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The word αὐθέντης and its derivatives have occasioned a great deal of scholarly discussion. An initial series of studies (1909–1962) focused especially on αὐθέντης itself, and was carried out by classical scholars, notably those by J. Psichari,1 L. Gernet,2 P. Kretschmer,3 W. Kamps,4 P. Chantraine,5 A. Dihle,6 and F. Zucker.7 More recently (1979–1995), New Testament scholars have begun to show an interest in this word and its derivatives, especially in connection with the verb αὐθέντεω, which occurs in the disputed verse 1 Tim. 2.12. Noteworthy contributions have been made by C. Kroeger,8 A.J. Panning,9 G.W. Knight III,10 L.E. Wilshire,11 A.C. Perriman,12 and H.S. Baldwin.13 The difficulty is that αὐθέντης appears to have three distinct senses in ancient Greek (‘murderer’, ‘master’, and ‘doer’), and it is a matter of dispute both how these senses are related among themselves, and how they influence the meaning of the derivatives of αὐθέντης. For New Testament scholars, the issue is whether αὐθέντεω in 1 Tim. 2.12 is based on the meaning ‘master’, thus yielding the traditional rendering ‘have authority over’ (possibly with the pejorative connotation of ‘domineering’), or whether it is semantically indebted to one or both of the other two senses of αὐθέντης.

In the present article, without focusing specifically on the one occurrence of αὐθέντεω in the New Testament, I propose to sketch the semantic contours of this word family from its earliest attestation in Attic drama to late antiquity. More specifically, I will survey most or all occurrences of both αὐθέντης and its cognates until the year AD 312 (the year of Constantine’s conversion), and make incidental observations about their use from 312 onward.14 It is possible to do a near-exhaustive survey of this time period with the help of the Theaurus Lin-
guae Graecae, supplemented by the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri.¹⁵

The Noun αὐθέντης

I begin with the noun αὐθέντης (also occasionally written αὐτοκέντης). As already noted, this word appears to have the three basic senses, ‘murderer’, ‘master’, and ‘doer’.¹⁶

The meaning ‘murderer’ is attested 24 times in the classical literature of the fifth and fourth centuries BC, almost all of them in Attic writers.¹⁷ As Gernet and others have pointed out, αὐθέντης in this literature has the specific meaning of ‘kin-murderer’, one who is guilty of the particularly heinous crime of slaying his or her own flesh and blood (comparable to the Latin parricida and the Irish fingal).¹⁸ After the Golden Age of ancient Greek literature, this meaning becomes relatively rare, occurring mainly in Atticistic writers.¹⁹ In fact, as Appendix A1 shows, in the seven centuries which separate its last occurrence in the early fourth century BC from AD 312, αὐθέντης ‘murderer’ is attested only 16 times. After this date it becomes even more sporadic.

αὐθέντης in the meaning ‘master’ has a very different history. It occurs once in a disputed passage of the Supplicants of Euripides (Suppl. 442),²⁰ but does not surface again before the turn of the era, after which ‘master’ gradually becomes the dominant sense of the word, ultimately leading via the Modern Greek ἀφέντης to the Turkish word effendi, still meaning ‘master’.²¹ Its earliest attestations after Euripides are in two recently discovered inscriptions from Asia Minor dated to the first century AD,²² and in the Shepherd of Hermas (first or second century).²³

I have identified some 30 examples of this meaning in the extant Greek literature which predate AD 312.²⁴ It should be pointed out that in none of these cases is ‘master’ used in the pejorative sense of ‘autocrat’ or ‘despot’. In fact, it is used twice in Christian contexts to refer to the lordship of Jesus Christ.²⁵ Furthermore, I have found no evidence to support Dihle’s contention that αὐθέντης in this sense refers primarily to a ‘boss’ in the workplace.²⁶

The third sense of αὐθέντης is very rare. In fact, the meaning ‘doer’ is attested only three times (some would say four) before AD 312, and occurs only in conjunction with the genitive of a noun designating an activity. One example is found in Polybius (first century BC), and the other two in Diodorus Siculus (first century BC), all three designating the doer or perpetrator of an action.²⁷ The meaning ‘doer’ is unattested in the first three centuries after Christ, and continues to be rare thereafter.²⁸ It should be noted, however, that αὐθέντης in this sense regularly means ‘author’ or ‘initiator’ of an action, not of a person or object. Consequently, the translation ‘creator’, which is occasionally found, must be rejected.²⁹

The rarity and lateness of αὐθέντης ‘doer’, as well as its exclusive association with the genitive of words denoting action, give reason to believe that this usage of the word is only seemingly distinct from that of αὐθέντης ‘master’. The doer or initiator of an action is conceived of as the master of that action, the one who is in charge of the action. There is a similar use of other Greek words meaning ‘master’ or ‘chief’, for examples, ἀνάσσα and Ἀρχηγός.³⁰ There are also parallels in other languages, as in Latin auctor and princeps.³¹ In other words, as the lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones recognizes, the meanings ‘doer’ and ‘master’ for αὐθέντης belong under the same semantic head-
It is clear from the above that in reality the two basic senses of αὐθέντης in ancient Greek were ‘murderer’ and ‘master’, and that the latter gradually eclipsed the former. In fact, there are many indications, beginning in the second century AD, that the ordinary meaning of αὐθέντης in Hellenistic Greek was ‘master’, and that ‘murderer’ had become a poorly understood literary sense.

This point emerges clearly from a number of Atticistic lexical works, which warn their readers against using αὐθέντης in the current sense ‘master’, but are unclear on the proper Attic meaning of the word. One of the earliest of these is the lexicon of Aelius Dionysius (early second century AD), which explains αὐθέντης as meaning ‘not the master, but the murderer by αὐτοκειρία’. This is a correct definition of Attic usage if αὐτοκειρία is understood to mean parricide or kin-murder, but subsequent Atticistic lexicographers appear to have misunderstood this term, so that they began to define classical αὐθέντης as properly meaning αὐτόχειρ, either as someone who murders with his own hands, or as someone who murders himself (that is, a suicide). The same confusion is found in a number of ancient scholia on αὐθέντης in classical authors, which all agree that the current meaning ‘master’ does not apply, but disagree on the proper Attic meaning that does. As Gernet, Chantraine, and Zucker have pointed out, the definitions given in these lexica and scholia (which have continued to exercise their influence in modern lexicography) do not correspond to actual Greek usage. (The single exception to this rule in Dio Cassius will be dealt with separately below.) The lexica and scholia simply illustrate the fact that αὐθέντης in the meaning ‘kin-murderer’ was no longer a living part of the language after the turn of the era.

The fact that αὐθέντης ‘murderer’ was no longer understood is clearly demonstrated by the ancient versions of Wis. 12.6. The author of this work (to be dated around the turn of the era) was sufficiently literate to be able to use αὐθέντης in its correct Attic sense of ‘kin-murderer’—in this case referring specifically to Canaanite parents who killed their own offspring in child sacrifice. Although the context (which has been shown to draw heavily on the language of the Attic tragedians) makes it very clear that this is the meaning intended, none of the ancient versions understood it correctly. The Old Latin (originally done in the second century AD, and later incorporated into the Vulgate) has auctores, probably meaning ‘progenitors’. The Peshitta fails to render the word altogether. The Armenian has ‘masters’, as does the Syro-Hexapla, while the Arabic has ‘suicides’. The last two renderings are clear examples of the influence, respectively, of current Hellenistic usage and the Atticistic lexic. It would be a great mistake to take any of these renderings as an indication of the true meaning of αὐθέντης in this passage.

