Esther Revisited Again,” 181.
Last but not least, the fifth pillar found in both books is the main reason why these stories were created. It is to justify the celebration of salvation and the motivation for the Jews living in the diaspora in pursuit of their own cultural identity. One can note that, while this general aim of both stories is widely accepted by many authors, details of its understanding can differ. In particular, Sara R. Johnson noticed similarities between the celebration in 3 Maccabees Esther, also in Daniel, and in the narrative of Exodus. However, she suggests that this celebration is probably better understood as a perennial fable about the uncertainties of life under foreign rule.38

Now Mordecai recorded these things in a book and sent it to the Judeans – as many as were in the kingdom of Artaxerxes, to those near and far, to keep these days, the fourteenth and fifteenth of Adar for on these days the Judeans gained relief from their enemies – and the whole month, which was Adar, in which matters had been turned for them from sorrow into joy and from mourning into a holiday, to celebrate it as days of feasting and gladness, sending portions to their friends and to the poor. (Esth 9:20–22)

Thereupon the king withdrew to the city, summoned the overseer of revenues and ordered him to supply the Judeans with both wines and all else requisite for seven days of feasting, having decided that they would joyfully celebrate a festival of deliverance in the very place in which they had expected to meet destruction. (3 Macc 6:30)

Regardless of the possible detailed function of such stories, though, it is arguably the most important aspect of both the biblical and parabiblical texts, which also constitutes the last of the five major pillars of both plots identified by the author.

5. Common Themes for Both Stories

In addition to the aforementioned five major similarities, the number of further common themes that can be found in both books is unusually large for such short texts. These themes are discussed below. Notably, different wording between both texts poses difficulties for such analysis and leads some scholars to doubt about the intertextuality of these books. At the narrative level, however, such similarities remain easier to identify. They are listed in Table 2 below.

It is worth stressing that the similarities between the books correspond to both the main, supposedly Hebrew, version of the book of Esther and to the Greek Additions, and they allow for the reconstruction of a similar plot with consecutive events leading to the celebration of salvation. The rest of the plot in both books plays a more auxiliary role: e.g., it creates tension and adds more drama to the stories. A detailed discussion of most of these similarities can be found in the article by Noah Hacham. As mentioned above, the accumulation of such parallels between both texts remains hard to explain other than by either a common origin of both books or by the impact of one of the books on the other text.

---

39 Next to Cyril W. Emmet, Noah Hacham (“3 Maccabees and Esther”) presented the most crucial work about the texts of Esther and 3 Maccabees. He has seen intertextuality as a text contained within and he found it only between Additions to Esther and 3 Maccabees. Although he reports a number of parallel themes in both books, which can be seen in Table 1.

40 Cf. Hacham, “3 Maccabees and Esther.”
It is useful to emphasize two selected topics from Table 2 that can be related to women characters in both books. These are highlighted therein with a bold face. While the lack of such a main character in the apocryphal text is the most striking difference between the books, one can easily find similar parts of the texts in 3 Maccabees that are, however, related to other characters and side plots.

In particular, both texts touch on the subject of women’s clothing during the time of lament.

---

41 Hacham, “3 Maccabees and Esther,” 766.
Taking off the garments of her glory, she put on the garments of distress and mourning, and instead of costly perfumes she covered her head with ashes and dung, and she utterly humbled her body; every part that she loved to adorn she covered with her tangled a hair. (Add C:13)

Cloistered virgins in their chambers rushed out with their mothers, sprinkled their hair with ashes, and began filling the streets with weeping and groaning. Others who had just now dressed for their weddings abandoned the chambers appointed for the occasion, as well as the appropriate modesty, and made a mad dash through the city. (3 Macc 1:18–19).

This expression of despair is not unusual in Scripture, but it is noteworthy that in both passages it is shown in contrast to the royal robes that Esther wore every day and the wedding robes that the newly married women wore. While this parallel has not been identified by Hacham, the author would like to emphasize a similar role this part of the text plays in both books.

