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Abstract

This thesis focuses on two separate, but related areas: the analysis of translation technique and the Greek texts of Daniel.

Foremost in the research of Translation Technique (TT) in the Septuagint is the need for a model that is appropriate for the analysis of different ancient languages. In recent years there has been an increasing emphasis on the features of literalism in a translation, but it is argued in this thesis that the focus on literalism is inadequate as a methodology for the analysis of TT. The contention of this thesis is that the analysis of TT should incorporate insights from modern linguistic research. Therefore, the main purpose of this thesis is to develop and apply such a model to the Old Greek (OG) and Theodotion (Th) versions of Daniel.

The existence of two complete Greek versions of the book of Daniel that are closely related to the same Vorlage (at least in chapters 1-3 and 7-12), furnish ideal examples for the application of the methodology. Unfortunately, it is no straightforward matter to employ the OG of Daniel, because the available critical edition can no longer be regarded as reliable. The most important witness to the OG version of Daniel is Papyrus 967, and large portions of this manuscript have been published since the appearance of the critical edition of the OG of Daniel in 1954. Therefore, in order to analyze and compare the two Greek texts of Daniel, it is necessary to evaluate all of the variants of Papyrus 967 in order to establish a preliminary critical text of OG. Once a critical text is established the proposed methodology for translation technique is applied to selected passages in the OG and Th versions of Daniel.

An analysis and comparison of TT in OG and Th makes it possible to: 1) characterize the TT employed by OG and Th in detail; 2) determine Th's relationship to OG, i.e. is it a revision or independent translation; 3) demonstrate how the Greek texts can be employed effectively for textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. On the basis of the analysis of Th's text it is also possible to determine Th's relationship to the body of works, which exhibit a close formal correspondence to the Masoretic text, known as kaige-Theodotion.
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Introduction

Over the last fifteen years there has been a growing interest in the study of the translation technique (TT) of the various books of the Septuagint (LXX). The impetus for such research is the application of the knowledge gained to the text-critical use of the LXX in Biblical research. It was through my own reading while studying for the Master of Divinity degree that I became convinced that a predominant methodology being employed for the study of TT in the LXX needed correction. This thesis represents an attempt to provide that correction.

The primary purpose of this thesis is to provide a descriptive analysis of the TT employed in the Old Greek (OG) and Theodotion (Th) versions of the Book of Daniel, which will also serve as a paradigm for others wishing to engage in similar research. Although the aim is stated in one sentence, it encompasses three important subjects. The first is the study of TT and how the study of TT can inform the scholar's use of a version for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. The second subject is the Greek texts chosen for the study: the OG and Th versions of Daniel. Finally, we will apply the results of the study of TT in the Greek texts to the textual-criticism of the Masoretic Text (MT).

In the course of this thesis, then, we will begin with the textual criticism and analysis of the TT of the Greek texts of Daniel and follow it through to its ultimate end: textual criticism of MT. There are those who might express reservations about the wisdom of "lone rangers" attempting to combine too many areas of research and manufacturing tendentious "do-it-yourself" methodologies, and,

---

1The pronoun "we" (or "our") is frequently employed in this thesis to designate myself, the writer, and you, the reader, in order to acknowledge your participation in the investigative process.

perhaps, the shortcomings of this thesis will prove their doubts well-founded. On the other hand, though it is more difficult nowadays to employ a multi-disciplinary approach in one's research, the necessity of doing so remains. If one of the main reasons for reconstructing the critical text of the versions is to serve textual criticism of MT and, furthermore, if the primary reason why we analyze TT is also to serve textual criticism of MT, then a study that combines these exercises is in order.

I will comment more fully on the aims of this thesis below. Chapter one (CH 1) is a brief introduction to previous studies in the OG and Th versions of Daniel, and will provide the necessary background for the understanding of the stated goals as well as the methodology employed to achieve them.

Translation Technique and Textual Criticism

Foremost in the research of TT in the OG is the need of a model that is appropriate for the analysis of two very different ancient languages. In recent years there has been an increasing emphasis on the features of literalism in a translation, but it is the contention of this thesis that the focus on literalism is inadequate to describe the TT of any book, particularly a free translation like the OG of Daniel. The emphasis on literalism has been influenced by two scholars who have set forth most clearly the means for defining

---

3 See also the article by Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, in which he raises concerns about the increasing specialization and fragmentation within biblical scholarship, in "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth," JBL 102 (1983): 365-99.

literalism: James Barr and Emanuel Tov. In separate works, first Barr and then Tov proposed criteria for literalism, which were very similar in content.⁵ In this thesis we will focus on Tov's approach, however, because he has been particularly influential in focusing the energy of scholars towards investigating the characteristics of literalism in the books of the LXX. Tov's influence is due to several factors, not the least of which are his voluminous and meticulous writings in the area of TT and the research of the LXX in general.⁶ He has also been instrumental in the CATSS⁷ project.

The research on the characteristics of literalism has concentrated on generating statistics that measure the degree to which various books formally reproduce the source text in the receptor language. Although these statistics are helpful as a general guide to TT, they are insufficient to describe how the translator understood the text before him in any particular case. Specific criticisms of the focus on literalism for the study of TT are made in CH 3 in order to support the view that it is inadequate as a methodology. Though the methodology of Tov, but, more particularly, its application by Galen Marquis and Benjamin Wright, is criticized, it is my intention that this appraisal is viewed constructively. Our common goal is to refine a methodology for the analysis of TT and apply it to the LXX. This thesis is one more step in that process.

The criticisms of the focus on literalism will also serve to prepare for the presentation of the proposed methodology for TT in CH 4. The contention of this thesis is that the analysis of TT should be informed by the insights of modern linguistic research. The science of linguistics has made great gains in the past century and the last

⁵Barr, "Typology", p. 294; E. Tov, TCU, pp. 54-60.

⁶Besides TCU, Tov has published numerous articles dealing with translation technique and the LXX in general (see the bibliography). He has recently published a volume on the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible which is already acknowledged to be the standard. See E. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, (Minneapolis: Fortress. 1992).

⁷CATSS = Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies. The CATSS project is based at the University of Pennsylvania and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and is under the co-direction of Robert Kraft and Emanuel Tov.
30 years of Biblical scholarship reveal the growing influence of linguistics in biblical studies. Though some scholars have used linguistic principles in their research of TT in the LXX (notably Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen and his students Raija Sollamo and Anneli Aejmelaeus), they have confined their investigations to specific areas of syntax and applied them to numerous books of the LXX rather than attempting to describe the TT of a particular book. However, there has been one recent publication that appeared during the course of this research that does offer a TT analysis of a biblical book employing a linguistic approach. H. Szpek offers a very thorough model for the analysis of TT; and we will be in dialogue with it at numerous points in this thesis. A theoretical foundation and linguistic model for the TT analysis of the individual units/books of the LXX will be presented in chapter four, and it will be applied to the OG and Th versions of Daniel in CH 5.

The existence of two Greek versions of the book of Daniel, which are closely related to the same Vorlage (at least in chapters 1-3 and 7-12), furnishes us with ideal examples for the demonstration of our methodology. The two versions are particularly appropriate because they manifest important differences in how each rendered its parent text. It has become common to conceptualize these differences by referring to the OG version as a "free" translation, whereas Th's translation is described as "literal." These characterizations,

---


however, have tended to cast more shadow than light on the subject. In fact, the majority of the books of the LXX were translated very literally; and the differences between "literal" and "free" translations have sometimes been overemphasized without due attention to features that they have in common. James Barr draws attention to this very point when he states: "truly 'free' translation in the sense in which this might be understood by the modern literary public, scarcely existed in the world of the LXX, or indeed of much of ancient biblical translation in general."\(^{12}\)

It has already been mentioned that the primary reason for the analysis of TT arises from the crucial role it plays in textual criticism.\(^{13}\) Since the aim is to develop an approach to the analysis of TT that also serves the practical needs of the textual critic, selected readings from Daniel will also be examined in CH 5 in order to illustrate how the results from TT can be applied to textual criticism of the Hebrew text.

**The Book of Daniel**

The content of Daniel may be divided into two parts: chapters one to six consist of court-tales narrated from the perspective of a third person,\(^{14}\) and chapters seven to twelve in which the character Daniel relates in the first person four visions he received. In the semitic text the book may also be divided on the basis of language. Chapters 1:1-2:4a and 8-12 are written in Hebrew, while 2:4b-7:28 are written in Aramaic. The obvious difficulty is the changes in content

---


\(^{13}\)See L. Greenspoon, "The Use and Abuse of the Term 'LXX' and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship," \emph{BIOSCS} 20 (1987): 21-29.

\(^{14}\)A scholarly consensus has recently developed, led by John J. Collins that the court-tales originate from the background of "manticism" and that Daniel is positively portrayed as a wise courtier. However, this view has been subjected to serious criticism by R.G. Wooden who is completing his doctoral work at St. Andrews University. See J.J. Collins, "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," \emph{JBL} 94 (1975): 218-234; W.L. Humphreys. "A Lifestyle for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel." \emph{JBL} 92 (1973): 211-223.
and the perspective from which the events are narrated do not coincide with the changes from Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew.\textsuperscript{15}

Not only are there linguistic and literary anomalies preserved in the HA version of Daniel, but the textual tradition of Daniel preserved in the LXX and the other ancient versions is very different from the Masoretic Text (MT). Daniel is ordered among the prophets in the LXX (as in the Protestant canon), while in the Hebrew canon it is placed with the Writings.\textsuperscript{16} The LXX also has three additions to the book:\textsuperscript{17} "The Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Young Men," "Susanna," and "Bel and the Dragon."\textsuperscript{18} One final anomaly concerns the fact that during the course of the development of the LXX the OG translation of Daniel was supplanted by the so-called Th version.

The co-existence of the OG and Th versions of Daniel inevitably leads to a discussion of how the two are related to one another. The third aim of this investigation is to determine whether Th is a translation or a recension of the OG and, if it is a recension, is it


\textsuperscript{16} For an excellent discussion of the issues involved see Klaus Koch, "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" \textit{Int} 39 (1985): 117-130.

\textsuperscript{17} The Roman Catholic church at the council of Trent in 1546 upheld their authority and declared them to be "deuterocanonical," i.e. of the second canon. Carey A. Moore, \textit{Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions}, \textit{AB} 44 (New York: Doubleday, 1977), p. 3.

\textsuperscript{18} For background to the order of appearance of the additions in the Greek versions and for the influence of the Greek versions on the other ancient versions, see Mont. pp. 5-7, 24-57. The presence of these additions and the existence of manuscript fragments of these and other Daniel stories found at Qumran has led many scholars to conclude the MT of Daniel (particularly chs. 1-6) was compiled from a wider cycle of existing stories. See, Moore, \textit{Additions}, p. 29. This strengthens the earlier views of scholars such as Mont., p. 90 and C.C. Torrey that the Aramaic chs. 2-6 were enlarged later with ch. 7 in Aramaic and chs. 1 and 8-12 in Hebrew. See C. C. Torrey. "Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel," \textit{Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences} 15 (1909): 250.
part of the *kaige* tradition? Most scholars would affirm that Th is a recension (or revision) of the QG, but such an assessment has to be grounded in a detailed analysis. Previous research on the recensions have been limited primarily to lexical studies, whereas this investigation of TT offers the opportunity of providing a more complete description of the activity of Th. There have been two criteria proposed to determine whether a text is a revision of another text: 1) there must be a sufficient number of distinctive agreements between the texts to prove that one used the other as its basis; 2) that the revisor worked in a certain way, i.e., in our case, towards the proto-MT. The first criterion is more important than the second.

---


for two reasons. If a text is closer to the MT, it may be that a translator just worked that way. Therefore, a sufficient number of distinctive agreements are required in order to prove dependence.

Unfortunately, even the criterion of distinctive agreements has to be applied cautiously, because agreements may be explained as later corruptions during the transmission of the texts. Therefore, we have to add a third criterion to our list: distinctive disagreements. Distinctive disagreements are not mere inconsistencies found in the work of the (presumed) revisor, but renditions which are totally independent of the text (presumably) being revised. In other words, distinctive disagreements are features that indicate the work of an independent translator. In a comparison of the texts of Th and OG in Daniel we will have to weigh very carefully evidence of agreements and disagreements in order to give us a balanced perspective of Th's text, especially when our witnesses to the text of the OG are so sparse. Even with the advent of 967 as a witness to the OG we will discover that there remains significant evidence that the text of OG has been corrupted through harmonization to MT and Th. Therefore, determining the relationship that existed between the texts in their original composition is a complex question, and requires that the original OG text be disentangled as much as possible from the later corrupted form. In some passages this task is impossible. However, the analysis of the texts in CH 5 will provide the reader with an opportunity to draw his/her own conclusion regarding this issue. The analysis of CH 5 will also inform the analysis of Th's relationship to the kaige tradition in CH 6.

**Texts and Witnesses Consulted**

The HA text for this study is the fourth edition of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), which is based on the Leningrad Codex of the Masoretic Text. Reference is also made to the manuscript


fragments from Qumran, particularly 4QDan\textsuperscript{a,b,c}.\textsuperscript{24} The fragments from caves 1 and 6 do not witness any significant variants from MT, though 1QDan\textsuperscript{a} does have the beginning of the Aramaic section in 2:4b.\textsuperscript{15}

The main text for the Th version of Daniel is the critical text by Ziegler.\textsuperscript{26} The situation is more complicated with respect to OG because the Th version supplanted it at an early date and the majority of manuscripts we possess witness to this later Th version. There are only two extant witnesses to the complete text of OG, and only one of them is in Greek. The Chisian (Chigi) manuscript, numbered 88 by Rahlfs and Ziegler,\textsuperscript{27} is dated in the 9-11th centuries C.E. The other manuscript is the Syro-Hexapla (Syh) which was completed by Paul of Tella in 615-617 C.E. The Syh is an extremely literal translation of Origen's Hexapla into Syriac.\textsuperscript{28} One notable feature of 88 and Syh is the extent of their agreement. Ziegler refers to them as "sister manuscripts."\textsuperscript{29}

The only extant pre-hexaplaric manuscript of Daniel is papyrus 967 which was discovered in 1931 and required 46 years and four editors before it was fully published.\textsuperscript{30} Unfortunately, Ziegler was only able to make use of the texts published by Kenyon, so the


\textsuperscript{25}Jeans., p. 6, fn. 3.

\textsuperscript{26}J. Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco, Septuaginta 16:2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).


\textsuperscript{29}Zieg., p. 13.

Göttingen critical edition of OG is lacking the readings of 967 in the editions published by Hamm, Geissen, and Roca-Puig. The necessity of reconstructing the OG for these sections is made obvious by the number of variants between 967 and Ziegler's text. For example, in chs. 1-2 alone there are approximately 350 variants between 967 and Ziegler's text! There is also no doubt that 967 is the more faithful witness to the original OG text.\textsuperscript{31} Therefore, all the variant readings from the aforementioned editions of 967 have been collated and evaluated against Ziegler's critical text in CH 2.\textsuperscript{32} Obviously, it would have been more practical to have analyzed an established critical text, and if a revised edition of Ziegler's text were not already in preparation by O. Munnich, the OG text of Daniel would have been worthy of a thesis in its own right.\textsuperscript{31} On the other hand, the OG and Th texts of Daniel were ideal for the purposes of this thesis, so by establishing a preliminary critical text we should be able to achieve reasonably accurate results. Furthermore, the editors of 967 and other scholars like Jeansonne and Albertz have already evaluated variant readings in the papyrus. In many cases they have provided more than adequate reason to adopt a reading as OG, and the reader is frequently directed to one of their volumes for more detailed discussions. This is not to say that any text-critical decisions were made lightly or without thorough examination of each and every reading. It only recognizes that the discussion of the variants and the reasons for some decisions are not as full as they might be otherwise.

Occasional reference is also made to the standard critical

\textsuperscript{31}See Zieg., pp. 19-21; Hamm, I-II, pp. 19-55. Due to the limited number of witnesses to the OG we also have to recognize the provisional nature of any critical reconstruction of the text. Given the obvious superiority of 967 it is odd that in a recent thesis T. Meadowcroft characterizes Ziegler's text as "biased" toward 967. See "A Literary Critical Comparison of the Masoretic Text and Septuagint of Daniel 2-7," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1993), p. 22.

\textsuperscript{32}A modified form of a collation of the variants has been used to supplement the variant files for Daniel in the CATSS project.

\textsuperscript{33}The revised edition of Ziegler's text by O. Munnich is due for completion in the next few years.
editions of the Peshitta and Vulgate versions of Daniel. 34

Computers and the Analysis of TT

It is important to acknowledge the significance that modern technology played in the completion of this research. I am grateful to Dr. Robert A. Kraft who made available the Daniel files from the CATSS project for use in this thesis. There are three main parts to the CATSS database. 35 First, there is the morphological analysis of the LXX/OG. 36 Second, there is a parallel alignment of the LXX/OG and MT. Third, there are the textual variants for the LXX/OG. 37 All of the Daniel files proved useful in the present research, though the morphologically analyzed OG along with the morphologically analyzed MT were of prime importance. 38 These texts were searched in order to isolate specific words, morphemes, or syntactical constructions for purposes of comparison. The programs LBASE and Bible Windows 39 were used to read, search, and retrieve the data from the Biblical texts.


36 It should be noted that we use LXX/OG because critical editions of the OG for each book of the LXX have not yet been written. The text of Rahlfs' has been adopted for the data in such cases, but the database itself is continually updated with advances in research.


38 The morphologically tagged MT is distributed by Westminster Theological Seminary.

39 Developed by John Baima and distributed through Silver Mountain Software, Texas.
WinGreek\(^{40}\) was also helpful to read the data and was used in conjunction with the wordprocessor in CH 2 to display the texts in the original languages. Neither LBASE or WinGreek could use the parallel alignment and morphological files interactively,\(^{41}\) so the actual comparison and analysis of the data was done manually.