The conclusion which can be drawn from the foregoing discussions is that the two main senses of αὐθέντης in post-classical Greek, namely ‘murderer’ and ‘master’, belong to two quite different registers of the language. The former is an Attic usage which was artificially kept alive by a few authors with literary pretensions, but which was no longer understood by the great majority of Greek-speakers. The latter is the meaning of common usage, which is first attested (after its isolated occurrence in Eurip-
ides) in non-literary sources. It is telling that the first occurrence of αὐθέντης ‘master’ in a Hellenistic literary work is found in the Shepherd of Hermas, a work whose language belongs to the lower Koine.47

There thus seems to be ample confirmation of the view (first proposed by Thumb in 1901, and often repeated thereafter)48 that αὐθέντης with the meaning ‘master’ belonged to colloquial Greek (attested once in Euripides, but otherwise absent from literary sources until the Shepherd of Hermas), while αὐθέντης ‘murderer’ was at home only in the literary language of the classical period. By the first century AD, αὐθέντης in the living language meant ‘master’, and the meaning ‘murderer’ was largely forgotten.

The Derivatives of αὐθέντης

I turn now to the cognates of αὐθέντης, which are all chronologically later than αὐθέντης itself, and derived from it. The semantic picture here is much less complicated, since the senses of the derivatives, as Chantraine has pointed out, are all based on αὐθέντης in the meaning ‘master’.49 This is not surprising, because the derivatives do not begin to appear until well after the time that αὐθέντης ‘murderer’ was in common use, and because αὐθέντης ‘doer’, as we have seen, was itself dependent on the meaning ‘master’. It seems that αὐθέντης ‘master’, although it only appears once in extant literary texts before the first century AD, began to be productive in the formation of other words of similar meaning a century or two earlier.

We shall deal with the derivatives in the order of their first attestation.

1. αὐθεντικός (Including the Adverbial Form αὐθεντικῶς)

The meaning of this adjective is basically ‘authoritative’, and in a secondary sense ‘original’. The meaning ‘authoritative’ (that is, ‘masterful’) is well-attested; it is found in the letters of Cicero (first century BC) and in the Tetrabiblos of Ptolemy (second century AD), as well as later patristic and astrological literature.50 We find a striking example of this sense in Origen (third century), where the adverb αὐθεντικῶς is contrasted with δουλικῶς to describe the sovereign operation of the Holy Spirit.51 Altogether, I have identified ten examples of this usage before AD 312.52

However, since the papyrological discoveries of the nineteenth century, the more commonly attested meaning of αὐθεντικός is the secondary sense ‘original’, especially as applied to legal documents. I have collected some 42 examples of this meaning in extant Greek writings dated before AD 312.53 Although this sense has often been related to the word αὐτόχειρ, which occurs in the Atticistic definitions of αὐθέντης ‘murderer’, so that αὐθεντικός applied to documents is said to mean ‘written in the author’s own hand’, and thus ‘original’,54 this semantic derivation is clearly mistaken. As a number of scholars have pointed out, αὐθεντικός meaning ‘original’ is based on the meaning ‘authoritative’.55 The original copy of a legal document is the only one that is legally binding, and is thus the only one properly called ‘authoritative’. Just as we speak in English of a ‘master copy’ to refer to an original from which copies are made, so the Greeks gave the name ‘masterful’ or ‘authoritative’ to the original of a contract or will. It is telling that the modern derivatives of αὐθεντικός, like English ‘authentic’, also
have this as their first meaning. There are also two examples in our time period where the adverb ἀυθεντικῶς is used as a synonym of κυρίως, meaning ‘in the proper sense of the word’, or ‘non-metaphorically’. The parallel with κυρίως makes it clear that here too the meaning is derived from αὐθέντης ‘master’.

The very earliest attestation of the adjective ἀυθεντικός occurs in an inscription from Mylasa in Asia Minor, which is probably to be dated to the second (possibly the first) century BC. The word occurs twice in the combination εἰσοφέρεσθαι ἄυθεντικὴν σπουδήν, ‘to demonstrate a ἄυθεντικὴν zeal’, but it is not clear from the partially broken context what the precise force of the adjective is. The most recent editor of the inscription, Dr. Wolfgang Blümel, has suggested to me in personal correspondence that one possibility (among others) is that it means herrscherlich, that is, ‘masterful’. Another possibility might be ‘princely’ or ‘aristocratic’. Standard lexica agree that its meaning here is likely to be related to ἄυθεντης ‘master’.

2. ἄυθεντέω

ἀυθεντέω is clearly a denominative verb, related to ἄυθεντης as ἐπιστατέω is related to ἐπιστάτης, or ἔσπαστεω to ἔσπαστης. It thus originally means ‘to be an ἄυθεντης’. Like the other derivatives of this noun, the denominative verb is dependent for its meaning on ἄυθεντης ‘master’. ἄυθεντέω occurs at most only eight times before AD 312, although it becomes quite common thereafter. Since a number of these have been overlooked in previous discussions, I shall briefly review them in chronological order.

(1) Philodemus, Rhet. 2.133 Sudhaus (= P.Herc. 220), dated to the mid-first century BC. If Sudhaus’s restoration of the fragmentary text is correct, then the verb ἄυθεντέω occurs here for the first time. He restores the text as follows:

...πρὸς τοὺς ἑπιφανὲστάτους ἑκάστοτε διαμαχούνται καὶ “σὺν ἄυθεντε[ῦσιν ἀν[αξίῳ]...”

It is possible, however, that the text should read ἄυθεντε[ῦσιν instead of ἄυθεντε[ῦσιν, in which case we have a form not of the verb ἄυθεντέω, but of the noun ἄυθεντης. If we do read the verb, then its meaning here, according to standard lexicographical reference works, is ‘rule’ or ‘have authority over’.

(2) The papyrus BGU 1208.38, dated to 27 BC, where we read the following: κάμοι ἄυθεντικότος πρὸς αὐτὸν περιποίησαι Καλατύτει τού ναυτικῶν ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῶν φόρῳ ἐν τῷ ὠρᾳ ἐπεχώρησεν. The verb occurs here with the preposition πρὸς, and is taken to mean ‘to have full power or authority over’ by Liddell–Scott–Jones. Other standard lexica agree.

(3) Aristonicus Alexandrinus, On the Signs of the Iliad, dated to the late first century BC. The comment on II. 9.694 contains the sentence: τότε γὰρ εἰώθεν ἐπιφωνεῖσθαι [scil. the Homeric phrase μύθον ἀγασσάμενοι], ὅταν ἅν αὐθεντῶν τοῦ λόγου κατὰ πληκτικά τινα προενέχεται. This passage, which has been overlooked in most previous discussions of ἄυθεντέω, used the expression ἅν αὐθεντῶν τοῦ λόγου in the sense of ‘speaker’, like the German Wortführer (cf. ἅν ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου in Acts 14.12). What is interesting about this use of ἄυθεντέω is that it corresponds semantically to ἄυθεντης ‘doer’, with λόγος describing
the action initiated by the doer.