On the other hand, the description of the fate of the brave woman is almost a defining theme suggested by the title of the book of Esther. However, one can also find it in the third book of Maccabees. Certainly, Arsinoe, Philopator’s sister, who later according to custom became his wife, did not play as significant a role in the narrative as Esther did in her book. However, Arsinoe’s act of encouraging the warriors to fight at the battle of Raphia is immortalized in the first chapter of the apocryphal book. Due to this deed, Philopator’s army defeated Antiochus III the Great. Arsinoe is then directly responsible for saving her countrymen, similarly to Esther.

Summary

The numerous similarities which can be identified in the narrative of the book of Esther and the apocryphal book of 3 Maccabees

42 Cf. Livneh, “Female Bodies and Dress,” 475.
illustrate their strong connection, which has also been recognized by other scholars (Table 2). In particular, the author has stressed the significance of five major plot pillars that both books share (Table 1). This intersection not only strengthens claims about the intertextuality of both books but also allows one to study their historical interconnections. Notably, while the apocryphal book of 3 Maccabees is currently believed to have a relatively simple origin, the redaction criticism of Esther leads to a significantly more complex picture. In fact, this claim, if true, suggests the connection of 3 Maccabees to a more mature version of Esther and further supports the claims initially proposed by Motzo and later confirmed by Koller that 3 Maccabees is based on Esther, which has been rewritten to make it more relevant to the different political and sociological context of the readers of 3 Maccabees. So, the common prototypical narrative behind both books is not the same. For Esther, it would be the Persian Court Tales, while for 3 Maccabees it is Esther itself. However, it should be noted that the influence of the book of Esther on the 3 Maccabees is literary, using ready-made topoi. In contrast, at the level of content, the third book of Maccabees stands alone. It is not a typical literary exercise based on the text of Esther. For it draws on the memoirs of the repression of the Jews in the land of Israel and in Egypt.

Finally, it is also useful to consider possible specific motivations behind such rewriting of Esther. The author would like to point out that the 3 Maccabees shows divine intervention, which is difficult to find in the book of Esther. It makes the apocryphal text seem more pious than the biblical text itself. This focus could have been more easily accepted in certain Jewish religious environments, while the canonicality of Esther was subject to many discussions in the past.43

---

Intertekstualność i jej różne aspekty w analizie narracyjnej Księgi Estery i 3 Księgi Machabejskiej

Abstrakt: Choć pełna interpretacja księgi Estery nastręcza wielu trudności podczas analizy, jednym z kluczowych i dobrze rozpoznanych aspektów jest jej identyfikacja jako tekstu uzasadniającego żydowskie święto Purim. Ta rola księgi sprawiła również, że odegrała ona istotną rolę w kształtowaniu innych podobnych żydowskich pism, stworzonych w celu podtrzymania tradycji i celebrowania określonych świąt wśród Żydów żyjących w diasporze. W niniejszym artykule przeanalizowane zostały podobieństwa pomiędzy księgą Estery a apokryficzną 3 Księgą Machabejską, która została spisana dla Żydów w Aleksandrii. Podczas gdy ten temat był już kilkukrotnie opisywany w literaturze, w niniejszym artykule nacisk położony został na analizę podobieństwa w narracji obu ksiąg. W tym celu zidentyfikowanych zostało pięć głównych elementów podobieństwa narracyjnego, jak również przedstawione zostały liczne dodatkowe fragmenty paralelne. Dyskusja nad rozmieszczeniem tych fragmentów w różnych wersjach księgi Estery pozwala dodatkowo wzmocnić argumenty na rzecz pochodzenia 3 Księgi Machabejskiej z dojrzałej wersji tekstu Księgi Estery.

Słowa kluczowe: Księga Estery, 3 Księga Machabejska, intertekstualność, wspólna opowieść prototypiczna
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