A Note on the Citation of the Texts of Daniel

Most readers are familiar with the fact that the chapter and verse divisions are different in MT and the critical edition of the Greek texts in Ziegler. However, these discrepancies are confined primarily to chs. 3, 4, and 6. In an effort to be as inclusive as possible, passages in Daniel will be cited as follows. In CH 2 citations will always follow Ziegler because our focus is the critical text of OG, and Ziegler's edition is the established critical text. Apart from CH 2 the cited text will always be MT in the first instance, while any deviations will follow in round ( ) brackets. For example, the passage corresponding to 3:24 in MT is 3:91 in OG and Th, so it will be cited as 3:24(91). The basic rule is that there is a difference of three verses in ch. 4 and one verse in ch. 6.

Furthermore, the differences between the HA and Greek texts of Daniel means that in many cases OG has a plus or minus when compared to MT. Therefore, in our discussion of translation equivalents it will be noted when there is no corresponding Vorlage (eg. OG=0).

\(^{40}\) A shareware program developed by Dr. Peter Gentry and Andrew Fountain.

Chapter I

Previous Research into the OG and Th Versions of Daniel

A thorough history of research into the OG and Th versions of Daniel up to 1980 is available elsewhere. Therefore, we are only required to note the main lines of investigation in previous studies and to expand the discussion on occasions necessary for the aims of this research. An arbitrary division has been imposed between studies prior to and following Barthélemy's publication of Les Devanciers D'Aquila in 1963 because of the impact of this work on subsequent LXX research.

I. Early Investigations of the OG and (Ur)Theodotion

The most extensive early examination of OG was by A. Bludau in 1897. Unfortunately, Bludau laboured prior to the discovery of papyrus 967. His evaluation of OG was therefore of necessity only partial, and renders some of his data invalid. Although a pre-Hexaplaric witness to the OG might have altered Bludau's assessment of the text somewhat, it would not have affected his basic premise that the Vorlage of the OG was MT. On the assumption that the OG had the equivalent of MT as a Vorlage, Bludau invariably concluded that any differences between the two resulted from intentional changes introduced by the translator. This assumption also led Bludau to investigate chs. 1-3, 7-12 separately from 4-6, which he characterized

---

1 McCrystal, pp. 1-67.

2 For example, the picture Bludau (pp. 46-57) provides of additions and omissions in OG is completely changed when one accounts for the witness of 967. Bludau was aware of these difficulties, as he notes, "Bei alle dem bleibt der LXX-Text des Buches Daniel noch immer an vielen Stellen unsicher," p. 28.

3 This methodology is well attested in his 27 page analysis of 9:24-27. See Blud.. pp. 104-130; see the criticisms of Jeans.. pp. 125-130.
as "Paraskeuase, Epitome, Paraphrase."\textsuperscript{4}

Regarding the translation of chs. 1-3, 7-12 Bludau stated, "It was faithfully and carefully done on the whole, however, the translation was produced more according to the sense [of the Vorlage] than according to literalness."\textsuperscript{5} It should also be pointed out that Bludau made a further distinction in the quality of the translation. He applied the above assessment mainly to chs. 1, 2, and 7, whereas he regarded parts of chs. 8-12, especially ch. 11, as incomprehensible apart from retroversion. At this point, it is sufficient to note that Bludau notes a discrepancy in the TT employed in Daniel and suggests that it is worthy of further investigation.\textsuperscript{6}

The first section of Bludau's study included an examination of sources, which betrayed influence by the OG and Th of Daniel, and he observed that there were already quotations and allusions to Th in the NT. The relationship of Th to the OG received some attention by Bludau, but the problem of Ur-Theodotion received more complete treatment in other quarters.\textsuperscript{7}

The "problem" of Ur-Theodotion is that the NT documents that reveal dependence on Th were written prior to the period when the

\textsuperscript{4}Blud., p. 143 and see also p. 31 where Bludau includes ch. 3 in this assessment. See also A.A. Bevan, A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel, (Cambridge: University Press, 1892), p. 46. That chs. 4-6 are paraphrase has been the view of the majority of scholars, as we shall note below.

\textsuperscript{5}Blud., p. 34, "Sie ist im ganzen treu und sorgfältig gearbeitet, jedoch ist mehr dem Sinn als dem Buchstaben Rechnung getragen."

\textsuperscript{6}Blud., pp. 34-35, suggests that the reason for the discrepancy lies in the translator's deficient knowledge of Hebrew as compared to Aramaic since the Hebrew language was dead or dying. As regards chs. (3)4-6, he also offered the conclusion that the translator adopted a previously written revision into his work (p. 218).

\textsuperscript{7}Blud., p. 24, does venture to suggest that a major reason for the decline of OG was that the translator had given new expression to the prophecy in 9:24-27 which "ganz ungeeignet war für eine Deutung auf die Zeit, in welcher der Messias erschienen war." He also thought Th was a translation rather than a revision of OG. Cf. Bevan (Daniel, p. 2) who considered Th a revision of OG.
historical Theodotion is believed to have lived. The most reliable reference to Theodotion is by Irenaeus in his treatise Against Heresies, iii. 24, in which he refers to Theodotion as an Ephesian and a Jewish proselyte. Since Irenaeus mentions Theodotion prior to Aquila some scholars have taken this to mean that Theodotion preceded Aquila. Although another reference to Theodotion by Epiphanius is unreliable for the purpose of dating, it appears to be further early confirmation that such a figure did exist. However, A. Salvesen has examined Epiphanius' testimony about Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion and notes the use of stereotyped descriptions of each. She concludes that Epiphanius was attempting to discredit the three and his "account should be treated with caution." Furthermore, Salvesen states, "It is interesting that Theodotion . . . is not subjected to the same vilification as Aquila and Symmachus. This may be because there was no such translator, and Epiphanius therefore had only a hazy notion of his biography."

A very good summary and early discussion of the problem of Ur-Th

---


Contrary to the order of the appearance of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, in the Hexapla. Mont., p. 47; Jellicoe, Septuagint, pp. 83-94.

Mont., pp. 46-50; Swete, Introduction, pp. 42-43. Epiphanius, De mens. et pond. 17, places Theodotion under Commodus (c. 180). This is obviously contradicted by Irenaeus' reference in Ag. Her. which was written 180-189.

If this Theodotion was in any way responsible for any revision/translation work in the LXX he would have done this work between 130-180. Mont. suggests an early dating whereas Jellicoe (Septuagint, p. 92) places him "towards the end of the second century A.D."

See A. Salvesen, Symmachus in the Pentateuch, JSSM, 15 (Manchester: University Press, 1991), pp. 287-289. See also DA, pp. 146-147 and the discussion of Jerome's uncertain identification of Theodotion: "And Theodotion, at any rate, was an unbeliever subsequent to the advent of Christ, although some assert that he was an Ebionite, which is another variety of Jew."
is provided in an article by J. Gwynn. Gwynn dates the historical Theodotion prior to Aquila, around 180, and explains the Theodotionic citations in NT as follows:

... side by side with the Chisian LXX, there was current among the Jews, from pre-Christian times, another version of Daniel, more deserving of the name, claiming to belong to the LXX collection and similar in general character to the LXX. Thus, according to Gwynn, Theodotion made only minor revisions to a prior Greek version which was held in high authority by the church and pre-dated the Chisian LXX preserved from the fifth column of the Hexapla. Since the publication of DA scholars have devoted more time to discussion of the recensional characteristics of *kaige-Theodotion*, and it has become generally accepted that a second century Theodotion did not participate in any way in the recension that bears his name.

Returning to the discussion of OG and chs. 4-6, we note that not everyone accepted the view that chs. 4-6 were paraphrastic. In contrast to Bludau, G. Jahn, following the lead of P. Riessler, adopted the Hexaplaric text as the most original and attempted to reconstruct the original Hebrew by retroversion. The same procedure

---


14 Gwynn, 'Theodotion,' p. 976.

15 On this basis Gwynn could explain the early citations of the Chisian LXX, as well as why the church would accept a revision by a Jewish proselyte.

16 *kaige-Theodotion* appears to have been coined by Tov in "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament," *Textus* 8 (1973): 78-92.

17 Jellicoe (Septuagint, p. 92) had given qualified acceptance of Theodotion's later input, whereas Barthélemy in DA had rejected his involvement altogether. Others, such as Shenkl (Chronology, p. 17), O'Connell (Exodus, p. 5), and Tov (Hebrew Bible, p. 145) allow for the later use or revision of the recension by Theodotion.

18 P. Riessler, *Das Buch Daniel*, (Stuttgart: Roth'sche, 1899), 28-44; G. Jahn, *Das Buch Daniel nach der Septuaginta hergestellt*, (Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1904). C. Kuhl also worked on the addition to ch. 3 which he believed was based on a Hebrew Vorlage. C. Kuhl, *Die Drei Männer im Feuer*, BZAW, 55 (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann), 1930.
was embraced by R.H. Charles in his commentary (1929), who argued the "LXX makes its greatest contribution to the recovery of the original text over against the late redacted text of the MT, particularly in chapter 4 and to a less extent in 5." Charles recognized that the OG of Daniel had to be reconstructed, but, like Jahn, he has been justly criticized for his excessive preference for the OG against MT. His text-critical judgments were not always guided as much by an analysis of TT of the OG as they were by literary criteria. For example, according to Charles, "which are four" (דָּבָרָה שֵׁיחֶּדַּת) in 7:17 should be omitted with the LXX because, "the seer knows perfectly well the number of the kingdoms." On the other hand, his and Jahn's hypothetical reconstructions of the Vorlage in chs. 4-6 are very valuable and support the case that the OG represents an early translation. Charles also allowed for activity by the historical Theodotion, but Ur-Th, though based on an Aramaic Vorlage, was later in date, and "borrowed its renderings largely from the LXX."

The arguments for an alternative Vorlage did not impress J.A. Montgomery, whose commentary (1927) remains an indispensable tool for the study of the textual history of the book of Daniel. Despite writing prior to the discovery of papyrus 967, Montgomery recognized that many of the obscure and inaccurate translations in the original LXX (his terminology) resulted from "the presence of genuine glosses, both primary and secondary, which may occur lines away from their proper designation, . . . and also of doublet translations." He also believed there was "considerable evidence" that the expanded text

19 Charles, p. lvii.

20 We will return to the question of the history of transmission of Daniel and which version is more "original" at the end of this chapter.

21 Ibid., p. 189.


23 Ibid., pp. cxviii, lxix.

24 Mont., p. 36.
of chs. 4-6 was based on a semitic Vorlage, but dismissed the feasibility of using the OG to correct the HA.

The very ingenuity of the translator must put us on guard against accepting his facile translations as representing a better text than HA. The lists assembled by the writer for cases where OG may be used against HA yield a small modicum of positive betterments, many of them hanging in a balance.25

With regard to Ur-Th, Montgomery posited that a written source was not necessary, and suggested that the historical Theodotion may have drawn upon a Hellenistic oral Targum.26

J.M. Rife and A.P. Wikgren did Ph.D. dissertations using the OG of Daniel at the University of Chicago a few years later, but their aim was to show that the semitic character of the gospels could not be traced to semitic sources.27 The work of later scholars in the Greek texts of Daniel would be influenced significantly by two factors: the initial discovery (1931) and partial publication of Papyrus 967 (1937), and the publication of DA in 1963.

II. LXX Research Since Barthélemy

The publication of DA in 1963 is justly recognized as a watershed in present LXX research.28 In DA Barthélemy presented a translation of the Greek Scroll of the Minor Prophets, which is dated

25 Ibid., p. 37 and see notes on pp. 247-249, 267, 280-281. Cf. the judgment of Charles (below) and earlier by Bevan (Daniel, pp. 53f.) who stated: "The very fact that the Greek translator often missed the sense where it is perfectly plain to us, and where his text evidently agreed with the Masoretic, renders it highly improbable that he was capable of making plausible emendations."

26 Mont., p. 50.


28 Wevers, "Barthélemy," pp. 23-34.
to the middle of the first century C.E. More importantly, Barthélemy isolated revisionary techniques that the Minor Prophet Scroll had in common with other Greek translations and argued that they were the product of a group or school of translators located in Palestine that culminated in the work of Aquila. The main characteristics of the group is the translation of מ by καίγε (hence the name kaige recension) coupled with the non-translation of א by σώ. Barthélemy suggested the recension was completed between 30-50 C.E. and identified the translator with Jonathan ben 'Uzziel who has traditionally been associated with the authorship of an Aramaic Targum in the mid-first century C.E. Barthélemy included Th within kaige, and subsequent research has been devoted to isolating further characteristics of the recension and its members. His location of the recension in Palestine has never attained widespread support, and O. Munnich has cogently demonstrated that the links between kaige and Rabbinic exegesis are tenuous.

---


30 The texts he identified as belonging to this recension are Lamentations, Ruth, Cantica, Ḩy and Ḥ6 of Kings, the B text of Judges, the Theodotionic additions to Job and Jeremiah, Th Daniel, the sixth column of the Hexapla and the Quinta of the Psalter. (DA, p. 47).

31 Ibid., pp. 15-46. Barthélemy added eight more characteristics as well, pp. 48-80.

32 Ibid., pp. 144-157.

33 Research on recensional characteristics has been carried out predominately at Harvard University. Greenspoon, Joshua, pp. 270-273 lists 96 characteristics of Kaige which have been identified mainly by Barthélemy, Bodine, O'Connell and Shenkl. However, many of these characteristics are dubious at best, while others should be discarded. See the analysis in CH 6.

Three years after the publication of DA, A. Schmitt's thesis was published in which he asked the question, "Stammt der sogennante Θ' Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?"\(^{35}\) Schmitt was following up the suggestion made by Ziegler that, "Our text probably has nothing to do with Theodotion, or the entire book was only superficially revised by him."\(^{36}\) Schmitt attempted to prove Ziegler's thesis by subjecting Th and the remainder of the readings of Theodotion as witnessed in the sixth column of the hexapla to a thorough comparative analysis.

Schmitt's analysis has been questioned, however, because we must ask whether "the so-called Θ-readings outside Daniel which are adduced by Armin Schmitt for comparison really stem from Theodotion?"\(^{37}\) Jellicoe's question is certainly valid, particularly when Schmitt omits the Theodotion readings of both 2 Ki. 11:2-3 Ki. 2:11 and the minor prophets from his analysis on the basis of Barthélemy's view that these sections were not to be identified with *kaige*-Theodotion.\(^{38}\) Barthélemy also has responded to Schmitt's thesis with some specific criticisms of his own.\(^{39}\) The substance of Barthélemy's criticisms is that Schmitt uses singular instances where Th witnesses to a translation equivalent of the Hebrew, which is not found in Theodotion elsewhere, as proof that Th is not to be identified with *kaige*-Theodotion. Barthélemy cites seven of Schmitt's examples and points out that in the vast majority of cases in each of Schmitt's examples Th does in fact use the same equivalent as Theodotion. Barthélemy

---


\(^{38}\) Schmitt, *Theodotion*, p. 16.

concludes that the unique translations which Schmitt adduces are better explained as later "contaminations" or by the "incomplete nature of the recension."\(^\text{40}\)

Barthélemy's criticisms of Schmitt are not compelling, however, and Schmitt himself has recently offered a response.\(^\text{41}\) It is instructive for the purposes of this thesis to enumerate Schmitt's response in some detail. First of all, Schmitt argues that the cases of the translation of vocabulary where the translation equivalent in Th normally agrees with Theodotion does not prove affinity with kaige-Theodotion if the equivalent is OG. Since kaige-Theodotion generally corrects anomalous readings in the OG and chooses a more common translation, one has to explain the unusual translations in Th, which are not witnessed elsewhere in Theodotion, other than by resorting to later contaminations and an incomplete recension.\(^\text{42}\) For example, Barthélemy ("Notes," p. 298) refers to Schmitt (p. 42), where Schmitt states the translation of הָנָיִּים by εἰσινούμενα in 1:20 is unique to Th. Barthélemy points out that in 3 other instances Th follows the normal rendering of הָנָיִּים in Theodotion by translating it with σώνεις and suggests that 1:20 is an example of a later contamination. However, the usual translation of הָנָיִּים by σώνεις in Th is not that remarkable, because it is the most frequent translation equivalent (18x) for הָנָיִּים in the LXX. On the other hand, Th's singular translation in 1:20 is significant because Th employs no less than four HL for the book to translate wisdom vocabulary that are not found in the OG of Daniel! Th's treatment of wisdom terminology as a whole reveals that he is working to his own agenda.\(^\text{43}\) Second, Schmitt asks why Barthélemy does not even consider his more substantial arguments concerning the syntax of Th. In his thesis, Schmitt compared minute details of syntax (eg. the partitive gen., enclitic pers. pro., infin. cons., temporal dat.) and showed, on the one hand, there is a narrow connection of Th to

\(^\text{40}\) Barthélemy, "Notes," pp. 298-299.


\(^\text{43}\) See the more complete discussion in CH 4.III.1.iii.
the HA, while on the other, Th has constant departures from the HA Vorlage in favour of idiomatic Greek.\textsuperscript{44} Third, Schmitt argues that there are minuses in Th against MT that are not found in the OG, as well as pluses in Th which have no equivalent in MT: these result from accommodation to Greek style. These phenomena are contrary to the general pattern of Theodotion in other books, for Theodotion usually follows MT very closely. He finds it surprising that Barthélemy does not attempt to account for these pluses and minuses, especially when the manuscripts from Qumran generally support the fact that the Vorlage of Th must have been very similar to MT.\textsuperscript{45}

The significance of Schmitt's reply to Barthélemy is that it offers some very telling criticisms of kaige research. First and foremost, there has developed a kind of kaige-fad where scholars have attempted to identify more and more characteristics of the recension; but the research has been far too one-sided in its approach. The characteristics that have been adduced for kaige are not shared consistently by all the so-called members of the recension, nor has there been any significant recognition of the differences between them. If one's methodology is exclusively guided by concerns to isolate evidence for the inclusion of a text within kaige, then significant differences, which may suggest that a text may not belong to the kaige group, are liable to be ignored.\textsuperscript{46} Second, shared lexical equivalencies are not the strongest foundation upon which to prove a relationship. Obviously, there is strength in numbers, but the numbers may not be that significant if the kaige-Theodotion reading actually reflects OG. This criticism certainly applies to Barthélemy's

\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 12; see \textit{Stammt}, pp. 62-100.