(4) 1 Tim 2.12, dated to the first or second century AD: διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ σὺν ἐπιτρέποσο ὑδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ’ εἶναι ἐν ἑσυχίᾳ. There is a widespread lexico-
graphical consensus that αὐθεντεῖν here means ‘have authority over’ and/or ‘domineer’.71

(5) Ptolemy, Tetr. 3.13.10, dated to the second century AD: ο` μὲν οὖν τοῦ Κρόνου ἀστήρ μόνος τὴν οἰκοδοσποτεῖαν τῆς ψυχῆς λαβὼν καὶ αὐθεντήσας τοῦ τε Ἐρμοῦ καὶ τοῦ τῆς Σελήνης...ποιεῖ φιλοσωμάτους.72 The verb αὐθεντεῖν here occurs in an astrological context as a synonym for οἰκοδοσποτεῖν.73 Existing translations render it as ‘dominate’ or ‘control’.74 The precise technical meaning is given in the paraphrase of Tetrabiblos by Proclus (fifth century), which here substitutes the verb κατακρατεῖ ‘pre-
dominate’.75

(6) Moeris Atticista, Lexicon Atticum, dated to the second century AD.76 The entry on αὐτοδίκην, according to the manuscript tradition, identifies this noun as the proper Attic equivalent of Hellenistic αὐθέντην. However, it is agreed by most scholars that these two nouns are in fact a corruption (no doubt due to an itacistic pronunciation) of an original text which had the infinitives αὐτὸ δικέειν and αὐθεντεῖν—a reading which is confirmed by later versions of the entry in Hesychius and Thomas Magister.77 Consequently, this passage (which is sometimes neglected in discussions of αὐθεντεῖν) tells us that αὐθεντεῖν was frowned upon by the Atticists (no doubt because it was a recent word based on colloquial usage), and was a synonym of αὐτοδίκην ‘to have independent jurisdiction’, that is, to be master in one’s own sphere.

(7) The papyrus, P.Tebt. 276.28, an astrological fragment dated to the late second or third century. In the restoration proposed by Grenfell and Hunt, the verb occurs in a fragmentary sentence containing the words περὶ[...]κτησιν ἐξελ Καὶ [α]ὐθεντήθησε...].78 The restored reading [α]ὐθεντήθησε is uncertain, but seems probable in the light of the context (‘he will make acquisitions and rule’) and the parallel with other astrological texts, notably Ptolemy’s Tetrabiblos. Previous discussions of the verb have missed this occurrence, since it is listed in neither the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae nor the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri.79

(8) Origen, Commentary on 1 Corinthians, dated to the third century.80 This is another passage which has often been overlooked, although it casts an instructive light on the interpretation of 1 Tim. 2.12. Origen here cites the words αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός from that text, and goes on to paraphrase the apostolic prohibition as μὴ τὴν γυναίκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός, ‘that the woman is not to become leader of the man in [the ministry of] the word’.81

It is clear that all these examples illustrate the verb αὐθεντεῖν in the sense ‘to be an αὐθέντης’, and are semanti-
cally dependent on the meaning ‘master’ (or its variant ‘doer’). However, there is no evidence in any of these cases (with the possible exception of the disputed verse 1 Tim. 2.12) that the verb is to be understood in a negative sense.82

A search of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae turns up about a hundred further occurrences of αὐθεντεῖν in Greek literature after AD 312.83 With the single exception of a medieval scholion which I will discuss below, all of them derive their meaning from αὐθέντης ‘master’, and have to do with the exercise of au-
thority or sovereignty, almost always in
a non-pejorative sense. In seven cases the meaning corresponds to αὐθέντης ‘doer’, and refers to the initiation of an action.

3. αὐθέντης

The abstract noun αὐθέντης (also spelled αὐθέντεια) almost always refers to authority or sovereignty, and is thus also clearly based on αὐθέντης ‘master’. (The peculiar usage in Dio Cassius will be dealt with separately below.) It is first attested in 3 Macc. 2.29 (probably first century BC), where it refers to the (limited) legal autonomy of the Jews in Egypt, and it occurs frequently thereafter. I have collected 29 examples before AD 312, and many others can be found after that date. It is noteworthy that the word αὐθέντης played a prominent role in Gnosticism; for example it was the name of the supreme deity in the systems of the early Gnostics Cerinthus and Saturninus, and in the gnostic writing Poimandres (first and second centuries AD). As early as the mid-second century αὐθέντεια was also used in a bilingual Roman inscription as the Greek equivalent of Latin auctoritas. It is used in patristic literature to describe the sovereignty of God or Christ, and in papyri and inscriptions to refer to the authority of Roman officials. To the best of my knowledge it is never used in a pejorative sense before AD 312, and very rarely thereafter.

4. Other Derivatives

There are a few other derivatives of αὐθέντης, but they are all either late, rare, or dubious. In the period before AD 312, we find only the two nouns αὐθέντησις and αὐθέντρω. The first is a hapax legomenon meaning ‘exercise of authority’, and the latter is the feminine equivalent of αὐθέντης ‘master’, and thus means ‘mistress’. The lexica also list an adverb αὐτοεντεί and a verb αὐτοεντεῖω, but both of these are probably ghost-words, arising in the one case from a scribal corruption of αὐτοεντεί (a variant of αὐθέντης), and in the other from the occasional itacistic spelling of aorist or future forms of αὐθέντεω. In the Greek of late antiquity we also find αὐθέντησις, listed in a glossary as meaning auctoramentum, αὐθέντευω, a later synonym of αὐθέντεω, and the compound noun αὐθέντοπωλος, meaning ‘son (slave) of the master’. Clearly, all of these minor derivatives are also semantically based on αὐθέντης ‘master’. The same pattern persists in medieval Greek.

The result of our survey of the derivatives of αὐθέντης is that they are indeed all dependent for their meaning of αὐθέντης ‘master’. We thus find further confirmation of the earlier conclusion that it was only in the meaning ‘master’ that αὐθέντης was part of the living language after the classical period.

Ancient Translations and Loanwords

This conclusion finds further support in the evidence of ancient translations and loanwords based on the αὐθέντης family. Wherever ancient translations are available, they indicate that αὐθέντης and its derivatives were overwhelmingly understood to refer to mastery or authority, and wherever a member of this word-family was taken over as a loanword into another language, it carried with it a meaning related to αὐθέντης ‘master’.

Needless to say, the evidence of ancient translations needs to be handled with discretion. On the one hand, the translators’ grasp of the Greek they were translating was not infrequently inadequate, and they made mistakes. On the other hand, in some cases their command
of Greek was at least as good as that of the authors they were translating, and they had the advantage of being in touch with the living Greek of their own day. More often than not, where the original Greek is obscure to the modern reader, an ancient translation can help to clarify its meaning.