\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Schmitt}, pp. 19-25; "Danieltexte," p. 13. The number of omissions is evident throughout Th, but is particularly acute in chs. 4-6.

\textsuperscript{46}A. Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues", \textit{VT} 35 (1985): 304-305; Schmitt, "Danieltexte," p. 15. See the thorough evaluation of the Kaige characteristics and Theodotion Job by Gentry, pp. 406-410. Gentry concludes that "While R [Theodotion Job] is related somehow to the kaige group, the differences are by no means insignificant and should not be ignored in a blind attempt to connect R to a so-called Kaige Recension," p. 410.
review of Schmitt, but also to kaige research in general.\(^4^7\) As Schmitt emphasizes, syntactical evidence is particularly useful for establishing the degree to which two texts share a common basis. The analysis of TT in CH 5 and the kaige characteristics in CH 6 will enable us to evaluate Th's relationship to the kaige group more adequately.

The same year that Schmitt's thesis became available P. Grelot had an article published in which he agrees with the view of Barthélémy that Th is part of the kaige recension.\(^4^8\) Grelot does add his own refinements to the basic view of Barthélémy by suggesting that a comparison of the two Greek versions indicates that the text of "Jonathan-Theodotion" is better described as a translation "entièrement refaite." He cites the differences in vocabulary, but particularly the distinctive semitic Grundsschrift in chapters 4-6 as evidence for this view, though he does not make clear how this is different from describing Th as a recension.\(^4^9\) In two later articles Grelot argued that the OG chs. 4 and 5 were translated from a Hebrew version which had been secondarily adapted from the Aramaic.\(^5^0\)

Grelot also argues that "Theodotion" wanted to provide a translation of the Scriptures which adhered closely to the Jews' textus receptus because of the growing controversy between the

---

\(^4^7\) Of the seven specific vocabulary items that Barthélémy ("Notes," pp. 298-299) brings against Schmitt as evidence that Th maintains kaige-Theodotion vocabulary in the majority of readings, four are the main equivalent of the OG throughout the LXX—σύνεσις, καιρός, συντέλεια, ὅπι. See Schmitt, pp. 42, 40, 34, 90. See also Pietersma's ("Plea," pp. 305-306) comments regarding Bodine's work in Judges. Bodine attempted to delineate the recensional characteristics of the B text in Judges without first establishing the OG text.

\(^4^8\) Grelot, "versions," pp. 381-402.


Jewish and Christian communities over the interpretation of scripture. However, this view results in a predicament for which he can offer very little by way of solution. Since Grelot believes that Theodotion represents a translation toward the proto-MT, then this presupposes that there was a semitic text with the deuto-canonical additions current in 30-50. Why has no evidence for this semitic text been preserved? The available evidence from Qumran retains the transitions from Hebrew to Aramaic in 2:4 and Aramaic to Hebrew in 8:1 and does not give a semitic text for the additions. On the other hand, Grelot does raise an important question. How do we explain the retention of the additions in Th if it was based on the proto-MT? Do the OG, Th, and MT represent three different stages in the literary development of the book?

While not always addressing the question of separate editions of Daniel, the research in the OG and Th versions of Daniel in the past 25 years has been focused on the Vorlage to chs. 4-6 and the deuto-canonical additions. A consensus is building that the translator did indeed have a semitic Vorlage. W. Hamm, in his careful study and editing of papyrus 967, has given the opinion that ch. 4 of OG and the addition to ch. 3 is based on a semitic Vorlage. A similar stance is taken by Wills and Wenthe whose views we will examine later, but the claim for a semitic Vorlage for chs. 4-6 and the additions has not gone unchallenged.

The point of departure for J.R Busto Saiz' investigation of the deuto-canonical additions was Schmitt's conclusion that the proto- and deuto-canonical parts of the text of Theodotion are not by the same author. Busto Saiz has examined the relation between the text of Th to OG in the prose sections of ch. 3 (vss. 24-25, 46-51) and the first five verses of Bel and the Dragon and maintains that the differences in ch. 3 are due to the revisions of the OG by Th. He describes Th as a free revision of the Septuagintal text, which "avoids unnecessary repetitions and orders the text in a more harmonious

\[51\] Hamm, III-IV, pp. 55-57, 281-289. Hamm states that the Vorlage for the additions to ch. 3 is Hebrew and offers the names of Bludau and Schmitt among others in support. While Blud., p. 159 clearly advocates a Hebrew Vorlage, Schmitt, p. 101 is not decisive.

\[52\] Busto Saiz, p. 42.
As to whether the revisor of these verses is different from the revisor in the proto-MT section, Busto Saiz suggests that the lack of a Hebrew Vorlage for the deuto-canonical part explains why there seem to be different hands at work.54

Doubts about a semitic Vorlage underlying the alternative text of chs. 4-6 in the OG have also been expressed. Instead, it has been argued, following the lead of Bludau, that the translator was paraphrasing or engaging in a type of midrashic exegesis.55 This approach is adopted by F.F. Bruce in several articles and his suggestions have been pursued in greater detail in a thesis by A. McCrystall.56

McCrystall's research of the Old Greek translation of Daniel is the first extensive examination of the OG since that of A. Bludau in 1897, and the first chapter offers an excellent summary of the history of the investigation of the Old Greek of Daniel.57 He contends that the Book of Daniel underwent extensive revision at the hands of OG and McCrystall seeks to expose this revision, particularly as it relates to dream terminology and to the translator's knowledge of history.

53 Ibid., p. 45, "evitando repeticiones innecesarias y ordenando el texto de manera más armonía." J. Schüpphaus has also argued in detail that the deuto-canonical additions in Th are a revision of the OG, but he does not address the question whether they are based on a semitic Vorlage. See "Das Verhältnis von LXX- und Theodotion-Text in den apokryphen Zusätzen zum Danielbuch," ZAW 83 (1971): 49-72. Klaus Koch thoroughly investigates the issue of the semitic Vorlage for the additions in Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch, AQT, 38, 2 vols. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987).


57 McCrystall, pp. 1-68.
The former is examined in his fourth chapter while the latter is the subject of chapters 5–6.\textsuperscript{58} We will examine his thesis in closer detail, because it is an extensive investigation of OG and his research purports to be based on an analysis of the TT in OG.\textsuperscript{59}

The fundamental weakness in McCrystall's work is his analysis of TT. His whole thesis is grounded in one premise, which can be summarized by his quotation of James Barr's statement, "A free translator is bound to a much greater extent to show what he himself thinks to be the meaning of the text."\textsuperscript{60} It is important to observe that it is misleading for McCrystall to quote Barr in this way, because Barr's study is chiefly concerned to propose a typology of literalism; and he does not discuss in detail the difference between free/dynamic translation and the type of theological Tendenz advocated by McCrystall.\textsuperscript{61} For example, Barr also states, "There are enormous differences in the degree to which a translator interprets,"\textsuperscript{62} (italics mine). The ability to discern whether and to what extent there is theological Tendenz in OG (or any text) is dependent upon the ability of the scholar to distinguish between formal vs. dynamic equivalence on the one hand, and dynamic equivalence vs. theological Tendenz on the other.\textsuperscript{63} Unfortunately, McCrystall tends to equate a dynamic translation with Tendenz.

The inadequacy of McCrystall's analysis of TT can be illustrated with several types of examples. First, there is the tendency to confuse the intentions of the translator and the meaning of the OG with MT. For example, in his third chapter McCrystall examines the terms of the OG in Daniel chapters one and three that refer to the educational system, the lists of officials, and groups of people. He

\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., pp. 150-184; 218-386.

\textsuperscript{59}Jeans. (pp. 116-123), has already offered some criticisms of McCrystall, particularly with respect to his analysis of ch. 11, but she does not deal with all of his major arguments or specifically with his understanding of TT.

\textsuperscript{60}Barr, "Typology," 292-293 quoted by McCrystall, pp 79-80.

\textsuperscript{61}Ibid., pp. 284-294.

\textsuperscript{62}Barr, "Typology," 290.

\textsuperscript{63}Jeans., p. 60. makes a similar point. See also CH 4.II.4.
concludes that the Greek terms used are Hellenistic even though OG "purports to describe Babylonian society."\(^{64}\) We need only observe that the translator's use of terms from the Hellenistic world has absolutely no relevance to the question whether the book of Daniel portrays Babylonian society correctly. The translator is exactly that—a *translator*! It was natural for him to select the Greek terms that he felt would best convey the meaning intended by the source text from which he worked. McCrystall's findings could be useful for locating the origin or date of the OG translation if it could be proved that certain Greek terms were restricted to a particular geographical area or chronological period, but whether Babylonian society is depicted accurately is a question for the *Vorlage*.\(^{65}\)

An example related to the above is found in McCrystall's discussion of differences of vocabulary in OG compared with words normally used in the Septuagint. He illustrates this point with seven terms in Daniel chapter nine and concludes that, since OG employed unusual renditions,\(^{66}\) the translator exhibits little desire to maintain the "spirit" of the Hebrew of the MT.\(^{67}\) The logic of this argument is difficult to follow. The decision of the translator to translate the vocabulary in the LXX with rare Septuagintal words or in unique ways has no relevance in determining whether the translator was faithful to the "spirit" of the *Vorlage*. McCrystall somehow equates the use of "normal" Septuagint renderings with fidelity to the Hebrew text. If the renderings translate the meaning of the text (or can be shown to be based on an error), then the translator has retained the "spirit" of the *Vorlage* to the best of his ability.

In his discussion of TT, McCrystall's fifth point is that free

---

\(^{64}\) McCrystall, p. iv.

\(^{65}\) In fact, McCrystall's (pp. 96-149) discussion of the vocabulary of OG demonstrates that at many points it betrays the social world of the Seleucid-Ptolemyic empire.

\(^{66}\) Examples he gives are δυνάστης for ναος in 9:8 (only here); προσταγμα for עולים passim (rare in LXX, but it actually occurs 9x: 4 are in the Pentateuch while 3 are in Esther); δεσποτης for רבי 3x (only 4x elsewhere).

\(^{67}\) Ibid., p. 79.
translations in Daniel reveal theological Tendenz. He attempts to prove this with five examples, which we will examine at various points throughout our thesis. Of the five specific examples McCrystall provides of supposed theological Tendenz only one or two can be considered dynamic translations, and both retain the basic meaning of MT. However, even five examples are not enough to characterize a whole translation. The only proper way to analyze TT is to do a detailed examination of large sections (or the whole) of the translation in order to determine how the translator generally treated the text. Then specific cases where the translation seems to deviate from the source can be investigated and an attempt made to determine how this difference originated.

Finally, we will examine one example that constituted one of McCrystall's most important proofs of theological Tendenz in the OG of Daniel. In his fourth chapter McCrystall engages in an extensive argument that the OG translator's choice of ὑάμα for ἐνύπνιον in seven out of twenty-five instances reflects the fact that ἐνύπνιον had the connotation of "illusion:" in these instances the translator is updating the terminology in order to make it more acceptable to both Jews and Gentiles. The argument is based on the fact that Philo, who has adopted the classification of dreams by Stoic philosophers, describes ἐνύπνιον to be "what is illusory." However, the contrast between ἐνύπνιον and ὑάμα is grounded in the classification of dreams in Artemedorus of Daldis (latter half of the second century C.E.) who distinguished between ὑνεμρος and ἐνύπνιον. McCrystall believes this distinction in dream terminology is also reflected in Josephus who only uses ἐνυπνιον when quoting others. It is found six times in Antiquities where Josephus recounts the book of Daniel, five times in Against Apion (i. 207, 211, 294, 298, 312), but nowhere in Jewish War.

---

68 Ibid., pp. 79-88.

69 See the discussion of κληροδοσία (11:21), 32, 34 and ἀποσταθήσεται (11:4) in CH 4.II.2, εἰδωλον (3:12) in CH 3.II.2.i and 2:5, 12:7, 10(9) in CH 5.III,VI.


71 McCrystall, pp. 152-184.
Before we consider some of the details there are two obvious objections that are fatal to McCrystall's argument. First, if the translator really wanted to "update" the terminology, why did he use ἐνώμνιον at all? Second, the argument rests on the attempt to read back the much later dream classification of Artemedorus into OG. Furthermore, Artemedorus distinguished between ἐνώμνιον and ὄνειρος, and though ὄραμα was regarded as a type of the latter, the difference in terminology is significant. We also note that the argument from Josephus rests on the five quotations (three different writers) in Ag. Ap., but McCrystall offers no evidence that the people quoted made any distinction between types of dreams and visions. For example, the most negative statement by Agatharchides (i. 211) suggests that the condemnation of ἐνώμνιον has everything to do with incredulity that one should rely on such "hocus-pocus" (i.e. visions), but there is no concern for what term is employed. If his analysis has not already proved troublesome, we can consider McCrystall's presentation of the evidence concerning the use of the terms in the papyri, which are contemporary with the writing of OG. He finds that there is no evidence that ἐνώμνιον and ὄραμα were distinguished in the papyri and even admits that the evidence suggests that the two were used as synonyms.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 162. 168.}

McCrystall's discussion of the dream terminology and how it is employed in the LXX is illuminating because it is directly related to our investigation of TT. He notes that ἐνώμνιον is used 10 times in chapters 2 and 4 (for מ召回, Hebrew-מָרָב, 5x) of Daniel and elsewhere only in 1:17 and 8:2. It is found 61 other times in the LXX; and McCrystall divides these uses into three categories. The first are those in which there is no hostility shown towards ἐνώμνιον, and is represented most frequently in Gen. 37-42 (24x in the Joseph story), though there are 16 other instances scattered through seven other books. The second category concerns those instances where there is hostility shown towards ἐνώμνιον. This use is found 16 times in six books, most frequently in Jeremiah (6x). The third category exhibits a cautious scepticism towards ἐνώμνιον and is represented by the five
occurrences in Sirach.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 151-152.} As for \textit{δραμα}, it is found 25 times in the Old Greek of Daniel, and in seven of those cases (ch. 2-5 times; ch. 7:1 twice) it translates \textit{חולמ}. Elsewhere in the LXX \textit{δραμα} is found 19 times and in none of these does it translate \textit{חולמ}. Based on these statistics and his analysis of the use of \textit{ἐνυπνιον}, McCrystall concludes that \textit{ἐνυπνια} were the focus of prophetic attacks, particularly in Jeremiah, while the "authentic" nature of the \textit{δραμα} is revealed in texts like Jer. 39 (32):21; Gen. 15:1, 46:2; Num. 12:6; Is. 21:2.\footnote{McCrystall, p. 164.} Therefore, the OG translator incorporated \textit{δραμα} into the translation because of its positive connotations. Can this interpretation be sustained?

Once again, McCrystall confuses the translation with the Vorlage, because in all but three of its uses where \textit{ἐνυπνιον} translates a Vorlage in the LXX the semitic term is \textit{חולמ} (חולמ),\footnote{Both \textit{ἐνυπνιον} and \textit{δραμα} occur in 2:1 to render \textit{חולמ חולמ}. The difference may involve an alternative Vorlage, but just as easily could have originated from a touch of hyperbole from the translator.} while \textit{δραμα} translates various terms. In other words, \textit{ἐνυπνιον} was employed as a stereotyped equivalent (SE) for \textit{חולמ}; therefore, any so-called classification of the uses of \textit{ἐνυπνιον} cannot be proved from the distribution of the term, because it was universally employed to render \textit{חולמ (חולמ)}. Whether or not the semitic writers/editors used \textit{חולמ} in a pejorative way is a totally different question and best pursued elsewhere. We might also note that \textit{חולמ/δραμα} and \textit{[יו וב)]/ἐνυπνιον} occur together in 2:28 (see also 1:17 and 2:1) where there is no discernible difference in meaning (חולמ חולמ יושב), so the translator could easily have employed the Greek terms as alternative equivalents.

It is quite clear that McCrystall has attempted to read a second century dream classification into the OG text of Daniel. However, there may be a possible explanation for the translation technique that resulted in the seven anomalous uses of \textit{δραμα} in Daniel (2:7, 9, 26, 36, 45; 7:1 bis). The four cases in ch. 2 could be viewed merely as an attempt to vary the style due to the frequency of \textit{חולמ} (15 times). For example, \textit{חולמ (חולמ)} occurs ten times in the first nine verses and two
substitutions of ὀράμα for ἐνόσσιον occur in verses 7 and 9. However, the rendering of ἔννοια by ὀράμα in vs. 19 may provide the key to understanding why the translator used ὀράμα for ἐνόσσιον—because ἔννοια is a favourite rendering in Daniel. The third time the translator replaced ἐνόσσιον with ὀράμα is in verse 26. The choice in verse 26 can be explained not only as a stylistic variation, but also by the fact that when the translator was confronted with rendering חנה רוח there was no etymologically related verb for ὀράμα to render חנה. Instead, he was able to preserve his preference for ὀράμα rendering חנה by substituting the noun for שׁפִּיל in place of ἐνόσσιον and still provide a good translation—יו ὀράμα δ ἐγένετο. Having established the two terms as alternative equivalents by the previous substitutions and their use as synonymous terms in verse 28, the translator had no hesitation in substituting ὀράμα in verses 36 and 45 (although חנה also occurs in the latter). There is further support for this suggestion from 967 where the text in 2:9 (the second case of substitution) contains the plus δ ἐγένετο τὴν νῦξα. The whole phrase would be retroverted as שׁפִּיל וּדְרוּהוּ (קיקיל) יִרְמָיו וּיִרְמָיו יִרְמָיו שׁפִּיל לְלֵי. It is probable that the OG had this in its Vorlage, and שׁפִּיל וּדְרוּהוּ may have been omitted from MT through parablepsis.

The text in Dan. 7:1-2a is notoriously difficult and there are some indications that this difficulty is due to an editorial splicing

77 See also N. Leiter, "Assimilation and Dissimilation Techniques in the LXX of the Book of Balaam," Textus 12 (1985): 79-95, who describes the process of using one word and then another to translate the same Hebrew term as dissimilation.

78 In 6/9 occurrences OG translates חנה with ὀράμα: 2:19, 28; 7:1, 7, 13, 15. In 4:2(5), 6(9), 7(10)? OG=0. The places where the rendering does not occur are 4:10(13); 7:2, 20. In 7:20 חנה is used with the meaning of "appearance" so OG employs a different term covering that semantic range. 4:10(13) and 7:2 are rendered differently because of a different concern of the translator. The Aramaic reads חנה חָנָה חנה חנה חנה חנה חנה (also 7:7, 13 where OG has ἐξακρον εν ὀράματι) and in these two places OG employs ἐξακρον for חנה. The use of the same phraseology in 4:10(13) and 7:2 is evidence against Albertz' thesis that 4-6 stem from a different translator (see p. 38, below).

79 See the discussion of this variant in the section on 2:1-10 in CH 5.
together of chs. 6 and 7. The Greek witnesses exhibit difficulties as well, not all of which can be addressed here. However, at this point, we would suggest that the motivation for using ὅμα twice in 7:1 may be explained similarly to 2:26. The first occurrence of "dream" is in the phrase ἡλίος ἡ ἀνα. The translator did not have an etymologically related verb for ὅμα which he preferred for ἡλίος, so he rendered the participle with εἶδον and ἀνα with ὅμα. The remainder of the verse does not follow the Aramaic word order though the elements are represented. The texts run thus:

MT: ἡ θεοτοκία τῆς κοίτης αὐτοῦ τὸς Δανιήλ τῷ ὅμα δὲ εἶδον

OG: παρὰ κεφαλῆς ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης αὐτοῦ τότε Δανιήλ τῷ ὅμα δὲ εἶδον

The main difference is that παρὰ appears in place of ἡλίος and OG seems to add δὲ εἶδον. Some of the difference can be explained, however, if we grant that the translator read ἡλίος with ἀνα in order to produce τῷ ὅμα δὲ εἶδον on the same basis as 2:9, 26 (45?) and earlier in 7:1. What the translator actually read in the Vorlage and whether he read the plural noun as the participle can not be known. However, this proposal does explain both the lexical choice of the translator as well as some of the textual differences.

Not every reader may find the above explanation convincing. The discussion, however, was intended to demonstrate the complex factors that influenced the choices of the LXX translator and to indicate that the analysis of TT requires detailed examination of the texts. However, even though it is an overstatement to characterize the OG translator as engaging in wholesale theological manipulation of the text, it is also an overstatement for Jeansonne to claim that OG does not engage in any Tendenz.

In response to the claims of Bruce and McCrystall, Jeansonne has already made an extensive analysis of the texts of OG 7-12 and demonstrated that the OG translator "attempted to translate accurately
the Vorlage available of the day." Not only was the OG translator faithful to the Vorlage, Jeansonne believes the Vorlage was not equivalent to MT. A third conclusion is that Th is a systematic revision of the OG towards MT. Jeansonne's thesis is cited extensively in the secondary sources so there is little need to summarize her findings here.

Jeansonne's work not only provides necessary corrections to the inadequate methodology of previous investigations: it is supported by very careful text-critical analysis, and she bases her understanding of TT in her second chapter on a running text. In this way, she is able to achieve a realistic understanding of how the translator approached the task of translating. However, the fact that she has not examined the TT of the OG in detail leads her to unwarranted conclusions about what the Vorlage may have read. This is especially true in those instances having to do with differences in number, suffixes, and prepositions. She also frequently appeals to an alternative Vorlage as the explanation for various, though usually minor, variants. Some of these cases may indeed reflect an alternative Vorlage, but the conclusion has to be based on an examination of how these features are treated throughout Daniel; and even then a decision may not be possible.

Jeansonne's conclusion that Th is a revision of the OG towards MT is also questionable because it rests on insufficient evidence.

---

82 Jeans., p. 132.


84 See her analysis of 8:1-10, pp. 52-53 #34, 38, 43, as well as her discussion of 9:21 and 10:20 on p. 67 and 7:8 on p. 68.

85 It is ironic that Jeansonne appeals so strenuously for an alternative Vorlage throughout her investigation, yet in her treatment of the extremely corrupt 9:24-27 (pp. 125-130) she attempts to reconstruct a text that is faithful to MT! On the other hand, the arguments that the LXX is either: 1. a tendentious reworking of the MT (Blud., pp. 104-130; McCrystall, pp. 250-258); or 2. witnesses to a very different Vorlage which was earlier (David, "Composition," pp. 280-335) or later (Bogaert, "Relecture," pp. 212-216) than MT are not convincing either. Given the temporal proximity between the writing of the semitic original and the Greek translation and the events to which they are directed, it is not surprising that someone engaged in historicizing of the text.
Jeansonne notes from her passage (8:1-10) that in 40% of the readings (69x) Th retains the OG, and in 18% (30x), it is dependent upon the OG.\(^{86}\) Without discussing the adequacy of her sample for statistical purposes we should note that the statistics themselves are misleading. In and of themselves agreements prove nothing (especially when 42% or 72 readings of Th are distinct), and she does not define exactly what she means by the readings of Th which are dependent on OG. Are these distinctive agreements which can not be explained by recourse to MT? She examines six words in which Th uses standard equivalents where OG displays diversity, and then offers further cases "to exemplify the differences in translation of Daniel OG and Θ", but never provides evidence that she has systematically analyzed agreements and disagreements of Th and OG.\(^{87}\) A more detailed study of the texts is required to attempt to confirm whether Th is in fact a recension of the OG.\(^{88}\)

Support for an alternative Vorlage of chs. 4-6 has also come from other recent studies. R. Albertz and L. Wills carried out independent form-, source-, and redaction-critical investigations of chapters 4-6 in the MT and OG and concluded that the OG reflects an older Aramaic Vorlage.\(^{89}\) Wills' examination of the OG of these chapters is part of his larger attempt to define the "wisdom court legend" genre. He has convincingly argued that chs. 4-6 of OG originally circulated independently and were redacted at a later point into the larger framework of the court legends in Daniel. Therefore, Wills agrees with Jahn, Charles, Grelot and Jeansonne that the Vorlage of OG of these chapters is earlier and "may be a better witness than the

\(^{86}\)Ibid., p. 57.

\(^{87}\)Ibid., pp. 58-69.

\(^{88}\)In CH 5 we will re-examine 8:1-10 with a view to determining the relationship between OG and Th.

\(^{89}\)Albertz, pp. 175-177. We will consider Albertz' work in more detail below. Wills does not give the date when his dissertation was completed, but evidently he did not have access to Albertz's work which was published in 1988. See L.M. Wills, The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990), pp. 88-152. Haag also did a source-critical analysis of chs. 4-6, but he did not consider OG. See E. Haag, Die Errettung Daniels aus der Löwengrube, SBS 10 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983).
MT" to the original version.\(^9\)

The same judgment concerning the priority (hence "superiority") of the OG text is made in two other recent theses by D. Wenthe and P.S. David. Wenthe argues that OG demonstrates a "flexible, but faithful fidelity" to its Vorlage in chs. 1-3; therefore, it is reasonable to conclude the same care is shown in chs. 4-6.\(^9\) Unfortunately, there are serious shortcomings with the thesis that detract from the positive contributions. For example, Wenthe basically accepts Ziegler's text as representing OG in chapters 1-6 and only rarely refers to the reading of 967.\(^9\) Furthermore, with respect to TT, Wenthe states it is essential to have a "precise and nuanced description" in order to evaluate properly the source and parent text. We agree, but his description amounts to no more than an evaluation of translation equivalents for a limited number of words.\(^9\) While a discussion of translation equivalents is useful, Wenthe rarely indicates how the OG could be retroverted into Aramaic.

\(^9\)Wills, pp. 87, 144.


\(^9\)For example, Wenthe (pp. 55, 260-261) accepts as OG the texts of 1:20-21 as they are found in Ziegler and believes the pluses stem from an alternative Vorlage; but the text of 967 is very different. Wenthe also makes numerous references to Th's revision towards MT (pp. 54, 57, 61 \textit{passim}), but does not evidence any careful analysis of the question.

\(^9\)See Wenthe, pp. 251-256. Unfortunately, even Wenthe's analysis of vocabulary is of limited value. He gives the frequency of 20 HA lexemes and their translation equivalents, but rarely provides any specific references for where they occur. In some instances he does note where the OG leaves a word untranslated, but in other cases he omits the information. For example, in the cases of דַּעְתָּן 23x (15 untranslated in OG), מֹרֶשֶׁה 22x (2), מִצְרִים 17x (3), לֶחֶם 9x (2), מַג 5x (2), מַכְּרו 13x (2) he does not even indicate where the OG leaves the text untranslated! In other cases his numbers do not even add up correctly. For example, he states that פָּתִיפ 9x is usually translated by פָּתִיפ 12x. He also indicates that OG has 2 additional occurrences of פָּתִיפ in ch. 3, but leaves פָּתִיפ untranslated in 5:13, 18. Anyway you look at these numbers they do not add up, but Wenthe does not explain why. Using Ziegler's text, he suggests incorrectly that the OG uses דֶּהֶּז (57x) for דֶּהֶּז, מַלְבָּש (73x) and leaves it untranslated 23x. 57+23=80.
P.S. David's thesis is basically a restatement of the views of Hølscher, Sellin, and Ginsberg; though there are a few other points of interest. For example, he includes a separate investigation of the *OG* of 9:24-27 in which he argues that the doublets reveal that there were two forms of the same text and that these were combined in the transmission of the *OG*. In its reconstructed form the *OG* of 9:24-27 supposedly envisaged a restored temple along with the vindication of the legitimate Zadokite priesthood. We do not have the space to treat his arguments in detail, but one of the crucial points is his interpretation of *ἀποσταθήσεται* in 9:26 as a reference to the removal of Jason. David supports his interpretation of *ἀποσταθήσεται* with the suggestion that the reading of *χρίσμα* in *OG* should be emended to *χριστός*, because it is the usual equivalent for *μνήμη*. Here David is arguing for the priority of the *OG* against MT, but wants to establish this earlier reading based on MT rather than the text of the *OG*! Clearly there are no means of falsifying such a thesis. David also suggests that papyrus 967 preserves the original ordering of the *OG* text, but does not offer an adequate account for this displacement in his reconstruction of the literary growth of the book. On the other

---


95 See David, pp. 283-356.

96 However, we also give good reason to question his interpretation of *ἀποσταθήσεται* on p. 134.

97 See his diachronic reading of Daniel, pp. 207-267. There are other disturbing and/or unsupported statements in his thesis. For example, on p. 103, he states, "The fact nevertheless remains that the denial of the unity of Dn 7 continues to be a majority opinion of critical scholars." Considering the fact that he can only cite four authors since 1970 who have ventured this opinion (Coppens, Weimar, Kvanvig, van der Woude), yet can also cite Collins, Raabe, Zevit, Ferch, and Casey as not holding this view makes his statement absurd. We could also add P. Porter (1983), S. Niditch (1980), and J. Goldingay (1989) as recent proponents of the unity of ch. 7. Another example is p. 284, where David offers definitions of diplomatic and eclectic texts, but mistakes the meaning of the terms. He cites Ziegler as an example of a diplomatic text!
hand, David has advanced valuable insights on the development of the book of Daniel and does isolate possible doublets in 9:24-27 and 8:11-14.  

One of the major weaknesses in the works of Wenthe, Wills and David is the sweeping assumption that a different or older Vorlage of the OG is therefore "superior" to MT. There are at least three very distinct issues at stake in the evaluation of the text of the OG as it compares with MT. The first issue is to settle the question whether chs. 4-6 of the OG are a faithful translation of a semitic Vorlage alternative to MT. Although there should always remain a residue of doubt concerning this question, the cumulative work of Jahn, Charles, Grelot, Albertz, Wills and Wenthe makes it highly probable that such a text did in fact exist. Once we accept that there was an alternative text for chs. 4-6 we have to decide, secondly, about the possibility of a double literary tradition for Daniel such as that found in Jeremiah. In such cases it is nonsense to speak of a "superior" text, because we are dealing with two quite separate and distinct literary texts. Third, it is all the more remarkable that Wills can refer to the text of the OG as superior to MT when he argues that the OG is a better witness to the tales as they were when they circulated independently. If the OG somehow preserves the tales of 4-6 in a form in which they existed prior to their redaction into a larger framework (or as a later expansion), then we cannot speak of two literary traditions of the semitic text of Daniel. It would have to be reasonably demonstrated that chs. 4-6 of the OG exhibit the same TT as the remainder of the book and that they faithfully reproduce a semitic Vorlage in order to justify the conclusion that Daniel does represent a double literary tradition.

98 David, pp. 289-335, 370-380. For our part, we believe it to be impossible to reconstruct the OG reading of 9:24-27 because of the corrupt state of the texts; therefore, any theory based on a rereading of the Greek or Hebrew text is pure fiction.

99 See Tov, Hebrew Bible, pp. 347-349. The debate then becomes which edition do we attempt to reconstruct as the more original text. Tov argues that it should be that text which was received and preserved in the Hebrew canon. See E. Tov, "The Original Shape of the Biblical Text," VTSupp 43 (1991): 345-59.

100Wills, pp. 87-88.
It is with respect to the Vorlage of OG 4-6 and the consequences for the transmission history and textual criticism of the Hebrew version of Daniel that Albertz' work has significant implications. Albertz argues that chs. 4-6 exhibit a different TT from the remainder of the book and that the OG of chs. 4-6 reflects an early form of the tales before they were redacted into the larger framework of chs. (1)2-7 and, ultimately, 1-12. This conclusion is based on a comparison of the Greek vocabulary employed between chs. 4-6 and the remainder of the book.\(^{101}\) In his view, the early form of the tales was employed for chs. 4-6\(^{102}\) when the completed Aramaic book of Daniel was translated into Greek for two reasons: 1. The older version was probably more popular; 2. the older version served the theological interests of the translator because it emphasized monotheism (eg. 4:34c) and the theme of conversion.\(^ {103}\) Obviously, it is difficult to falsify either of these claims. However, the significance of Albertz’s work lies in the argument that chs. 4-6 of OG derive from a different translator.\(^ {104}\)

III. Summary

Our brief foray into Danielic literature reveals a mixture of consensus in some issues and diversity in others. The biggest consensus, which was shared by most scholars who ventured an opinion, apart from slight vacillation on the part of Grelot and Bogaert, is

\(^{101}\)Albertz, pp. 159-163. This is the same conclusion which Blud., p. 218 had reached. There is also a fundamental weakness in Albertz' argument. He has not sufficiently considered the question whether these variations in vocabulary reflect the use of different translation equivalents for the target text (see CH 4.11.5). Ulrich is clearly of the opinion that chs. 4-6 do exhibit the same TT as the rest of the book, but he has not offered any evidence to support this view. E. Ulrich, "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible," in Sha'arei Talmoh, ed. M. Fishbane, E. Tov, and W. W. Fields (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), p. 285.

\(^{102}\)It should also be noted that Albertz (p. 178) is undecided about whether chs. 4-6 are actually a translation from a Semitic Vorlage.

\(^{103}\)Albertz, p. 164.

\(^{104}\)Cf. Tov, Hebrew Bible, pp. 177, 178, 317(fn. 3) who gives the opinion that Th is midrashic and later than MT.
that Th is a revision of the OG. On the other hand, no one has actually studied the relationship between the two in any detail. The OG has received the greater attention of the two texts, but there are several contentious issues. First, there is the question of TT. The early analysis by Bludau was affected by two different factors: 1. Bludau did not have the benefit of the best textual witness to the OG, papyrus 967; 2. Bludau assumed that the Vorlage of the OG was MT. McCrystall has recently attempted a new examination of the TT, but we have demonstrated that there are serious deficiencies in his methodology. Jeansonne has also shown that McCrystall’s arguments for theological Tendenz in the OG are, for the most part, without foundation. Wenthe has attempted to utilize insights from TT in his study as well, but he does not operate with any clearly defined methodology. Both Wenthe and McCrystall exemplify that the main difficulty with investigations of TT is that there has been no clearly defined methodology for the analysis of the TT in a book of the LXX. Second, this lack of methodology for TT has had consequences in the evaluation of the OG as a witness to the MT. Where Montgomery, Bludau, and McCrystall find Tendenz, Jahn, Charles, Jeansonne, and Wenthe discover a superior text. In the third place, there is the specific question of the Vorlage of chs. 4–6 and whether a retroverted text of the OG can be considered superior to MT. Finally, most of these recent investigations of the OG of Daniel have not been carried out with a clearly defined text of the OG! The major exceptions to this are Albertz, who does reconstruct the text of chs. 4–6; and Jeansonne, who almost always considers the readings of 967. However, the eclectic nature of Jeansonne’s analysis makes it very difficult to acquire a perspective of the difference that 967 makes to the evaluation of the OG text.

That is, except in her examination of 7:13 (pp. 96–98) where she refers to the edition of Ziegler, but does not discuss the fact that 967 stands very close to 88–Syh. It cannot be that she does not know the text of 967. Rather, it would seem that she avoided it because it did not support Ziegler’s reconstruction and her argument! As K. Cathcart has recently noted, there are other examples of scholars publishing on the text of OG, apparently without knowledge that 967 was available to consult. See K. Cathcart, “Daniel, especially the Additions, and Chester Beatty-Cologne Papyrus 967,” IBA 15 (1992): 37–41.
The following chapters will attempt to introduce some necessary corrections to the deficiencies that have been noted. The primary concern is to establish a methodology for the analysis of TT in the LXX and apply it to the OG and Th texts of Daniel. This will involve four steps. First of all, a critical text of OG which provides the basis for the analysis of TT has to be established. It is folly to analyze TT and to use the OG for text-critical judgments about MT without first establishing the OG text. Second, it is necessary to offer a critical examination of the current methodology of TT which focuses on the features of literalism. Third, a methodology for TT based on linguistic principles will be proposed. In the fourth stage, the proposed methodology for TT will be applied to the OG and Th texts of Daniel. The primary concern in this analysis will be the text of the OG, but the relationship of Th to OG will be considered in order to determine whether Th is a recension of OG. Matters of textual differences between the Greek texts and MT will also be addressed as they appear.