We have already seen how the ancient versions of Wis. 12.6 illustrate the confusion of translators when faced with áuvqenths in the unusual Attic sense of ‘kin-murderer’. But there is no such confusion when words of the áuvqenths group are used to convey the current meaning of mastery or authority. For example, the occurrence of áuvqenths ‘master’ in the Shepherd of Hermas is correctly translated dominus in both of the surviving ancient Latin translations of this work.

The derivatives of áuvqenths were rendered by ancient translators in similar ways. The Syriac version of 3 Macc. 2.29 renders áuvqentia as šultan ‘power, authority, right’. An early Latin version of Irenaeus, who reports the use of áuvqentia as a gnostic divine name, regularly translates this term as principalitas, a word derived via principalis from the Latin princeps. This is a happy choice, because Latin principalitas, like Greek áuθεντία, is thus an abstract noun formed on the basis of a common noun designating someone in authority.

The same pattern is followed in ancient versions of áuvqentew in 1 Tim. 2.12. The Old Latin of this verse has a variety of renderings (dated to the third century and later), all of which are related to a Latin word designating someone in authority. The renderings in question are praepositam esse (related to praepositus), dominari and dominare (related to dominus), and principari (related to princeps). Of these, the Vulgate retains the rendering dominari. The Sahidic Coptic version uses a verb meaning ‘to be lord’, and the Bohairic another Coptic verb meaning ‘to be head’. The Gothic version of Ulfilas has a verb derived from the regular Gothic word for ‘lord’. Only the Peshitta seems to break this pattern, since the printed editions of 1 Tim. 2.12 all have the Aphel of the verb mrah, meaning ‘to venture’ or ‘be rash’, which does not seem to fit the Greek very well. However, if we read the third radical of the printed verbal form (lmarāḥu) not as a heth, but as medial nun (with which heth is easily confused), then the form in question (lmarnu) becomes a denominative verb based on mārā, the standard Syriac word for ‘lord’ or ‘master’. Consequently, a good case can be made for the thesis that all these ancient versions (with the possible exception of the Peshitta) reflect an accurate understanding of áuvqentew in 1 Tim. 2.12 as a denominative verb based on áuvqenths ‘master’. Furthermore, it is to be noted that all these versions (with the same possible exception) understand the verb in a non-pejorative sense.

The virtually exclusive association of áuvqenths and its cognates with the notion of authority in ordinary post-classical Greek is further confirmed by the evidence of loanwords drawn from this word-group. áuvqenths ‘master’ was the source of loanwords in Hebrew, Coptic, Syriac, Latin, and Turkish, and from Turkish spread to many other languages. The derivative áuθεντικός, in the meaning ‘authoritative’ or ‘original’, was taken over into Syriac and Latin, and from Latin found its way into many other languages, including English. Likewise, áuθεντία meaning ‘authority’ was the source of loanwords in Hebrew, Coptic and Syriac. No doubt there are other derivatives and other languages which I have overlooked. To the best of
my knowledge all examples of loanwords drawn from the αὐθέντης family depend for their meaning on αὐθέντης ‘master’, and none has a pejorative sense. This is further evidence that, after the classical period, αὐθέντης ‘murderer’ had become archaic or obsolete, while αὐθέντης ‘master’ had become a productive part of the living language, giving rise not only to several new word-formation within Greek itself, but also to many loanwords outside of Greek.

The Evidence of the Paraphrasis of Proclus

For additional evidence of the overall pattern which we have discerned, I turn finally to Proclus’s Paraphrasis of Ptolemy’s Tetrabiblos.

As we have seen, the gradual emergence of the semantic derivatives of αὐθέντης ‘master’ in literary (that is, non-documentary) contexts is especially clearly attested in the Tetrabiblos of Ptolemy. In this famous astrological handbook, written in the second half of the second century AD, we find one of the earliest and clearest examples of the verb αὐθεντέω, as well as five instances of the adjective αὐθεντικός meaning ‘authoritative’. In each case, the meaning is securely established by the context. Apparently Ptolemy had no qualms about using these colloquial words in a serious scholarly treatise.

Further light on both the meaning and the non-literate status of these two words in Ptolemy’s Tetrabiblos is shed by the paraphrase of this work attributed to the fifth-century philosopher Proclus.121 His Paraphrasis, though often using a different Greek phraseology, follows the Tetrabiblos very closely, and is acknowledged by students of the latter to be quite accurate.122 It is therefore significant that the paraphrase, when it recasts the six passages in the Tetrabiblos which contain members of the αὐθέντης family, with one exception substitutes a more literary synonym. This is evident from the two columns in Table 1 (facing page), the first representing the wording of the Tetrabiblos, and the second that of the Paraphrasis.123

In all cases but the last, Proclus replaces words derived from αὐθέντης ‘master’ with a synonym. Since the former were not any less clear than their substitutes, it is probable that Proclus wished to avoid them (as he does in his other writings) simply because they were considered to belong to a sub-literary register of the language. Furthermore, the synonyms which he chooses make unmistakably clear that he understood that the words which they replaced had to do with mastery and authority.

Exceptions to the Pattern

The broad picture which we have sketched of the semantic development of αὐθέντης and its derivatives in ancient Greek accounts for almost all the available linguistic data. However, there are two clearly defined phenomena which do not fit this picture, and need to be explained separately. These are the distinctive usage of Dio Cassius, and the single example of αὐθεντέω meaning ‘murder’ in a medieval scholion on Aeschylus. Unfortunately, these two exceptions have sometimes been given disproportionate weight in recent discussions of the semantics of αὐθέντης and its cognates.125

Dio Cassius, the Roman historian of the third century AD, has his own way of using words from the αὐθέντης family. Not only does he prefer the unelided forms (αὐτοεντης and αὐτοεντηα instead of αὐθέντης and αὐθεντία—an usage found elsewhere only in Sophocles),
but he uses them in senses which are found elsewhere only in the Atticist lexica. Thus he twice uses αὐτοέντης (αὐθέντης) to mean ‘suicide’, and three times uses αὐτοεντία in the dative singular to mean ‘by one’s own hand’.

(The ghost-word αὐτοεντία is probably a corruption of one of these.) Since Dio was an Atticist writer, we can safely conclude that he was influenced by the Atticist handbooks to use αὐτοέντης and αὐτοεντία in this unusual way. As we saw above, these handbooks themselves were influenced by the ambiguity of the Greek word αὐτοεντία and its cognates, which could refer, not only to kin-murder, but also to suicide, as well as other actions ‘by one’s own hand’. The peculiar usage of Dio Cassius is thus based on an apparent misunderstanding of αὐθέντης ‘murderer’, and once more illustrates the fact that the classical meaning of this word was no longer understood in Hellenistic times.

The second exception is found in a scholion on the word στάζουντα, ‘dripping [with blood]’, in Aeschylus, Eum. 42. The scholion reads as follows: ‘by this [the author] vividly portrays the one who has just committed a murder (τὸν νεωστὸν ἤθεντηκότα).’ The verb αὐθεντέω is here unmistakably used in the sense ‘to murder’, and clearly depends for its meaning on αὐθέντης ‘murderer’. How are we to account for this unprecedented meaning of the verb?

Since the scholion is found in a tenth-century scholarly manuscript, and there is no other example of this meaning of αὐθεντέω, it is best to take this unusual usage to be an Atticist hypercorrection on the part of a Byzantine scholar. Seeking to write his scholia on Aeschylus in pure Attic Greek, and having learned that αὐθέντης in Attic meant ‘murderer’, he assumed that the corresponding verb in Attic must have meant ‘murder’, unaware that the verb is in fact not attested in Attic, and appears never to have carried this meaning in all of extant Greek literature. As a result, he used αὐθεντέω in an otherwise unattested sense.

This hypothesis of an Atticist hypercorrection is confirmed by a
later version of the Aeschylus scholion, which adds the following explanation to the unusual ἡμενατικοτα: ‘as it were the one who committed a homicide (τὸν φονευσαντα). For the murderer is called an αὐθεντής.’ Apparently this explanatory note was necessary to clarify the unusual use of αὐθεντέω in the original scholion. Even Byzantine scholars who read Aeschylus might have been puzzled by the use of αὐθεντέω to mean ‘murder’.

The exceptions which we have noted can thus all be explained as the result of Atticism, the artificial and often unsuccessful attempt on the part of many Hellenistic and Byzantine authors to write in a classical Attic Greek which was far removed from the current speech of their own day. Needless to say, it is a great mistake to take the definitions and usages of the Atticists as a reliable guide to the meaning of αὐθεντής and its derivatives in Hellenistic Greek.

Conclusions

The overall conclusion must be that there was a great semantic divide in ancient Greek between αὐθεντής ‘murderer’ and all other members of the αὐθεντής family (see Figure 1). On the one side of the divide is an Attic usage which was no longer alive in Hellenistic Greek, and which even the Atticists had largely ceased to understand. On the other hand we have αὐθεντής ‘master’ and its derivatives, which all convey the basic notion of mastery or authority. Whether or not this semantic divide is the result of separate etymological roots (a view that has often been proposed), there can be no doubt that the semantic domains of murder and authority were not only kept separate, but also belonged to different registers of the language.

With respect to the meaning of αὐθεντέω in 1 Tim. 2.12, my investigation leads to two further conclusions. First, the verb αὐθεντέω should not be interpreted in the light of αὐθεντής ‘murderer’, or the muddled definitions of it given in the Atticistic lexica. Instead, it should be understood, like all the other Hellenistic derivatives of αὐθεντής, in the light of the meaning which that word had in the living Greek of the day, namely ‘master’.

Secondly, there seems to be no basis for the claim that αὐθεντέω in 1 Tim. 2.12 has a pejorative connotation, as in ‘usurp authority’ or ‘domineer’. Although it is possible to identify isolated cases of a pejorative use for both αὐθεντέω and αὐθεντηα, these are not found before the fourth century AD. Overwhelmingly, the authority to which αὐθεντής ‘master’ and all its derivatives refer is a positive or neutral concept.
Figure 1: Chronological Chart (500 BC–AD 312)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC</th>
<th>APPENDIX A1</th>
<th>APDX A2</th>
<th>APDX A3</th>
<th>APDX B</th>
<th>APDX C</th>
<th>APDX D</th>
<th>APDX E-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αὐθέντης murderer</td>
<td>αὐθέντης master</td>
<td>αὐθέντης doer</td>
<td>αὐθέντηκός</td>
<td>αὐθέντεω</td>
<td>αὐθεντία</td>
<td>αὐθέν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>1-2 Aesch.</td>
<td>3-4 Soph.</td>
<td>5-13 Eur.</td>
<td>1-2 Eur.</td>
<td>1-2 Mylasa</td>
<td>1-2 Phldm*</td>
<td>1-3 Macc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>15-20 Ant.</td>
<td>21 Thuc.</td>
<td>22-23 Lys.</td>
<td>24 Isocr.</td>
<td>1 Polyb.</td>
<td>3-4 Cicero</td>
<td>3 Ariston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>28 Wis. 12.6</td>
<td>29 Philo</td>
<td>3-4 Diod. Sic.</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>4 1 Tim. 2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>30-31 Josephus</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 AD</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>11-21</td>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2 P.Bab.</td>
<td>3 SEG 18</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32-36 Appian</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>37 Phryn.</td>
<td>21-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38-39 Clement</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 Dio Cassius</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>41-43</td>
<td>51-56</td>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>5 Ptolemy</td>
<td>6 Moeris*</td>
<td>7 P. Tebt.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 312</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>44-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Origen</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Conjectural emendation or restoration.
Appendix A1: Occurrences of 
\textit{μυρμόντας} ‘murderer’

1. Aeschylus, \textit{Ag.} 1573 (458 BC)
2. Aeschylus, \textit{Eum.} 212 (458 BC)
3. Sophocles, \textit{El.} 272. NB: \textit{μυρμόντας} is a widely accepted emendation of \textit{μυρμοφόντας}
4. Sophocles, \textit{Oed. tyr.} 107 (ca. 430 BC)
5. Euripides, \textit{Andr.} 172 (ca. 431 BC)
6. Euripides, \textit{Andr.} 614
7. Euripides, \textit{Heracl.} 839
8. Euripides, \textit{Heracl.} 1359
9. Euripides, \textit{Th.} 660
10. Euripides, \textit{Phoen.} 873 (ca. 410 BC)
11. Euripides, \textit{Iph. aul.} 1190 (405 BC)
12. Euripides, \textit{Rhes.} 873
13. Euripides, \textit{Frag.} 1030 (Nauck)
15. Antiphon, \textit{Caedes Her.} 11.6
16. Ps.-Antiphon, \textit{II Tetr.} 3.4
17. Ps.-Antiphon, \textit{II Tetr.} 3.11.4
18. Ps.-Antiphon, \textit{II Tetr.} 4.4.3
19. Ps.-Antiphon, \textit{II Tetr.} 4.9.6
20. Ps.-Antiphon, \textit{II Tetr.} 4.10.1
21. Thucydides, \textit{Hist.} 3.58.5.4
22. Lysias, Isodemus, teste Harpocratio, \textit{Lexicon in decem Oratores Atticos} 66.7 (= \textit{Frag.} 63, Th.)
23. Lysias, Eratosthenes, teste Harpocratio, \textit{Lexicon in decem Oratores Atticos} 66.7
24. Isocrates, teste Suidae \textit{Lexicon} s.v. \textit{μυρμόντας}
25. P. Cairo Zen. 4.59.532 (mid-3rd century BC)
26. Apollonius Rhodius, \textit{Argon.} 2.754 (mid-3rd century BC)
27. Apollonius Rhodius, \textit{Argon.} 4.479
28. Wisdom 12.6 (late 1st century BC/early 1st century AD)
29. Philo, \textit{Det.}, 78 (1st century AD)
30. Josephus, \textit{War} 1.582 (AD 70s)
31. Josephus, \textit{War} 2.240
32. Appian, \textit{Bell. Civ.} 1.7§61.4 (mid-2nd century AD)
33. Appian, \textit{Bell. Civ.} 1.13§115.17
34. Appian, \textit{Bell. Civ.} 3.2§16.13
35. Appian, \textit{Bell. Civ.} 4.17§134.40
38. Clement of Alexandria, \textit{Strom.} 3.18.106 (ca. AD 200)