Unfortunately, the limits of space imposed by the critical reconstruction of the OG in CH 2 and the establishing of a methodology for the analysis of TT in CHs 3 and 4 will not allow the opportunity to investigate the TT of the OG as completely as one otherwise might like. For this reason, the analysis of TT of the OG in chs. 4-6 will remain on the periphery and our treatment of chapters 1-3 and 7-12 will be selective. However, by providing detailed examination of selected texts we will have a good foundation to draw conclusions concerning the TT as a whole and to refine the work on the texts of Daniel done previously. It would require a textual commentary on the OG and Th of Daniel in order to apply the methodology completely.
Excursus

Translation Technique and Textual Criticism

A good place to begin the discussion of TT and textual criticism is with a quote by E. Tov, which will put some perspective on our remarks concerning the intention of the translators (see CH 3.11.2.i.).

In other words, if the translator took care to render most elements of the Hebrew faithfully, it is not likely that he would have added or omitted other elements . . . . Reversely, if a translation unit may be considered free, the translator should be held responsible for extensive pluses or minuses.

In my opinion, only the first half of that statement is correct. The second half assumes that only those translators who reproduced their source text primarily with formal equivalents were concerned to translate the text faithfully. The above quotation of Tov clearly contradicts a principle of textual criticism that he himself has stated elsewhere:

... all Hebrew and retroverted variants are compared with MT, and in the case of reconstructed evidence one must forget for a moment that one is dealing with variants which are "merely" retroverted from non-Hebrew sources. In principle, the evaluation of hebrew and retroverted variants is identical, as long as the retroversion is reliable.

Generally speaking, MT readings are preferred, "but this statistical information should not influence decisions in individual instances, because the exceptions to this situation are not predictable." It is difficult to refrain from bias towards MT and


2TCU. p. 278 and repeated in his new volume, Hebrew Bible, p. 298.

3Tov. Hebrew Bible. p. 299.
demonstrate reasonable balance in the practice of textual criticism. However, if LXX pluses can be retroverted reliably, regardless of how formal or dynamic the translation is, then there is no reason a priori to characterize them as expansions by the translator. Obviously, we have to treat each book individually—there is a world of difference between OG in Daniel and the OG of Proverbs—but only a thorough study of the individual book and the specific passages can hope to distinguish between dynamic equivalence, which is an expansion by the translator or a later scribe, and an original reading.5

Textual criticism involves two steps: first, the collection of variants and, second, the evaluation of the variants. However, the evaluation of the LXX as a source of variant readings for the proto-MT is complicated for three reasons. First, the LXX is a translation and one must attempt to reconstruct the hypothetical Vorlage of the Greek text by retroversion before one can assess the value of the OG as a witness. However, as Goshen-Gottstein warns, "there is no retroversion without a residue of doubt, and what seems self-evident to one scholar may look like a house of cards to his fellow."6 In the second place, the process of retroversion is itself complicated in many instances because the original OG text must first be established before attempting to retrovert the semitic text from which it was translated. In essence, one must collect and evaluate the variant readings from the witnesses to the OG text of a book before one can evaluate the retroverted reading of the OG as a witness to the original semitic text.7 There are then two stages of textual


7 TCU by E. Tov is by far the best introduction to this process. The Göttingen editions are indispensable for this task and it can only be hoped that the work on the remaining books will be accomplished as soon as possible.
criticism in the use of an ancient version like the LXX for the textual criticism of the MT, and the exhaustive analysis of the TT in a given unit/book is essential for its text-critical use at both of these levels.

The importance of TT at the second level is generally recognized. For example, A. Pietersma writes that a thorough analysis of the TT:

... might be called the quest for the Archimedean point, because only from this vantage point can the text-critic sit in judgment over the fidelity with which the manuscripts have preserved the original text, and hence determine the quality of individual texts.  

However, even if we were to possess the autograph of the OG text of the Book of Daniel it would be comparatively useless for text-critical purposes without the requisite knowledge of the TT employed in the book. The study of TT provides the means to understand how the translator rendered the parent text; therefore, it helps in determining whether a particular substitution, omission, or addition in the translation reflects a variant text or is an exegetical rendering based on the theological concerns of the translator.

Acquaintance with the TT is, therefore, valuable for the reconstruction of the OG and understanding the history of the transmission of the OG text. For example, אָלַמִּי רְאֵי יָרְאֵי occurs four times in ch. 2:28, 29(2), 45. Th renders it in each instance with אֵלָיְתִּי דְָֽיְתָיְתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי. OG uses אֵלָיְתִּי דְָֽיְתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי in 2:28 and תְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי in 2:45, while the textual witnesses have variant readings for the two occurrences of the phrase in 2:29. The first occurrence in 2:29 is omitted in 88 due to homoioteleuton, and so Ziegler reconstructs בְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי from Syh; whereas 967 reads בְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי. In the second, Ziegler again reads בְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי while 967 has בְָֽיֵתִּי תְָֽיֵתִּי. Given the reading in 2:45 and the greater probability that the OG readings in 2:29 are represented by 967 which offers a variety of translation equivalents for the Aramaic אָלַמִּי רְאֵי יָרְאֵי, the readings of 88-Syh would be due to later scribal harmonization to the first

---


*The importance of understanding the TT in a particular book has been emphasized in J.W. Wevers' work on the Göttingen Pentateuch. See p. 116, above.
reading in 2:28 or, more likely, Th influence.\textsuperscript{10} When evaluating a variant reading on the basis of TT the critic must be sensitive to the text and to his/her own prejudices, however, because the temptation would be to allow the understanding of TT to dictate text-critical decisions (or the reverse). There is nothing to be gained from constructing a circular argument.

Once the OG text is established and the textual critic encounters a passage which, when retroverted, witnesses to a variant reading against MT, it has to be evaluated. There are three basic options: 1) Does the OG reflect a different Vorlage or a misunderstanding of the Vorlage?\textsuperscript{11} 2) Is the reading merely a dynamic rendering or does it in some way reflect the TT of the translator? 3) Is there evidence of theological Tendenz on the part of the translator, which motivated the rendering? Only with a balanced assessment of the TT of the whole book/unit in question can the text-critic begin to evaluate each possible variant and whether it originates from a differing Vorlage. As Talshir states, "The scholar finds himself in a vicious circle of evaluating the character of the translator's source on the one hand, and his translation technique on the other."\textsuperscript{12}

There is an important caveat to be added to our cursory introduction to the process of evaluating texts, which is the third difficulty of using the LXX for textual criticism. The Vorlage from

\textsuperscript{10}See also 8:19; cf. the remarks of F.F. Bruce ("Oldest," p. 24) who states that the use of & δει γενέσθαι (presupposing Ziegler's text) is an implicit "emphasis on apocalyptic necessity." Even if the text did read as Bruce supposes, it would not justify his interpretation because the OG employs a variety of equivalents for the same Aramaic. It is Th who employs & δει γενέσθαι consistently. In fact, given the Th influence on the 2 uses in 2:29—which would remain unknown without 967—it is possible that the reading of & δει γενέσθαι in vs. 28 also stems from Th.

\textsuperscript{11}Obviously, if a reading in the OG can be explained by the fact that the translator possibly misread (metathesis, parablepsis) or misunderstood the Vorlage in any way, then the OG does not witness to a variant at all.

which an OG translation was made was not always the same as the majority text which eventually emerged as MT.\textsuperscript{13} In fact, the discoveries from Qumran prove that in some cases they were very different.\textsuperscript{14} There are several theories to account for these discrepancies, but it is impossible to evaluate the merits of these theories here.\textsuperscript{15} However, it is also impossible to avoid the issue of the Vorlage for OG because of chapters 4-6.

The presence of an alternative Vorlage in the OG of chs. 4-6 is assumed for the analysis of TT in CH 5.\textsuperscript{16} However, it need not follow from the existence of an alternative Vorlage in chapters 4-6 that the Vorlage in chs. 1-3, and 7-12 also differed significantly from MT. Not only is this premise logical, but there are two additional factors to consider. First, and this anticipates the conclusions of CH 5, the analysis of TT in OG supports Albertz' conclusion that chs. 4-6


\textsuperscript{16}See the discussion on p. 37.
originate from a different translator. Second, in the main, the OG text itself and the extant manuscripts from Qumran are very close to MT.\textsuperscript{17} As Collins states in the latest commentary on Daniel, "On the whole, the Qumran discoveries provide powerful evidence of the antiquity of the textual tradition of the MT."\textsuperscript{18} For this reason, although the view that the OG translator was engaging in a type of wholesale theological reinterpretation of the text envisaged by McCrystal ought to be rejected, we cannot automatically assume that every difference between OG and MT necessarily points to an alternative Vorlage. The latter error is committed by Wenthe. It is true that the Dead Sea Scrolls have confirmed many retroverted readings and the existence of alternative literary editions. However, each variant has to be evaluated individually. We have to consider the corrupt condition of the OG text and then attempt to discern the TT as best as we are able in order to use this understanding for textual criticism of MT. Therefore, the working hypothesis adopted for this thesis is that the Vorlage of OG was very close to MT except in chs. 4-6 and the end of ch. 3 where OG has differences due to the long addition in the text.

Given the working hypothesis we will approach the variant readings in OG and Th Daniel with the required understanding of the TT employed and by the judicious application of two general rules of thumb. First, if the translation can be explained from a text corresponding to MT, it has no significance for textual criticism, i.e. there is a "built-in prejudice towards the MT."\textsuperscript{19} The first rule is balanced by the second, which is that any deviations in the translation, particularly pluses and minuses, may reflect an alternative Vorlage; because any scholar who:

\begin{itemize}
  \item wishes to attribute deliberate changes, harmonizations, completion of details and new accents to the translator is under the obligation to prove his thesis
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{17} See also Ulrich, "Canonical Process," pp. 284-285. See the preliminary edition of the Qumran fragments of Daniel from cave four by Ulrich, "Part 1;" "Part 2."

\textsuperscript{18} J. J. Collins, Daniel, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), p. 3.

with weighty arguments and also to show why the divergences cannot have originated with the Vorlage.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., p. 71.
Chapter 2
A Critical Evaluation of Papyrus 967

The first and most basic step of the investigation of TT in the book of Daniel is to establish the OG text in order to ensure accuracy in the analysis of TT and for the use of the OG in textual-criticism of MT. For this reason, the present chapter offers a collation and critical evaluation of all the variant readings from 967 in the editions of Geissen, Hamm, and Roca-Puig against the critical text of Ziegler. However, it must be acknowledged that this critical text is only a preliminary one for two reasons. First, it only evaluates the variants from the editions of 967 to which Ziegler did not have access when he published his text in 1954. It is possible that the evaluation of some variants could change in the remainder of Ziegler's text in the light of 967's witness elsewhere. Second, it is possible that different decisions might have been made for some readings if more time had been devoted to the analysis. A more sustained investigation could not be justified when O. Munnich has undertaken the task of preparing a complete revision of Ziegler's text. Therefore, it is highly improbable that the reconstructed text presented here will be the same as Munnich's, but, hopefully, his work will agree quite closely with it. So, although a detailed presentation of 967's text is somewhat premature, a thorough presentation of the evidence still offers the best leverage from which to evaluate the evidence.

The evaluation of 967 will be divided into two main sections. The first section will treat orthographical and other minor variants and will classify them according to type. The majority of these variants are insignificant as regards the content of the OG and the evaluation of TT. The second section will treat the more substantial types of variants--minuses, pluses, substitutions, transpositions--and will proceed verse by verse.

---

1The reader is directed to the editions of Ziegler, Hamm, and Geissen for more detailed discussion of the contents of the papyrus and some of its more salient features. The production of this collation was aided through the use of the variant files of Daniel from the CATSS project (co-directed by Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov) and I am most grateful for the assistance of Dr. Kraft and Jay Treat of CCAT at the University of Pennsylvania. An electronic version of this collation has been made available for inclusion in the CATSS database.

2In fact, there will be occasions during the analysis of TT in CH 5 that corrections are suggested for other readings in Zieg.
The second section, then, will provide an additional critical apparatus of major variants to be used in conjunction with Ziegler's text.

The division of variants into the categories "minor" as opposed to "major" is, admittedly, rather arbitrary. All the orthographical variants are included in the first section as well as those variants restricted to differences in number and case for nouns, and person, number, tense, mood, and voice for verbs. Therefore, a variant between a finite vb. and a participle is not in the first section if it also impinges on syntax (e.g. 1:2). All additions, omissions, or substitutions of articles that can be handled without reference to their governing noun or preposition are listed in the first section as well. Any other additions, omissions, substitutions or transpositions are listed in the verse-by-verse analysis in the second section. This grouping of variants according to type serves to remove the "clutter" from the main apparatus and a general acquaintance with the characteristics of the manuscript can be extremely valuable for the assessment of more important variants. A reason for almost every decision will be provided in the second section. In the case of some recurrent variants it is assumed that the evaluation of the reading is obvious to the reader. In the first section it is often possible to evaluate the variants as a group. Where an adequate judgement regarding the originality of a reading has been given elsewhere, that discussion is usually cited. An asterisk in the left margin indicates that the reading is deemed to be original.

The point of reference for the readings of 967 is always Ziegler's text; therefore, it is assumed throughout this chapter that the reader has a copy of Ziegler's edition in hand. The remainder of this thesis will presuppose the critically reconstructed text of the OG.

Prior to the evaluation of its readings there is a brief introduction to the papyrus. The chapter will conclude with a statistical summary.

I. Introduction to Papyrus 967

The best evidence that 967 is the closest witness we have to the OG text of Daniel is that 967 almost never has the asterisked additions of 88-Syh, and in many additional cases 967 still has a shorter text. Other significant indicators of 967's

3Of course, many of the variants that remain in the "major" section are relatively insignificant, but a line had to be drawn somewhere.

4See O. Munnich, "Origène, éditeur de la Septante de Daniel," in Studien zur Septuaginta - Robert Hanhart zu Ehren, MsU, 20, ed. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J. Wevers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 187-218. In almost all of these cases Ziegler has correctly reconstructed the original text. Actually, the papyrus has confirmed that 88-Syh managed to preserve the OG quite faithfully, but there remain significant differences.
importance as a witness to the OG are some of the lexical variants and occasions where 967 offers the more likely Greek reading (e.g. the combination of art., adj., noun as opposed to art. + noun, art. + adj. in 88-Syh). ⁵ At the same time, the variants in 967 demonstrate that the papyrus and/or its parent text had still undergone considerable influence from Th as well as correction toward MT.

Papyrus 967 is also notable because it preserves yet another anomaly about the book of Daniel. In 967, chapters 7-8 intervene between ch. 4 and 5. The different order of chapters has also been found in a Latin manuscript, so Bogaert is correct that 967 is no longer a "meteor." ⁶ However, the variant order is best attributed to a scribe attempting to "fix" the chronology of the book. By placing chs. 7-8 after ch. 4 the events and visions relating to Belshazzar are kept together (chs. 7-8, 5) and precede those relating to Darius (chs. 6, 9). ⁹⁶⁷ also reverses the order of chapters 38-39 in Ezekiel, so the change in Daniel is not unique. Although, P.S. David argues that we should accept 967's order as original, the difference in content between OG and MT in chs. 4-6 is an insurmountable obstacle to any hypothetical restructuring of the book. Furthermore, R. Albertz has produced strong evidence that chs. 4-6 of OG originate from a separate translator, and, in our examination of TT in CH 5, we will adduce further evidence in support of Albertz' thesis.⁷

Perhaps the greatest tragedy surrounding 967 is that we do not possess the entire text of Daniel. It is particularly lamentable that the most damaged portions of the papyrus and large lacunae are in chs. 10-12, especially ch. 11, where the OG text exhibits the highest degree of confusion as to the meaning of MT. In order to appreciate the extent of the damage and to clarify where the witness of 967 is unavailable a more precise description of the lacunae of the papyrus is given here.⁸ Take heed that the place where I note the ms. is broken is only approximate, i.e. there may be a few letters extant from a following line or two where the ms. is broken and usually only about half of the preceding dozen words are extant.

Generally speaking, minimal reconstruction is required for the first eight chs. of Daniel, even where it was ripped. Chapters 9-12, Sus and Bel are in worse shape, though the top part of the leaves of the whole papyrus are well preserved. Most of Dan

⁵See Zieg., pp. 19-21; Hamm, I-II, pp. 19-44 for evaluations of readings and the judgment that 967 best preserves the OG.


⁷See David, pp. 87-94; Albertz, pp. 159-163.

⁸Geissen's (pp. 12-16) description is not so precise.
10:11, 18; 11:2, 3 and almost all of 10:4 and 10:17 are missing. Still larger lacunae are as follows: 11:8 from ἄποισοντο κατασύρον in vs. 10, though the ms. is in bad shape from the beginning of vs. 8. 11:15 from στήσοντα (967 reads στέσει) to θελήσανος in 11:16, though most of vss. 14 and 15 are not extant. 11:20 from Βασιλείας εἰς το [σύμνογέντος μετ'] in 11:23. 11:26 to end of 11:28, though portions of two words are extant from 11:26. 11:32 to end of 11:34. 11:38 from καὶ ὃς το πολλοῖς in 11:40. 11:45 καὶ ὃς το [ἀνεύσιμον in 12:2. 12:6 καὶ καθαρισμόν το τίς ἦ in 12:8. 12:13 ἔπι τήν to end.

II. Primarily Orthographical Variants

In this section are categorised most of the minor variants from the corpus of papyrus 967. In many cases we can only make educated guesses in the evaluation of readings. In the case of OG, where the textual evidence is so sparse, decisions have to be based on our understanding of the writing practices of the time and what reading is more likely to reflect the period from which it emerged. After all, perhaps the original translator did not spell very well. So, although Ziegler is correct that the orthography of 967 was not carefully done compared to 88,9 there are instances where 967 probably preserves the more accurate spelling.

Key to Sigla:

* = accepted as an original reading
> = omission in 967
+ = longer reading in 967
· = alternative reading in 967
trans. = transposed, transposition
2,1,3 = the order of words in 967
[ ] = letter/s or word/s in brackets omitted in 967
( ) = letter/s or word/s in brackets added in 967
- - = orthog. difference in 967 Always limited to one letter in the apparatus.

Indented + or > means the word is added or omitted in 967 following the previously noted variant.