Appendix A2: Occurrences of 
\textit{μυρμόντας} ‘master’

1. Euripides, \textit{Suppl.} 442 (mid-420s BC)
2. \textit{SEG} 34.1260.25 (= \textit{I. Klaudiu polis} 70.11.25) (1st century AD)
3. \textit{SEG} 39.1180.109 (AD 62)
4. SEG 39.1180.123
5. Hermas, Sim. 9.5.6 (1st/2nd century AD)
6. P.Fam.Tebt. 15.1.15 (AD 114/15)
7. P.Fam.Tebt. 15.1.31 (AD 114/15)
8. P.Fam.Tebt. 15.2.33 (AD 114/15)
9. P.Fam.Tebt. 15.2.48 (AD 114/15)
10. P.Fam.Tebt. 15.6.141 (AD 114/15)
11. P.Fam.Tebt. 15.6.142 (AD 114/15)
12. P.Fam.Tebt. 24.1.21 (AD 124)
13. P.Fam.Tebt. 24.3.69 (AD 124)
14. P.Fam.Tebt. 24.3.78 (AD 124)
15. P.Fam.Tebt. 24.4.87 (AD 124)
16. P.Fam.Tebt. 24.4.102 (AD 124)
17. SB 7404.2.31 (AD 117/38)
18. SB 7404.2.37 (AD 117/38)
19. SB 7404.2.45 (AD 117/38)
20. SB 7404.3.64 (AD 117/38)
21. P.Aberd. 20.11 (2nd century AD?)
23. Alexander Rhetor 2.1.6
24. Phrynichus, Eclogae Nominum et Verborum Atticorum s.v. αὐθέντης (2nd century AD)
25. Ps.-Clement of Rome, Hom. 18.12.1.4 (2nd century AD)
26. Sib. Or. 7.69 (2nd century AD)
27. Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 2.8.38.3 (ca. AD 200)
28. Sib. Or. 8.309 (2nd/3rd century AD)
29. SB 10205.21 (= P.Leit. 13.21) (mid-3rd century AD)
30. P.Oxy. 3813.60 (3rd/4th century AD)

Appendix A3: Occurrences of αὐθέντης ‘doer’
1. Polybius, Hist. 22.14.2.3 (140/120 BC)
2. Diodorus Siculus, Bib. Hist. 16.61.1.3 (ca. 40 BC)
3. Diodorus Siculus, Bib. Hist. 17.5.4.6

Appendix B: Occurrences of αὐθεντικός and αὐθεντικός
(an asterisk marks the meaning ‘authoritative’)
1. I. Mylasa 134.2 (2nd century BC)
2. I. Mylasa 134.6
3. Cicero, Att. 9.14.2 (49 BC)*
4. Cicero, Att. 10.9.1 (49 BC)*
5. P.Oxy. 2836.18 (AD 50)
6. P. Oxy. 260.20 (AD 59)
7. PSI 871.29 (AD 66)
8. P.Fam.Tebt. 4.1 (AD 94)
9. P.Soter. 23.20 (AD 106)
10. Kerygma Petri, Frag. 9 (AD 100–133)
11. P.Meyer 6.24 (AD 125)
12. *BGU* 2037.1 (AD 100–150)
13. *PSI* 1236.13 (AD 128)
14. 2 *Clem.* 14.3 (ca. AD 120–140)
15. *SB* 10500.35 (= *SB* 10756.35) (AD 133)
16. *SB* 10500.36 (= *SB* 10756.36) (AD 133)
17. *SB* 10500.38 (= *SB* 10756.38) (AD 133)
18. *SB* 10500.39 (= *SB* 10756.39) (AD 133)
19. *PHamb.* 8.26 (AD 136)
20. *SB* 11959.30 (AD 142)
21. O. Wilck. 1010.4 (30 BC/AD323)
22. PFam.Tebt. 31.13 (2nd century AD)
23. Chr.Wilck. 173.12 (AD 151)
24. PCol. vol. V, no. 1, verso; 4.3.57 (AD 160/180)
25. P.Erl. 46B.27 (AD161–180)
26. Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.3.6 (AD 152–178)*
27. Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.4.11*
28. Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.7.5*
29. Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.7.10*
30. Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.10.9*
31. Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae, Appendix I* 381.21 (Pingree) (late 2nd century AD)*
32. Chr.Mitt. 227.17 (AD 189)
33. Chr.Mitt. 316.23 (= *BGU* 326.2.23) (AD 189/194)
34. P.Oxy. 719.30 (AD 193)
35. P.Oxy. 719.33 (AD 193)
36. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.7.38.6 (ca. AD 200)*
38. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6.6.47.3
39. P.Oxy. 1473.40 (AD 201)
40. P.Hamb. 18.2.6 (AD 222)
41. Origen, *Frag. 116 in Lam.* 4.20 (p. 277.7; *PG* XIII, col. 660B) (first half of 3rd century AD)*
42. P.Laur. 4.14 (= P.Flor. 4.14) (AD 246)
43. SB 9298.28 (= ChLA 486B.29) (AD 249)
44. SEG 32.1220.23 (ca. AD 254)
45. P.Mich. 614.42 (AD 256)
46. P.Flor. 223.5 (AD 257)
47. P.Mich. 615.23 (ca. AD 259)
48. K. Buresch, *Aus Lydien* (1898) (= Sussidia Epigraphica 8) 46.24 (ca. AD 250/270)
49. Chr.Mitt. 75.4 (AD 265/66)
50. P.Oxy. 1475.44 (AD 267)
51. P.Oxy. 1562.4 (AD 276/282)
52. P.Oxy. 1115.5 (AD 284)
53. P.Oxy. 1115.7 (AD 284)
54. P.Oxy. 1115.9 (AD 284)
55. P.Oxy. 1115.18 (AD 284)
56. P.Oxy. 1208.5 (AD 291)
57. P.Charite 15.2.26 (before AD 312?)
58. Chr.Wilck. 466.18 (= P.Lond. 985.18) (4th century AD; before AD 312?)
Appendix C: Occurrences of αὐθεντέω
1. Philodemus, *Rhet.* (P.Herc. 220) (1st century BC)
2. *BGU* 1208.38 (27 BC)
4. 1 Tim. 2.12 (1st or 2nd century AD)
5. Ptolemy, *Tetr.* 3.13.10 (late 2nd century AD)
7. *P.Tebt.* 276.28 (late 2nd or 3rd century AD)
8. Origen, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*; see C. Jenkins, ‘Origen on 1 Corinthians. IV’, *JTS* 10 (1909), p. 42 (3rd century AD)