II.1. Corrections by Later Hands 14x

αὐτὸν ἐπ" 2:15 υ added by 2 corrector.
συνετε'αίροις 2:17 Delete ε, add αι by 2nd corr.
ἐσήμην'α'νος 2:23 Deleted η and added α by 2nd corr. Thack. §24, p. 284.

9Zieg., p. 21.
These errors were due mainly to carelessness in transcription.

11.2. Errors 55x

These errors were due mainly to carelessness in transcription.
>λατρε. μηδε 3:95 (28)
πληροδν(τα) 4:8 (11) dittog.
πάσαν 4:8 (11) twice by dittog.
σού ναυ 4:30c
ἐ(ν)θνεςι(ν) 4:34b 1st ν is an err.
πάντων τόν τόν 4:34c dittog.
περιέθ. αὐτῷ +καὶ ἐδωκέν αὐτῷ 5:29 dittog.
ὁρθ[ρ][ε][ι][σ[ε][ν]](ν) 6:19 (20) ῥ omitted by err.
ἐκάλεσ[ι]ν(ν) 6:20 (21) ἐσ omitted by err.
ἀπό +άπό 6:22 (23) dittog.
tὸ θηρίον 7:11 dittog.
ἐκεῖνον ὁ ὁ 7:20 dittog.
δοθεῖσα(ν) 8:13
ἐν νηστείας: ἐνηστείας 9:3 haplog.
ἡμιν ἡμῶν 9:7
dιες -ρ-κόρπισας 9:7
κατά: κακά 9:13
tοὺς +τους 9:18 dittog.
tὴν ἐρήμωσιν: ἡρμωσίν 9:18
ἐβδομήκοντα: ἐν θ (with a line over it) 9:24 o mistaken for θ and ἐν for ἐννέα as a gloss?
+ἐτι 9:24 for ἐτι (1st), but then corr.
eἰκοσὶν. ἐ (with a line over it) 10:13 967 has κε? misunderstood from κ = 20?
Geissen, p. 233.
kαί εἶπε[ν] dittog? 10:20 There is enough space on the previous line for this to have been written.
σου μοι 10:21 Change in pronoun to harmonize with the change in person of the vb.
πρώτα +τά 10:21 haplog. or dittog.?
ἀνθεστήκαςιν: 11:2 dittog.? Uncertain.
οὺ στήσει: συστήσει 11:6
χώρ[αν] 11:19
ἐξώσιοςιν 11:30 err. due to previous ἡξιοσιν(ν).
eἰς τὸ καθα +εἰς τὸ 11:35 dittog.
eἶπα ἐπάν 12:6
ἀν ἀποσταθῇ ἀνασταθῇ 12:11

II.3. Interchange of Vowels
II.3.i. ανέ, ε/α Thack. §6.11 45x

ανέ 4x

ἐκπυξόμαι 1:5; συνετάρων 5:6; εὐφημία 6:5(6); βοηθήσατε 10:13;

ε/α 41x


II.3.ii. νεί, εντ, ενε Thack. §6.24-26. 115x + 20x listed with Proper Nouns

νεί 85x

βασιλευκῆς 1:5, παένει 1:5, 8; ὀλοκληρώθη 1:18; «εὐνα 1:10; ἧμερα 1:12, 3:27, 30; 9:12, 13; ὄμεν 1:13; ὀμαλομέσος 1:19; ἐκκενθήσθη 2:3; 11:38; ἀποκαθισθεὶς 2:5; καθευδοτών 2:21; γαῖς ἱδρύσκων 2:22, 3:15; βραχευδόνε 3:22; 9:15; 10:6; 11:6, 15, 31; ἔρπ|πεισθε 2:35; ἀφανευθεί 4:44; ἐ-ν-κατανεμήσουν 3:2; ἐκάθαρθ 3:5, 14; καίρευον 3:6, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22(2), 23, 24, 25, 46, 47, 48, 49(2), 51, 79; παίδιπτοντα 3:7; συνεκείνων 3:14; σῶθωρεθεί 3:15; ὅλοκαάτωσεν 3:38; κρειδῶν 3:40; περίτοινων 3:40; ἐξαφαλάτα 3:40; ἐξετεκναζέων 3:49; ἡμέρας 3:67; ἡθείων 4:30a; ὑπεκειστᾶ 4:30c; δισυκεφαλίσας 5 πρεσας; ἐπεισπεραν 6:10(11); τρεῖς 6:10(11), 11(12); ἐρήθρ|πεισθεν 6:19(20); ἀπητυπανειδιαθή 7:11; δισυκεφαλίσα 8:14; πάσοι 9:16; «εὐκλήσεων 9:18; χρονείας 9:19; διευμον 9:19, 24; κρειδῶν 9:26; κατευκρύσει 11:5, 6; ἐπεισευθοστρέμει 11:10; ἐξάπασθα 11:24; ἐρεθθείνσησατα 11:25; λειαν 11:25; ἐγ-ν-καταλειμέπων 11:30; καὶ συνεκείνων 11:31; καθαρευκίας 11:35; ἀφανευθεί 11:44; συνεκείνων 12:3; χειρευκίας 12:12, 11, 12.

εντ 27x

καταλεξε[να]φθήνα 2:35
καταφθε[τε]ραγετε 4:11(14)
γινώσκε[β] 10:20

II.3.iii. Omission of 7x

*ἐσθ[ύοντας 1:13; 7:7 κατεσθ[ύοντες 7:19 Thack. §19.3.
ἐπι[ει]κειόμενα 3:42
ὑπεκα[ύον 3:46
δ[λ]αθήκη 9:13
ἐπιθυμ[ί]ον 10:3

II.3.iv. α/ε, ε/α Thack. §6.2,3 5x

ἀνε-α-μοσ 2:35
ἐπι· ἀπ' 3:2
ὑπολογίζοντας·σ·ς 3:9
καταφθει[ραγε]τε 4:11(14)
καθα-ριο[ν]θησεται 8:14

II.3.v. ο/ν Thack. §6.41 4x

ἠνυζεν· ᾧνυζεν 6:10(11); 10:16
συγ· συ 2:23; 9:7

II.4. Non-Elision Thack. §9.10 6x

*ἄλλο· ἀλλα 2:28, 30; 3:39, 95(28); 10:21
*παρ' παρὰ 3:19

II.5. ἐὰν for ὡν Mayser, II.1. 267; Thack. §5.4 8x

3:6, 10, 11, 96(29), 4:34α; 5:7; 9:14; 11:3
II.6. ἐως and ὡς 3x

(ἐ)ῶς 2:43
(ἐ)ως 4:30(33)
(ἐ)ως 7:13

There are three occasions where 967 has confused the writing of ἐως or ὡς. The most celebrated instance is in 7:13 where F.F. Bruce has argued that the OG makes an "astonishing" claim that the one like a son of man came as (the) Ancient of Days.10 Zieg. had reconstructed the text to read ἐως, but 967 does support 88-Syh in reading ὡς and J. Lust has suggested that the "so-called 'erroneous' reading . . . is not to be 'corrected' in an edition of the text of the LXX."11 Jeansonne has argued for the integrity of Zieg.'s reconstruction and she does note the parallel variants in 2:43 and 4:30(33), but she does not note that 967 actually supports the reading of 88-Syh in this particular case.12 However, there is no doubt that Zieg.'s text is correct.

In both the OG and Th ἐως is a SE for ἦλ θ. ἐως appears 43x in OG, but 14x MT =0.13 In the remaining 29 instances ἐως renders ἦλ θ in all but two passages.14 In 4:8(11) it is a good equivalent for ἦ in the sense "unto" and in 9:20 ἐως translates ἦλ θ, which is obviously an error of sight or hearing. We encounter the same equivalence when examining MT. ἦλ θ appears 47x in MT, so there are 20x when ἐως=ἤλ θ does not occur. 8x OG=0.15 Textual differences also explain the non-equivalence for ἦλ θ in five other cases.16 while TT accounts for the omissions in 2:20;
There remain four other passages. In 8:6 and 11:10 OG translates with ἐπι, while in 11:45 it has ὄρνα. As in the case of 9:20 above, OG has probably misread Ἰλ in 8:6, 11:10 and Ἰλ in 11:45. Not only is the direct equivalence between ἐδωκα and Ἰλ established, but there is no other instance in OG or Th where ὄς translates Ἰλ.

In 2:43, 967 may have read Ἰλ (see BHS) where it employs ἐδωκα for ὄς.

II.7. Consonants

II.7.i. Addition of ζ 5x

*οὗτος(ζ) 1:13; 3:40 Thack. §9.9, Mayser I, 1. p. 214
*ἡχους(ζ) 3:7(?) 10, 15. Thack. §10.29

II.7.ii. Omission of ζ 6x

νεανίσκους(ζ) 1:4
δεκαπλασίω(ζ) 1:20
ἐπταπλασίω(ζ) 3:46
βασιλείω(ζ) 4:30a
*λοχους(ζ) 5 preface S. Geissen, p. 141.
καθα-ε-ρι-ε-σησεται 8:14

II.7.iii. Doubled Consonants Thack. §7.39, 40, 42 5x

967 often writes only one consonant of a pair.

ἐπ[π]τερεύ 2:35, 3:46
ἐμβάλλοντες 3:46
ἐπ[π]σσατο 3:88
ἐρ[π]φησαν 6:24(25)
πρόσρ[ί]ξες 9:18

II.7.iv. Interchange of Λ/Ρ Thack. §7.20 3x

Thack. notes that the tendency was for ρ to replace Λ, but he also states that "instances occur, also, of the reverse change in the κοινή where no consonant follows."

17In 2:20 (cf. 7:18) OG omits the latter half of מַלְּכָה מַלְכָה, while in 8:8, 11:25 OG translates מַלְכָה מַלְכָה with σφόδρα.
The fact that λ was mistakenly written for ρ during the transmission of Daniel is exemplified in 6:22(23), which was later corrected; 11:25 where the addition of παραλογισθησαται is a corruption from the earlier variant παραργισθησαται (Geissen, p. 259, see 11:25); and the reading of θάλασσης in 10:6. 967 tends to substitute λ for ρ which suggests that it is a phonetic error. It also means that we should consider the possibility that 967 has the correct reading in 3:96(29).

διαμελ-ρ-υσθησαται 3:96(29) This orthographic variant is quite interesting because διαμελίζω "dissect" is usually interpreted as a neologism (so LEH, p. 106), which Mont., p. 148, reconstructed on the basis of an analogy to μέλη ποιμαστές in 2 Macc. 1:16. LSJ only has διαμελίζω attested in Plutarch. However, even without 967, we should consider the possibility of reading the far more common διαμερίζω "divide." The problem in reading διαμελίζω is that it would mean OG knew the meaning of the Vorlage here, but not in 2:5. On the other hand, the more common διαμερίζω would fit the pattern of orthographic change in OG and would also represent an adequate contextual guess. At some early stage of its transmission the λ could have been substituted for the ρ, and διαμελίζω may have been accepted into the language later. S. the discussion in CH 5.111.

ελ·ρ'υψας 6:22(23) Emended by 2 corr. θαρσης θάλασσης 10:6 967=88-Syh but does not make sense. It could derive from an early transcription mistake of λ for ρ.

II.7.v. Non-Assimilation of ν Thack. §9.3-6. 15x

*συμ-ν-μολυνθη 1:8
*συμ-ν-μιγεις 2:43
*συγ-ν-κραθήναι 2:43
*εγ-ν-κατινεῖς 3:2
*συμ-ν-πανίσαντας 3:20
εμ-ν-πυριμόν 3:95(28)
εγ-ν-κύκλιον 4:34b
εγ-ν-κατινεμοῦ 5 preface
*συγ-ν-κρίμα 5:7(2), 16, 30
εγ-ν-κατέληπε&nu 9:11; 11:30
εμ-ν-μένων 12:12 S. 6:12a where Zieg. should be emended to read with the compound.
II.7.vi. νυ-έφελκυστικόν Thack. §9.7 125x

As far as verbs are concerned, 967 consistently employs the variable νυ- and there is only one occurrence in 967 in which the ν is omitted against 88. There are 13x where 967 has the final ν on nouns and adjectives against 88 as well. Since the ν dropped out before consonants in later usage, it is more probable that we should retain it in all cases where it is attested.

II.7.vi.a. Verbs 112x

Addition of ν in 967 111x

• ηχίωσεν 1:8; ἔδωκεν 1:9; εἰπεν 1:11, 2:5, 14, 26, 27, 3:91, 6:14(15), 16(17), 21(22); 10:11, 12, 14, 20; 11:12; 12:9; έξήτηκεν 1:20; κρινόσιν 2:7; έστιν 2:11(2), 20, 27, 28, 3:17(2), 4:27(30), 34(37), 34c; 5 preface; 6:26(27), 8:20, 21; εἰσῆλθεν 2:16; ὑπεδείξεν 2:17; παρηγγέλει 2:18; ἐκδοθῶσιν 2:18; ἐνλόγησεν 2:19; εἰσήγαγεν 2:25; ἐδήλωσεν 2:28, 29; ἐπάταξεν 2:34, 35, 3:20; συνηλόσεν 2:45; ἐσήμανεν? 2:45; προσεκύνησεν 2:46; ἐπέταξεν 2:46; ήξιωσεν 2:49; εκήρυξεν 3:4; ἐστησεν 3:5, 7, 6:14(15); έσιν 3:12; ἡπείρισεν 3:22; ἐνεπάρασαν 3:48; εὐρεν 3:48; ἔξέτεταν 3:49; ἐποίησεν 3:50; ἐλύσασεν 3:50; ἐθαύμασεν 3:91; ἀπέστειλεν 3:95(28); ἔσωσεν 3:95(28); προσκυνήσωσιν 3:95(28); ἐφόνησεν 4:11(14); ὑπεδείξεν 4:15(18); συνετήρησεν 4:25(28); ἔγραψεν 4:34b; ἐπήνευσεν 5 preface; εἶδεν 5:5; ἐφώνησεν 5:7; ἔξέθηκεν 5:7; ἐνέδυσεν 5:29; ἐπήλθεν 5:30, 10:13; παρέλαβεν 5:31(6:1), 19(20), 28(29); ἦττήσωσιν 6:5(6); ἐστησεν 6:9(10), 10(11); ὄρθησεν 6:19(20); σέσωκεν 6:20(21), 21(22); ἐπήκουσεν 6:21(22); εἶδεν 7:1; εἴχεν 7:7; ἀπέστησεν 7:12; ὑπερέφερεν 7:20; ἀπολύσασιν 7:26; ἤθελεν 8:4; ἔδραμεν 8:6; ἐπάταξεν 8:7; συνέτριψεν 8:7; ἀγαπόσιν 9:4; ἔγ-ν-κατέλειπεν 9:11; ἡγρύπνησεν 9:14; προσήλθεν 9:22; ἑλάλησεν 9:22; ἔξηλθεν 9:23; κατίσχυσα-ε-ν 10:8; προσήγαγεν 10:10; κατίσχυσέν 10:18; ἐνίσχυσέν 10:19; ἤξουσιν 11:30; μελειοῦσιν 11:31; ἀποστήσουσιν 11:31; δὼσοσιν 11:31; πειρασθώσιν 12:9; ἀγιασθῶσιν 12:9

Omission of ν in 967 1x
κατατρέχουσιν[ν] 4:21(24)

II.7.vi.b. Nouns and Adjectives 13x

Addition of ν in 967 13x

πασίν 1:13, 2:4; 3:29(2); 4:34b, 34c.
δῶσιν 3:79
II.8. Number 17x
II.8.i. Nouns 9x

II.8.i.a. Singular for Plural 5x

*τὰ πρόσ. υἱ. διατ. ἀσθ.· τὸ πρόσωπον υμῶν διατετραμένον ἀσθενές 1:10
Given the predominant use of (oriously) in idioms and semi-prepositions it is not
unexpected that OG always has the sing. elsewhere in Daniel where it is rendered by
προσώπον, 18 but OG also employs προσώπον in all other cases as well. 19 This is the
only instance in Daniel where a plural would be suitable in Greek, but s. 1:13, 15 where
OG has the sing. ὑψίς.

*εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας· ἡ τοῦ αἰὼνος 2:44 Syh=sg. S. also 2:44(2); 3:9; 6:27(26)
where OG has the singular for plural in MT. The only time OG retains the plural of
MT for [15] is in 7:18 according to Zieg., but the formal correspondence to MT is
unlikely there. S. CH 5.111.

ἐσχάτων ἐσχάτου 2:45 967=MT In 2:28 and 2:29 OG has ἐπ ἐσχάτων τῶν
ἡμερῶν where MT has ἀναστάσεις (vs. 28) and ἀνάρχεις (vs. 29) respectively.
2:45 follows the same pattern. S. below.

*τὰ σώματα· τὸ σῶμα 3:95(28) 967=Syh The variant probably stems from
alternative Vorlagen because there is a K-Q difference. The Peshitta also offers a sing.
while Th and the Vulgate have the pl.

τῶν χειρῶν· τῆς χειρός 6:14(15) Here MT =0, but MT only has the pl. of ἐὰς 3x
(2:34, 45; 3:15) and each time OG retains the plural. Otherwise OG prefers the plural
even where MT is sg. The pl. renders a sg. in 1:2; 2:38; 3:17; 7:25; 8:4, 25; 11:11, 16;
12:7.

18:5, 17, 18, 23; 9:3, 7, 8, 13, 17; 10:6, 9, 15; 11:17, 18, 19, 22.
193:19, 41; 4:19(22), 30(33); 6:10(11), 12(13), 13(14); 7:10; 10:12.
II.8.i.b. Plural for Singular 3x

\[\alpha\gamma\nu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\sigma \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\sigma \delta\nu\ 2:11 \ 967=MT; \ s. \ Hamm, I-II, p. 181, 183.\]

*\[\epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\nu \ \epsilon\sigma\chi\alpha\tau\eta\nu \ 8:23; 10:14 \ The \ plural \ follows \ 8:19 \ and \ the \ pattern \ in \ 2:28, 29, 45.\]

to\[\delta \ \lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron: \ \tau\nu\ \lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \ 12:8 \ MT \ has \ \textit{\tau}\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \textit{\tau}\omicron\omicron\omicron.} \ \lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron \ appears \ 15x \ in \ OG. \ In \ every \ case \ except \ 2:9 \ OG \ follows \ the \ number \ of \ MT, \ though \ in \ 3/4 \ cases \ where \ MT=0 \ the \ pl. \ is \ used. \ The \ OG \ rendering \ probably \ stems \ from \ a \ misunderstanding \ of \ MT. \ OG \ has \ the \ sing. \ for \ \textit{\tau}\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \textit{\tau}\omicron\omicron\omicron \ while \ the \ pl. \ in \ 967 \ resulted \ from \ later \ harmonization \ to \ the \ demonstrative \ adj.\]

II.8.ii. Verbs 8x

II.8.ii.a. Singular for Plural 2x

\[\sigma\upsilon\nu\chi\omicron\theta\nu[\sigma\alpha\nu] \ 6:23(24) \ Elsewhere \ OG \ has \ the \ pl. \ S. \ 3:7; 4:9(12); 7:27; 8:4; 12:10. \ \sigma\tau\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\omicron: \ \sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\eta\tau\omicron? \ 11:15 \ 967 \ identifies \ "king \ of \ Egypt" \ as \ the \ subject.\]

II.8.ii.b. Plural for Singular 6x

\[\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu\gamma\mu\upsilon\alpha\tau\sigma\theta\nu[\sigma\alpha\nu] \ 2:13 \ Secondary \ harmonization \ to \ following \ verb. \ Hamm, I-II, p. 185.\]

*\[\epsilon\zeta\pi\tau\theta\nu \ \delta\epsilon: \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \epsilon\zeta\pi\tau\theta\nu\sigma\alpha\nu \ 2:13 \ The \ only \ grammatical \ parallel \ is \ in \ 2:18 \ where \ OG \ has \ the \ pl. \ 88-Syh \ has \ secondary \ harmonization \ to \ previous \ vb. \ Cf. \ Hamm, I-II, p. 187, \ who \ reads \ the \ s. \ for \ both \ vbs.\]

\[\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\omicron \ \epsilon\gamma\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron \ 2:35 \ \gamma\nu\omicron\nu\omicron \ \omicron \ occurs \ twice \ more \ in \ the \ s. \ in \ 2:35. \ The \ 3 \ pl. \ of \ \gamma\nu\omicron\nu\OMICRON \ is \ unusual, \ but \ there \ is \ one \ other \ passage \ where \ it \ is \ employed \ in \ OG \ (12:1). \ \textit{\textup{The singular occurs in 2:1, 35(3); 3:30, 40, 91(24), 92(25); 4:24(27); 8:11, 12, 15; 9:2, 12(2); 10:4; 11:36; 12:1. \ Other occurrences are inf. in 2:11, 12, 28, 29(2); 4:30b; inv. in 3:40; part. in 4:34c.}}\]
there are 27.22 The cases where the pl. are employed conform to Soisalon-Soininen’s suggestion that it is used when the parts of the whole are emphasized.23 In this instance the subject is viewed collectively, so it is most probably sing. while 967 has been corrected toward MT.

In this instance the subject is viewed collectively, so it is most probably sing. while 967 has been corrected toward MT.

27.22 The cases where the pl. are employed conform to Soisalon-Soininen’s suggestion that it is used when the parts of the whole are emphasized. In this instance the subject is viewed collectively, so it is most probably sing. while 967 has been corrected toward MT.


II.9. Miscellaneous Orthographical Variants 9x

This section includes variants in spelling (1:5; 3:55) as well as common orthographical variants that could not be classified elsewhere.

*έκ-χεσιν 1:5 Thack. §7.9.  ἀπι-νσ-ογγειλιτε 2:5
*οὔτε οὐσᾶ 2:43 Hamm, I-II, p. 265.  ἀπ-νσ-ογγειλιτε 2:6
σομβώκτος 3:5
κύμισκος 3:46 Thack. §6.22.
χερουβίμων 3:55 Thack. §6.22,
ιδων. ιδον 10:8
οὖθε-εις 10:21

II.10. Proper Nouns 70x

Most of the variants dealing with proper nouns have to do with common orthographical differences, though a few involve different names. A few important variants are treated in the main apparatus.

Ἰωκαίνημα 1:1, 2
In this section are listed additions, omissions, and substitutions of articles that can be treated without reference to their governing preposition or noun.

*τόν βασιλέα 1:2 Hamm, I-II, p. 81.
*τής Ιουδαίας 1:2
*είς +τήν 1:2
*τών τῶν 1:9 Hamm, I-II, p. 95.
βασιλέα +τῶν 1:18 Hamm, I-II, p. 125.
*τῶν Δαν. 1:19 967=Th Hamm, I-II, p. 127.
{τῷ} Αναν. 1:19
[τούς] φαρμάκους 2:2 Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 147. OG tends to employ only one article in a series, but it is included before both the previous elements.
>τῶν S. 3:48; 9:1 and DJD, I, p. 150.
(δ) βασιλεὺς 2:10
*[Μαχισάει] + τῷ cj. by Hamm, I-II, p. 197.
*[καὶ [τὰ] e.t. φωτ] 2:22 S. discussion of 2:22 in III.


*[τῆς] Βασυλωνίας 2:24

«τοῦτο» ἀπράκ. 2:34 Hamm, I-II, p. 133.

*[τὴν] ἱσχύ 2:37 S. Hamm, I-II, p. 137, but reference to 2:37 has been omitted.
*[τὴν] τιμὴν 2:37
*[τὴν] δόξαν 2:37
*[τῶν] ἱχθῶν 2:38 Hamm, I-II, p. 133.

>τῆς
*[τῶν] χαλκῶν 2:45
*[τῶν] ἀργυριῶν 2:45
*[τῶν] χρυσάν 2:45

πάντων τῶν 2:48 haplog.
>ὁ 3:2 Hamm, III-IV, p. 147.

πάντων >τῶν 3:7 haplog.? S. 2:10; 3:2, 37; 4:37, 34c; 7:14; but 2:30, 48.

«ὁ» θεός 3:17

Μισ. + τῶν 3:13

περὶ τῶν 3:49 S. 3:23.

αὐτῶν + τῶν 3:50 Hamm, III-IV, p. 331.

*>τοῦ 3:57 Hamm, III-IV, p. 351.

εὐλογ. + τά 3:81

ὑμνεῖτε καὶ + τά 3:81

ἐστίν + τὸ 4:34(37) S. 2:47.

>ὁ Ναβου. 4:34c Cf. Hamm, III-IV, p. 525.

πατρὸς σου >τοῦ 5:12

*>τῶν 6:1(2) S. Geissen, p. 161.

>ὁ 7:1 Omitted in 967 due to the previous reading of a rel. pro. (Δανυηλ ὁς Δανυηλος).

*>τῶν 7:22 S. 7:9, 13.
>ai 7:27

*ό] Ἰσχυρός 9:4 OG tends to omit articles in a series.

*καὶ [ὁ?] φοβερός 9:4

παιδὸς >τοῦ 9:11

κυρίου +τοῦ 9:13 967 =Th.

ἀφαιρεθ. >ἡ 9:27

*>τῷ 10:1

στρατηγοῦ >τοῦ 10:13

τῶν τῷ 11:35

*αὐτῇ +ό 11:42 Cf. Th and MT. More likely that the art. was dropped later.

*[(ἡ] ἀκοὴ 11:44 Cf. Th and MT. More likely that 88-Syh dropped the art. Cf.

Geissen, p. 65.

*ὁς +οι 12:3 88-Syh=MT, but the article might have been added because it is better Greek.

*>οι 12:4 OG never adds the art. elsewhere to πολλοί (s. 8:25, 11:10, 18, 26, 34, 44; 12:9[10]) and does not translate the art. when the Vorlage is definite (s. 9:18, 27; 11:33, 39; 12:3).

>ό 12:6

II.12. Reflexive Pronouns Thack. §14.2 8x

The reflexive pronoun was used more at the time of Daniel’s composition, so it is more likely that the reflexive was dropped during the course of transmission than it was added by 967. There are several places where 88 and 967 are agreed in the use (1:3, 11:7; 4:9[12] 967 +), which supports the view that we should read it elsewhere.

*[(ε]αὐτοῦ 1:20, 2:17, 6:10(11); 7:1; 11:7

*[(ε]αὐτῶν 3:21, 95(28)

[(ε]αὐτοὺς 11:35

II.13. Miscellaneous Nouns 24x

Included below are variants in nouns that are primarily differences in case.

*ὁ ἀργυρὸς; τὸ ἀργυρίον 2:35 88=Th Hamm, p. 241.

πετεινῶν πετηνῶν 2:38

*χαλκῆ· χαλκοῦ 2:39 Hamm, I-II, p. 255.


αινετῶν· αἰνετῶς 3:26 S. 3:55.

*t. δούλοις· τῶν δούλων 3:33 967=88

65


II. 14. Verbs 59x

II. 14.i. 1st and 2nd Aorist Thack. §17.1,2. BDF §81 3x

*eipov· eipan 3:9; 6:12a.
eipan· eipov 3:16.
*enetuxo-α·v 6:12(13) Thack. §17.2.

II. 14.ii. Verbs Terminating in osan Thack. §17.2; Mayser, I,2., pp. 83-84. 3x

eνεβάλοσαν· ενέβαλον 3:22
ενεβάλοσαν· ενέβαλον 3:46
*exηλθον· εξηλθοσαν 5 preface

II. 14.iii. The Temporal Augment Thack. §16.4-6; BDF §67, 69. 20x

*ex·ω·ρακα 2:3, 10, 27, 29, 31, 34, 41, 45
proset·e·-úxato 3:24  S. 3:25.
exω·ο·μολογείτο 3:25  S. 1:19; 6:12(13); 7:11; 12:7.
παρη-ε-νώχλησεν 3:50 παρηνό\'ω'χλήσαν 6:23(24) superscript by 1 corr.
*ε-η-υλόγουν 3:51
 фильουν φίλουν 4:8(11)
*ἐξε-η-ρήμωσας 4:19(22)
*ἀφίρηται: ἀφείρηται 4:28(31)
*ἀπο-ε-κατεστάθη 4:33(36) S. vs. 34b.
εὐω-ο-δώθη 8:12 S. 3.25.
*παρο-ο-ξυνθήσεται 11:10
συν(ε)τελεσθῇ 11:36 Incorrectly added ε on a subjunctive.

II.14.iv. Miscellaneous Verbs 33x

Below are listed minor variants in verbal forms primarily due to differences in person, tense, voice, and mood. 1:20; 2:11, 24, 31; 3:25; 10:7; 11:24 reflect orthographical differences.

*οἶεν: οἴη 2:11 Thack. §17.12.
Δύνασα 2:26 967=Th Hamm, I-II, p. 219.
*ἐ(ι)στήκει 2:31 Thack. §16.5
*τιμήθηςα: τιμήθεντα 2:45 Hamm, I-II, p. 267
προσεκύνησαν: προσκυνοῦσιν 3:12 967 influenced by Th. S. vs. 7.
εἰπα-ε-ν 3:25  S. the emendation in 6:5(6) and Zieg. for 6:13(14)
πονηροτάτο-η- 3:32
πληθ-η-ναι 3:36 Thack. §6.46.2.
εὐλογεῖτε-ω- 3:64 Cf. 3:74.
ἐφώτιζον: ἐφώτισαν 4:8(11)
*δήσουσιν: δήσωσιν 4:29(32) Future forms in context.
ἔπεγραψα-ε-ν 5 Preface
ἔσπευσ-δ-εν 5:6 967 harmonized to previous imperfect.
*ἐξήρταν: ἐξήρθη 5:30 Geissen, p. 159.
ἔστησε-α-(v) 6:10(11), 9:12
*συνίστα(ν)μεν 7:21 Thack. §23.3.
ἐδόκε-α- 7:27
III. Minuses, Pluses, Substitutions, Transpositions

1:1

1ωκ(ε)μ τῆς Ἰουδαίας 2,3,1

1:2

*ἀπενεγκεν· ἀπενέγκας  Hamm, I-II, p. 83.
*Βασιλείαν >καὶ  Depends on vb. vs. part. above.
*ἀπερείσατο >αὐτὰ  Hamm, I-II, p. 85; Blud., p. 54.

1:3

*ἀγαγεῖν > αὐτῷ  Hamm, I-II, p. 85.

1:4

*γραμματικοῦς > καὶ συνετοῦς  doub. Hamm, I-II, p. 87.
>ὁστε  A decision here is quite difficult. Hamm. (I-II, p. 87) suggests it is a hexaplaric addition to render the ἑ (see also1:12), but one would expect this more frequently. ὁστε is relatively infrequent in the LXX as a whole, but is found fairly frequently in the Maccabean books and sporadically in the remainder of the apocrypha. ὁστε is witnessed by all three major mss. in 2:35 and does not appear in Th at all.
There are no compelling reasons why ὁστε should have been chosen as an addition, and it does occur at least one other place in the book. Therefore, it is most probably OG.

*στῆναι· εἶναι =88-Syh, vs. cj. by Zieg., p. 93. S. 1:19.

1:5

*ἐκ· παρὰ
Although ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου in 88 sounds better (s. Hamm, I-II, p. 89), Syh preserves both readings and it is more likely that the awkward reading of 967 was fixed by harmonization with the preceding vs. in 88.

*ἡμέραν >καὶ Hamm, I-II, p. 89.

*καὶ [ἀπὸ] τοῦ οἴκου Hamm, I-II, p. 89.

*στήναι: στήσαι =88 vs. cj. by Katz, s. Zieg. pp., 93-94.

1:6
*ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν υἱῶν Ισραήλ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
  967 ἐκ τούτων ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας Hamm, I-II, p. 91.

1:7

1:8
*ἀλισγήθη· ἀλ(ε)ισθῇ 88-Syh=Th Munnich, "Origène," pp. 187-188, points out that OG stems from ἀλλίζω as a military metaphor and that Daniel did not want to be "recruited" into the king's service. See also CH 5.II. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 92.

1:9
*Δανιήλ +εἰς Hamm, I-II, p. 95.

1:10
*πόλιν >ὁμῶν Hamm, I-II, p. 97.


*νεανίας· νεανίσκους 1:10 See the analysis of 1:1-10 in CH 5. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 99 who prefers 88. His judgement presupposes the "freer" rendering is original. Here it is unwarranted, but the decision is difficult.

*ἀλλογενῶν >καὶ This variant is not noted or discussed by Hamm (see pp. 98-99), but does not seem to be a printing error.

1:11


1:12
*ὁσπρίων· σπορίμων Hamm, I-II, pp. 103, 105.
*τῆς γῆς Hamm, I-II, p. 105.


*κάπτειν ἔσθειειν Hamm, I-II, p.105; Mont. p. 37.

1:13

*διαστεραμένη διαφανής Hamm, I-II, p. 107.


1:15

*αὐτῶν >καλῇ Hamm, I-II, p. 111

1:16

ἡν Ἀβιεσδρν ἐδοκείμασεν err. Based on 1:11 we should emend to Σολομᾶρ(ος). Hamm, I-II, p. 113.

*ἀντεδίδου >αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν Hamm, I-II, pp. 113, 115.

1:17

σώνεσιν + φρονῆσεος (καί φρόνησιν 88-Syh) Hamm, I-II, p. 117.

>tékhnη

*Δανιήλ >ἐδοκε Hamm, I-II, p. 121.

*ὁρήματι =Tert. +καὶ ὀράματι 88-Syh. Zieg. cj. not verified by 967. One would expect the cj., but the evidence is too strong against. 88-Syh adds a later correction.

* cj. >καί ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Hamm, I-II, pp. 121, 123.

1:18


*[εἰσ]ήχθησαν S. previous.

*ἀπὸ ὑπὸ Hamm, I-II, p. 123.


1:19

*ἐστησαν ἥσαν =88-Syh, vs. Zieg. cj., p. 97.

1:20

(καί) κατέλαβεν Apodictic is untranslated. Hamm, I-II, p. 127; Charles, p. 8.

*cj. >σοφωτέρους Hamm, I-II, p. 129.

*ὑπὲρ τοὺς σοφιστὰς ὑπερφέροντας τῶν σοφιστῶν Hamm, I-II, p. 129.
καὶ >τοὺς Hamm, I-II, p. 131.

φιλοσόφους τοὺς φιλολόγων τῶν S. previous.

*βασιλεία >αὐτοῦ Blud. p. 54; Hamm, I-II, p. 133.


*ἀν-π-ἐδειξεν >αὐτοὺς σφοδρὰς παρὰ πάντας τοὺς αὐτοῦ Hamm, I-II, p. 137.

*ὑπὲρ γῆ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν doub. Hamm, I-II, p. 137.

*ὑπὲρ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ· τῇ ἐαυτοῦ βασιλ. Pre-positive attributive.

1:21
*βασιλείας Κύρου trans. Hamm, I-II, p. 139.
*>βασιλεάς Περσῶν S. previous.

2:1
*ἐτει τῷ δευτέρῳ δωδεκάτῳ ἔτη 1. 967 syntax correct, Hamm, I-II, p. 141. 2. The dating to the 12th year is probably based on a confusion from Judith 1:1, though it also fixes the chronological difficulties between chs. 1 and 2.24

*ἐνυπνιὼν· ὅπω Hamm, I-II, p. 145.
*>αὐτοῦ καὶ ὃ ὁποῖος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτοῦ doub. from Th. S. Hamm, I-II, p. 145. This is a good example of how great the Th influence on OG actually was. If not for the previous variant (ἐνυπνιὼν· ὅπω) it could easily have been concluded that 967 was missing this portion due to homiotel.

2:2
εἰσενεχθήναι· καλέσαι =Th Hamm, I-II, p. 147.

2:3
ἐπιγνώναι >οὖν θέλω Hamm, I-II, p. 149 regards 88-Syh as original, but the main reason he gives is because it represents a more dynamic translation. On the other hand, the words could have been added to smooth out the syntax. Perhaps it is best to bracket them to indicate that they are of doubtful authority, but s. the discussion in CH 5.III.

2:4
*πρὸς τὸν· ἐπὶ τοῦ Blud. p. 133; Hamm, I-II, p. 149.