Appendix D: Occurrences of αὐθεντία (αὐθεντεῖα)
1. 3 Macc. 2.29 (1st century BC)
2. *P.Babatha* 5, 2; A.12 (AD 110)
3. *SEG* 18.740.7 (ad 165/169)
4. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.24.1.9 (Saturninus) (late 2nd century AD)
5. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.26.1.3 (Cerinthus)
6. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.26.1.10 (Cerinthus)
7. *P.Mich.* 425.22 (AD 198)
8. *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.2 (= *Poimandres*) (2nd–3rd century AD)
9. *PSI* 870.18 (2nd/3rd century AD)
10. *P.Diog.* 17.31 (2nd/3rd century AD)

11. Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2.3.36.1 (ca. AD 200)
12. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.1.2.2 (ca. AD 200)
16. Hippolytus, *Haer.* 7.82.2 (Saturninus) (early 3rd century AD)
17. Hippolytus, *Haer.* 7.33.2 (Cerinthus)
20. Origen, *Commentary on John*, frag. 95 (=558.18 Preuschen) (ca. AD 236)
21. *P.Oxy.* 3048.1 (AD 246)
22. *P.Oxy.* 2664.1 (AD 245/248)
23. *P.Oxy.* 3050.2.18 (3rd century AD)
24. *SB* 11547B.10 (AD 252/53)
25. *P.Oxy.* 1410.1 (AD 285/86)
26. *P.Panop.Beatty* 2.4.92 (AD 300)
27. *P.Panop.Beatty* 2.6.156 (AD 300)
29. *P.Panop.Beatty* 2.9.229 (AD 300)

Appendix E-F: Occurrences of Other Derivatives

E. αὐθέντησις. Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae* 1.1 (ca. AD 175)

F. αὐθέντρα. *Tituli Asiae Minoris V* 795.17 (AD 236/45)
*I would like to thank the following scholars for commenting on earlier drafts of this article: H.S. Baldwin, S. Baugh, M. Silva, J.A.D. Weima, and M.O. Wise.
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47 See Brox, Hirt des Hermas, p. 43.


50 Cicero, *Att.* 9.14.2 and 10.9.1; Ptolemy, *Apotellesmatika* (Tetrabiblo) 4.3.6 (p. 178 in the Boll-Boer edition); 4.4.11 (p. 184); 4.7.5 (p. 195); 4.7.10 (p. 197); 4.10.9 (p. 207). See also Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.7.38.6, and Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae, Appendix I* (ed. D. Pingree; Leipzig; Teubner, 1986), 381.21.

51 Origen, *Fragmentum 116 in Lamentationes* (PG XIII, col. 660B), also published in *Origenes Werke* (GCS, 3; ed. E. Klostermann; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 277.7.

52 See the places marked with an asterisk in Appendix B. It is probably because Wilshire does not recognize this meaning that he excludes αὐθεντικός; αὐθεντικός from his survey of αὐθεντέω and its cognates ('The TLG Computer', pp. 120-21).

53 See the unmarked places in Appendix B (excluding the two places listed in note 57).


56 See *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. 'authentic', A. 1. The meaning 'authoritative' is also attested for French authentique, Italian autentico, etc.

57 See E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100) (2 vols.; New York: Frederick Ungar, 1887), s.v. αὐθεντικός 3, who refers for this meaning to Clement of Alexandria II, 352B (= *Strom.* 6.15.128.1 = *Kerygma Petri, Frag.* 9). Besides this place, I take αὐθεντικός to have this sense also in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4.13.90.1 (reading the subsequent word as ἔρθην rather than ἔφθην, following the 1592 edition of F. Syllburg).

58 The inscription (which has αὐθεντικός in lines 2 and 5) was first published in *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 5 (1881), pp. 101–102, and more recently in W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa* (Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 34–35; 2 vols.; Bonn: Habelt, 1987–1988), I, pp. 56–57 (Inscription #134). No date for the inscription is indicated in either one of these publications, but it is assigned to the second century BC by LSJ, *Revised Supplement*, s.v. αὐθεντικός. Blümel confirms this dating, although he would not rule out the first half of the first century (letter to A. Wolters dated 20 June 1993).


61 On the derivation of αὐθεντικός, see Moulton and Howard, *Grammar*, II, p. 278; and Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, p. 138. All the verbs mentioned (compare also γιγουμένων from γιγομένων, and τιμωμένον from τίμω) have the general meaning ‘rule’, and as such are construed with the genitive. On the genitive with verbs of ruling, see W.W. Goodwin and C.B. Gulick, *Greek Grammar* (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1930), § 1109; and BDF, § 177.

62 See Appendix C.


64 This possibility is correctly noted by Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not*, p. 96. Since the immediate context contains a quotation from Euripides, it is possible that Philodemus may here be citing a lost Attic work (note that Sudhaus prints the words σὺν αὐθεντικῶν αὐτείς [between quotation marks], which contained the Old Attic dative plural
διοικητής

65 See C.J. Voors, Lexicon Philodemum, I (Purmerend, The Netherlands: Maassen, 1934), s.v. (‘dominor’), and Diccionario Griego–Español, s.v. (‘ejercer la autoridad’). See also Knight, ‘διοικητής’, p. 145.

66 See Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Museen zu Berlin IV (Berlin: Weidmann, 1912), #1208, line 38 (p. 351).

67 LSJ, s.v.

68 This place is specifically mentioned in the entries on διοικητής in F. Freytag, Worterbuch der griechischen Papyrusrerundken (3 vols.; Berlin: Selbstverlag der Erben, 1925–1931), s.v. (‘Herr sein, fest auftreten’); and Diccionario Griego–Español, s.v. (‘ejercer la autoridad’).


70 In the context, Achilles (οὔ διοικητὴς τοῦ λόγου) is contrasted with Odysseus (οἱ μυρνῶν τὰ ὑπ’ Ἀχιλλέως ἐφημένοι). The former is the one who did the actual speaking, while the latter is the one who reported what was spoken.

71 See LSJ, s.v., 1 (‘to have full power or authority over’); and Diccionario Griego–Español, s.v. (‘tener autoridad sobre’). The following New Testament lexica give or include the pejorative sense ‘dominence’: Souter, Pocket Lexicon, s.v.; BAGD, s.v. [not in the German original, which has only ‘herrschen über’]; B.M. Newman, Jr, A Concise Greek–English Dictionary of the New Testament (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), s.v.; J.P. Louw and E. Nida, Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1989), I, p. 474 (sub 37.21).


75 Procli Paraphrasis in quatuor Ptolemaei libris De sidерum effectibus (Basilae, apud Ioannem Oprianum, 1554), p. 197. For the technical astrological sense ‘predominance’ of κατακράτεω in the Paraphrasis of Proclus, see LSJ, s.v. κατακράτεω I.2. See the general discussion of Proclus’s Paraphrasis below.


79 Presumably, P.Tebt. 276 was insufficiently ‘literary’ to be included in the former, and insufficiently ‘documentary’ to be included in the latter. It provides an instructive example of how some ancient Greek texts still ‘fall between the cracks’ of these two comprehensive data bases.

80 ‘The relevant passage was published in C. Jenkins, ‘Origen on 1 Corinthians. IV’, JTS 10 (1909), pp. 29–51. The reference to 1 Tim. 2.12 is found on p. 42.

81 The passage is discussed by Wilshire, ‘The TLG Computer’, p. 126, but Origen’s paraphrase is not given.

82 Nor is there any evidence that διοικητής refers to ‘the assumption or implementation of authority as an action’ as distinct from ‘having authority as status or office’, pace Perriman, ‘What Eve Did’, pp. 136–37.

83 According to Baldwin, ‘A Different Word’, p. 72 n. 15, the verb διοικητεῖσθαι is found about 110 times in the Greek corpus which can presently be electronically searched. He discusses 82 of these in his ‘Appendix 2’, excluding only citations of 1 Tim. 2.12 and the various recensions of the medieval Alexander Romance (p. 72 n. 17).

84 See Baldwin, ‘Appendix 2’. As Baldwin points out, only one of the 82 passages which he discusses has a clearly pejorative sense (‘A Difficult Word’, p. 75). It occurs around AD 400 in John Chrysostom, In Epistulam ad Colossenses. Hom. ‘Origen on 1 Corinthians. IV’, JTS 10 (1909), pp. 29–51. The reference to 1 Tim. 2.12 means ‘represent oneself as originator of’.


86 It is not necessary to postulate an unusual sense for διοικητεῖσθαι here, pace LSJ, s.v., 2 (‘restriction’ or the NRSV ‘status’), among others. The reference is to the limited ‘legal autonomy’ or ‘independent jurisdiction’
of the Jews in Alexandria; see A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 7; Tübingen: Mohr, 1985), p. 32 and passim. Compare auvqe,nthj in the sense auvqentei,w, ‘to have independent jurisdiction’, which was noted above in Moeris, Hesychius, and Thomas Magister.

87 See Appendix D.
88 It is striking that eight of the 29 occurrences listed in Appendix D refer to gnostic sources.
90 See Clement of Alexandria, *Paed*. 2.3.36.1 and *Strom*. 4.1.2.2; *PSI* 870.18; *PDiog*. 17.31; *POxy*. 3048.1, etc., as well as the inscription of the preceding note.
91 The examples of a pejorative sense given in *LPGL*, s.v., D all postdate AD 312, and many are debatable.
92 Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae* I.1 I. Dihle, ‘auvqentei,w’, p. 80, translates the term as ‘die Berufsstellung des selb
93 *Vir. ill.* s.v., D all postdate AD 312, and many are debatable.
95 Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, 58.24.4. The form auvqe,nthj is in fact a variant reading here. Not only does this reading match Dio’s usage elsewhere, but the emergence of the otherwise unattested form auvqe,nthj can be plausibly explained as a scribal corruption of it.
96 For example, in the Greek translation of Jerome’s *Vir. ill.* 8 (*PL* XXIII, col. 622B), the form auvqe,nthj should probably be read auvqe,nthj (so *LPGL*, s.v. auvqe,nthj, l.a). See also Zucker, ‘auvqe,nthj’, p. 19, on the form auvqe,nthj in *BGU* 1.103.
97 LSJ, s.v.
99 LSJ, Revised Supplement, s.v.
106 See the apparatus in Horner, *Coptic Version*, V, p. 450 (etbreejjoj, from joj ‘head’).
115 See Psichiari, *’Efendi*, pp. 396–400.
The correct Attic use of auvqe,nthj is realized that Dio's usage was un-Attic. We also find the reflexive pronoun was added by a scribe who noun in its proper Attic sense of 'murderer'. Perhaps auvtoceiri,zw expresses the same idea with the reflexive pronoun, auvqe,nthj, sui ipsius potentia. The numbers in the second column represent the page numbers of the editio princeps of this work was published by Melanchthon in 1554 (see n. 75 above). Two subsequent editions, with a Latin translation by Leo Allatius, were published in the seventeenth century (Leiden, 1635 and 1654). I have consulted the editio princeps available at the University of Michigan library (a copy formerly belonging to F.E. Robbins). Robbins expresses some doubt about the attribution to Proclus; see his edition of the Tetrabiblos (n. 73 above), p. xvi. An English translation of the Paraphrasis is available in J.M. Ashmand, Ptolemy's Tetrabiblos or Quadrupartite (Chicago: Aries Press, 1936). See A. Bouché-Leclercq, L'astrologie grecque (Paris: Ernest Lerou, 1899), XII; and Robbins's edition of Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos, pp. xvi-xvii.

The translation is conjectural. It is clear from the context in the Tetrabiblos that Ptolemy is referring to a position of higher authority or influence (τὸ αὐτοκράτερον) contrasted with τὸ ὑποτεχαίρειν. Perhaps the Greek adjective ἀυτοκράτορ, literally 'of the city', is to be understood here as 'close to the center of power in Rome'. The English translation by Ashmand renders it as 'important'.

For example, much is made of αὐτῳντιαν in the sense 'murder' in Kroeger and Kroeger, I Suffer Not, pp. 86, 95-98, 185-88. Dio Cassius, Roman History, 37.13.4 and 58.15.4, in both cases with γίγνεσθαι to mean 'to commit suicide'. Oddly enough, in Roman History, Frag. 9.38 he expresses the same idea with the reflexive pronoun, αὐτοντιαν...ἐκτῶν γίγνεσθαι, thus using the noun in its proper Attic sense of 'murderer'. Perhaps the reflexive pronoun was added by a scribe who realized that Dio's usage was un-Attic. We also find the correct Attic use of αὐτῳντια in the remains of Book 20 of the Roman History, but this is extant only in a medieval paraphrase (Zonaras 9.25.5). On Dio's peculiar usage, see also Zucker, 'Αὐτῳντια, p. 16.

See O.L. Smith, Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae Extant Omnia, I (Leipzig: Teubner, 1976), p. 45. There is a similar explanation in Zucker, 'Αὐτῳντια, p. 16: 'Sehr merkwürdig ist, dass noch in späterer Zeit das Verbαὐτῳντια in attizistischem Sinn "Mörder sein" heissen kann gegen die lebendige Sprache'.

See Smith, Scholia Graeca, pp. 45, 208. The expanded scholion is first found in the Tetrabiblos of Ptolemy (14th century) on Aeschylus, Eum. 40. See Kretschmer, 'Αὐτῳντια, pp. 291-93, as well as Zucker, 'Αὐτῳντια, p. 14, who came to the same conclusion independently. Actually, the scholarly tradition of identifying different etymological roots for αὐτῳντια goes back to Byzantine times; see Gaisford (ed.), Etymologicum Magnum (Oxford: Typographeo academiclo, 1848; repr. Amsteram: Hakkert, 1962), s.v. (p. 168). In the above I have myself deliberately refrained from invoking etymological evidence as part of my semantic argument, for fear of falling into the etymological fallacy.

The proposal by Wilshire, '1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited', p. 48, to conflate the meanings of αὐτῳντια 'murderer', and αὐτῳντια 'doer', and thus to arrive at the sense 'instigate violence' for the verb αὐτῳντια in 1 Tim. 2.12, fails to observe (among other things) this difference in register. See nn. 84 and 91 above.

The non-pejorative meaning of αὐτῳντια in 1 Tim. 2.12 is also supported by syntactical considerations. See A.J. Köstenberger, 'A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Tim 2:12', in Köstenberger, Schreiner and Baldwin (eds.), Women in the Church, pp. 81-103.