24McCrytall, p. 275.
Kύριε βασιλεῦ trans.
*ἡμεῖς σου
*τὴν σύγκρισιν αὐτοῦ· αὐτό Hamm, I-II, p. 153.

2:5
*ἢ λόγος ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ ἀπέστη as original. S. CH 5.III.25

2:6
*σύγκρισιν κρίσιν 88=Th

2:7
*καί οί· οἵ δὲ 2:7 Hamm, I-II, p. 93.

2:8
*ὑπείρ =Th
*καθάπερ ἁφάραστε ὅτι ἀπέστη ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ τὸ πράγμα The text is very difficult here.
Hamm, I-II, pp. 163, 165 argues this is omitted by homoioare., but compare our
discussion of 2:1-10 in CH 5.III.
καθάπερ οὐν προστέτοια>σὺν θέσα

2:9
ἐὰν μὴ ἀπόδωτε μοι OG employs δηλώσ as a favourite equivalent for the ha. of Σύν (s.
*ἀπαγγείλητε μοι εἰς ἀληθείας S. Hamm, I-II, p. 167.
*σύγκρισιν κρίσιν S. 2:5.
*tὸ ὅραμα εἰπεῖτε 3,1,2 Zieg.'s cj. of ὅραμα correct.
*μοι Hamm, I-II, p. 169.

25Acjmenaeus, "ΟΤΙ," p. 123, also notes that "ὅτι is often corrected to ὅτι in the
later transmission of the text." S. 3:29(96) for another example of the correction.
*(εἴδον) τὴν νύκτα >έφρακα S. CH 5 on 2:1-10.
* >τότε Hamm, I-II, p. 171.

2:10
τῆς γῆς haplog.
*δ· & Hamm, I-II, p. 173.

*πασ] δυνάστης Hamm, I-II, p. 175.

*τοιοῦτο· τότο τό Hamm, I-II, p. 177, suggests 967 is an error, but s. the discussion of this variant in CH 5:III.

*ἐπερωτάτη· ἐρωτή Hamm, I-II, p. 177.

2:11
δν ζητεῖς βασιλεῦ· δν ζητεὶ ὁ βασιλεύς Hamm, I-II, p. 177.

*τότα >τῷ βασιλεuite Hamm, I-II, p. 181.

2:12

*στυγνός· σύννοις =Syh
*γενόμενος καὶ περὶλυπος: 2,3,1 =Syh
*σοφοῦς· σοφιστάς Hamm, I-II, p. 185.

2:13

2:14

*γνώμην· γνώσιν Hamm, I-II, p. 189.

>ἡν εἰχεν OG employs the verb more frequently by ratio than any book of the LXX (21x). It is more likely that 967 has omitted it by conformity to MT. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 191.

προσέταξεν προσετάγῃ. Appears also in 2:13; 3:26(93)δίς 5:2, 3, 5; 7:10. Each time it is rendered with a verb and in 3:26(93) OG uses the same verb for both occurrences (aor. of ἐξέρχομαι, also 5:5) while in 5:2, 3 it uses ἰνέχθη for both. προσέταξεν appears for ὥκ in 2:12 and assuming that OG uses the verb in 2:14 the

---

clauses in which they are used would be almost exactly the same even though the Vorlage is different. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 191.

2:15
*πρόσταγμα [πράγμα] Missing in ms. but not enough room for πρόσταγμα. Hamm, I-II, p. 193 suggests πράγμα (s. 6:12a), but given the variety of equivalents employed by OG in ch. 2 it is impossible to know (s. CH 5.III.).

2:16

2:17
ἀπελθὼν Δανιήλ: trans.
*(ἐ)αὐτοῦ +ὑπεδείξεν ἐκαστα Hamm, I-II, pp. 197, 199.
συνετε ἀι'ρος +αὐτοῦ
>ὑπεδείξε πάντα trans. to above

2:19
Z=88-Syh- τότε τ. Δαν. ἐν ὀράμ. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτὶ τὸ μυστ. τοῦ βασ. ἔξεφάνη
967- τότε τὸ μυστ. τοῦ βασ. τ. Δαν. ἐδηλώθη τῇ νυκτὶ ἐν ὀράμ. τὸ πράγμα ἔξεφάνη
* cj.- τότε τ. Δαν. τῇ νυκτὶ ἐν ὀράμ. τὸ πράγμα ἔξεφάνη

See Hamm, I-II, pages 201-203. This reconstruction is similar to his. There are differences in word order as well as doublets in 967 between ἐδηλώθη and ἔξεφάνη as well as between πράγμα and μυστήριον τοῦ βασιλ. The difference between my cj. and Hamm is in the evaluation of μυστήριον. Although μυστήριον is the expected equivalent for ΠΠΠΠΠ because it renders it 7/7 elsewhere,27 there would be no reasonable explanation for the origin of πράγμα unless it is OG.
[ἐκφωνήσας cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 203 who prefers 967 on the basis that it is more free.

2:20
εἰς τὸν αἰώνα: ἀπὸ αἰῶνος ἕως αἰῶνος =MT, Th Hamm, I-II, p. 205.

2:21

272:18; 27, 28, 29, 30, 47(2). In 4:6 OG=0. Th employs μυστήριον 9/9.
σοφοῖς σοφίαν trans.

2:22
(καὶ) ἀνακαλ.
σκοτεῖνα >καὶ =Th
*κατάλυσις: καταλύει

The Aramaic reads: דַּעְתָּר לִבֵּךְ גֶּדֶר.

Hamm, I-II, p. 209 suggests that we read καὶ τὸ φῶς παρ' αὐτῷ καταλύει.

However, this reading is based on the assumption that the original translator did understand the syntax of his Vorlage, i.e. there is no parallelism with the preceding clause. This is not evidenced in 967, 88-Syh, or Th which offers a general translation of דַּעְתָּר (Th=τὸ φῶς μετ' αὐτῷ ἐστί, contextual guess?). Cf. 3:92(25); 5:6, 12, 16 where the verb also occurs (only other use is Ezra 5:2) and Th translates correctly (omitting 5:16, homoiotel?), but only seems to have been part of the Vorlage of OG in 3:92(25). Therefore, the reading of 967 is probably original. 88-Syh represents a later attempt to strengthen the parallel between darkness and light by adding the article (which was not the meaning of the Vorlage), and makes καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ κατάλυσις into a nominal clause either in error or in harmony with the preceding phrases due to anacoluthon.

2:23
κύριε +θεέ doub. Hamm, I-II, p. 211.
*>μοι Hamm, I-II, p. 213.

2:24
>πάντας Hamm, I-II, p. 213.

2:25
*εἰσήγαγε(ν) τὸν Δαν. 2,3,1
κ. (οὗτος) εἶπεν 88-Syh=Th
ἐκ' ἀπὸ 88=Th S. 5:10.

2:26
ἀποκρ. >δὲ Hamm, I-II, p. 219.
*ἐπικαλ. >δὲ
*σύγκρισιν κρίσιν S. 2:5.
2:27
>τὸ μυστήριον Hamm, I-II, p. 221 is uncertain, but more likely omitted by err.

2:28
*θεός· κύριος Hamm, I-II, p. 117.
*ἀνακαλύπτων φωτίζων Hamm, I-II, p. 225.
*ὁς ἐδήλωσε· καὶ ἐδήλ. 88-Syh reads ἡ for Ἡ? Hamm, I-II, p. 227.

2:28-29
>τοῦτό ἐστι ... κλίνης σου homoiotel. A larger portion of these verses is missing from 88, so Zieg. had reproduced his text mainly from Syh.

2:29
*pάντα ἢ ὅσα Zieg.=Syh
*ἀ δεῖ γενέσθαι· ἢ μέλλει γίνεσθαι S. vss. 28, 45. OG uses variety.

2:30
*παρὰ· κατὰ S. equivalent translations in 1:5; 2:25; 7:2; 8:16, 22; 11:4, 40; 12:1.
μυστήριον +μοι Hamm, I-II, p. 233.
ἐξεφάνηθη· ἀπεκαλύφθη =Th Hamm, I-II, p. 233.

2:31
καὶ >ἡν S. vs. 32.

2:32
*κεφάλη >αὐτῆς Hamm, I-II, p.235.

2:33
σιδήρου(ν) 967=Th Hamm, I-II, p. 237.
*διστάκινον· διστάκου 88=Th S. previous.

2:34
*(καὶ) ἐδωράκας S. vss. 41, 43 where OG adds the conj.
*κατήλησεν· κατηλόσεν Hamm, I-II, pp. 237, 239.
2:35
'ex auton ev autoic Hamm, I-II, p. 243.
(eic) 4roic 88-Syh=Th

2:37
basileo >basilevhs haplog.
*sol +e dokven Hamm, I-II, p. 245.
>*tyn arxin kai doub.
>e dokven 88-Syh =MT

2:38
upo eic Hamm, I-II, p. 249.
>* kefalh 1,4,2

2:39
*anaqesthsat S. 2:31, 44; 3:3, 91(24); 7:16, 24(2).
*basil. +allh Cf. variant below. Hamm, I-II, pp. 251, 253 reads without allh in either, but it is unlikely to have been introduced incorrectly in both 967 and 88-Syh. Therefore, 967 is probably correct.
* cj>trit dou. S. Hamm, I-II, p. 253 who suggests 967 reads without numerals (s. 1:17).
*>allh etera S. above.

2:40
*>tetart
*>damiqon proizon Hamm, I-II, p. 257.

2:41
*ostarag(n)vou peromikov meros de ti sidhrouv: 6,3,4,5,1,2 OG follows the same order of elements (s. 2:27) regardless of the Vorlage. Cf. Hamm, I-II, pp. 259, 261. S. 2:33 for "earthenware" and "iron."
>*eosta +kai This variant and the following are omitted by homoiotel. in 88.
>*tis deis tis sidhrov: 1,4,2
>*anememigmenov (dima) synememigmenw err. mevon 88=Th Hamm, I-II, p. 263.
2:42
*καὶ οἱ δάκτυλοι ... ὀπτράκινον Hamm, I-II, p. 263.

2:43
*ἀναμεμειγμένων [ἄμα] παραμεμειγμένῳ err. μενον S. 2:41
>δὲ Hamm, I-II, p. 265.
σίδηρος +οὖ Later interpretive error?

2:45
*τὸ ὀπτρακόν τὸν σιδηρον: trans. and coordinate with καὶ The decision is difficult to make, but OG has the order σιδ.-ὀστ. in vss. 33, 34, 41, 43.
ἀφγυρον καὶ [τὸν] χρυσόν trans. the nouns=MT

2:46
Ναβ. ὁ βασιλεὺς: 2,3,1 S. 3:14; 6:16(17) The usual order in BA is name-title, while the common Greek order is title-name.28 Here MT has title-name. It is possible that 88-Syh reflects a Vorlage with the different order (Hamm, I-II, p. 273), but hardly necessary. OG probably follows the usual order, whereas 967 has been harmonized to MT.

χαμαι ἐπὶ πρόσωπον 88 reads both. Read Syh with Zieg.
προσεκύνησε(ν) τῷ Δαν. 2,3,1 Hamm, I-II, p. 275.
*ποιήσας: ἐπιτελέσαι 88-Syh has changed the unusual reading of OG.

2:47
>ὅμων θεὸς homoioarc.
θεῶν καὶ +κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ Scribal flourish?

2:48
dωρεᾶς +αὐτῷ

2:49
tῆς +βασιλείας doub.?

3:1

* > βασιλεύς S. 3:2; 6:1(2); 11:1, but here the text is part of an OG plus.
* > ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Hamm, III-IV, pp. 131, 133; cf. Jahn, p. 26; Char., p. 60.
* Ἀθιμον + καὶ Hamm, III-IV, pp. 133, 135.

εὖ δὲ δὲνκα Hamm, III-IV, p. 135 believes the reading leads to a better Vorlage because the proportions of the statue would be better, but for that reason it is probably a correction.²⁹ Perhaps it stems from the same corrector who transposed chs. 7-8 before ch. 5.

3:2
* γλώσσας > σατράπας στρατηγοῦς trans. after διωμητὸς and insert καὶ. Retain 88-Syh order, but include the conj. Hamm, III-IV, p. 143.

ἡν ἡς S. 3:5, 7, 14, 18; cf. 1:5, 8; 3:12, 15, 27; 4:28(31).
* ἔστησεν ἔστησεν 88-Syh harmonize to 3:1, 5, 7, 12, 14, 18.

3:3
* τὰτε συνῆχθησαν S. also 3:94(27); 6:23(24). Blud., p. 58; Mont., p. 201; Hamm, III-IV, p. 147.
* καὶ ἔστη, οἱ προγεγ. 3,4,1,2 = Syh

3:4
παραγγέλλεται ἀπαγγέλλω The secondary character of 967 is betrayed by the change in voice and number. S. also the discussion of ἀπ(γ)αγγέλλω in CH 5.III.1.iii.
* > καὶ χώρας doub. Blud., p. 49; Jahn, p. 29

3:5
* σύριγγος > καὶ Later harmonization to Th.
* σαμβύκη-ας > καὶ
* ψαλτηρίου + καὶ
* συμφωνίας > καὶ 88-Syh would understand συμφωνίας as individual instruments (with MT?), whereas 967 reads it as the music produced when the instruments are played together. Hamm, III-IV, pp. 155, 157 wants to eliminate συμφωνίας as a doub., which is possible but not necessary. S. CH 5.IV.

3:6
* > τὴν καυμένην S. 3:17, 21.

3:7

²⁹ Collins, Daniel, p. 181.
*τῆς φωνῆς S. 3:10, 15.
*κατέναντι τοῦτον Aram. is insertion. Jahn, p. 28; Hamm, III-IV, p. 173; Bentzen, p. 28.

3:10
*τῆς φωνῆς S. 3:7.
mουσικ. +γένους doubt.

3:11

3:13
*οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἡχοθησαν 3,1,2 Hamm, III-IV, pp. 191, 193.

3:14
Ναβ. ὁ βασιλ. 2,3,1 S. 2:46 and 6:16(17). MT has no title here. The same situation occurs in 3:95(28) and 4:30(33), and in those cases the order is name-title.
αὐτοῖς >διὰ τί 
Αβεδ. + ἐπ᾽ ἀληθεῖας

3:15
ἐτοίμως +ὁπως Hamm, III-IV, p. 201.
>τῇ χρυσῇ Harmonized with vs. 14.
ἡ ἢν S. 3:2.
>γε haplog.?
ποῖος· τίς 967=Th. Hamm, III-IV, p. 205.

3:16
*>ήμεῖς S. 2:8; 6:(21)20.
*>ἐπὶ τ. ἐπιτ. τ. ἀποκ. σοι 5,6,1,2,3,4 88-Syh = MT

3:17
οὐρανοῖς >εῖς S. 4:34c.

3:19
*>ἥλλοιωθη + ἐπ' αὐτοῦς S. 3:20, 23.
3:20
tóν Σεδ. Mt. Ἀβεδ.: τούς περὶ τόν Ἀζωρίαν The decision here is difficult. 967 has a
dynamic rendering which is also found in 3:23. However, there is good reason to
believe that 3:20-30(97) have been freely edited in order to accomodate the insertion of
the additions to the chapter. 967's reading emphasizes Ἀζωρία which ties it to the

3:21
*(ἐν)έβληθησαν OG prefers compounds.

3:23
>σῶν Hamm, III-IV, p. 235.
ἐξελθοῦσα· ἐκκαταῖσα Hamm, III-IV, p. 235 prefers 967 primarily because the vb.
occurs in the preceding vs., but for that reason it could be the result of harmonization.
See also the discussion of the compositional history of OG in CH 5.IV.2.

3:24
*προσεταξεν· ἐπέταξεν A decision is difficult since OG uses both compounds. See
Hamm, III-IV, p. 243.

3:25
στὰς δὲ καὶ στὰς

3:27
αἱ ὀδοῖ σου εὕθ. 4,1,2,3=Th Hamm, III-IV, p. 251.
ἀληθινοί· ἀλήθειαi Hamm, III-IV, p. 253.

3:28
πατέρων >ἡμῶν S. 3:32, 52; 9:6, 8, 16.
*πάντα τοῦτα: trans. S. 4:30(33); but 4:14a; 7:16; 12:7.

3:29
*δι' διότι Thack. §9.12; BDF §456.1. S. vss. 27, 28, 37, 40.

3:31
ἀληθιναί· ἀλῆθειαi S. 3:27
+καὶ

3:32
ἐχθίστων +καὶ Hamm, III-IV, p. 271.

3:34
σου τὴν διοθ. 2,3,1 = Th

3:35
*[διὰ] Ισαα(κ) ὍG tends not to repeat prep.
ἀγιόν· λαόν

3:36
*ἀγέγον +πολύ =88-Syh S. Hamm, III-IV, pp., 281-284.
*τὸ ὁφ. +τῷ πλήθει =88-Syh

3:38
*οὐδὲ ἡγούμενος· καὶ ἡγου. =Th The titles should be connected.

3:39
[συν]τετριμένη Simple form never in LXX, compound 11x. S. Ps. 50(51):19.

3:40
ὁλοκαυτώμασι· ὁλοκαυτώσει 3:40 967=Th S. vs. 38.
*καὶ >ώς ἐν Hamm, III-IV, p. 299.
ἡμῶν ἡ θυσία· θυσ. ἡμῶν = Th
>δισθέν σου
δισθέν > σου

3:41
*καρδία +ήμων =88-Syh

3:42
ήμων +ἐλεος Hamm, III-IV, p. 307.

3:43
>κύριε Hamm, III-IV, p. 309.
3:44
*ἀπὸ ὑπὸ S. 1:18

3:45
>εἰ Hamm, III-IV, p. 311.
*>ὁ θεός Hamm, III-IV, p. 313.

3:46
>μὲν
*>αὐτοῦς Hamm, III-IV, p. 321.
>ἠσαν
*ὑτοπίπτον καὶ πίσοσαν 3,2,1 Hamm, III-IV, p. 325, 327.

3:51
ἀναλαβ. ἰδί τότε =Th

3:52
ἀναμα +σου

3:53-54
967-εὐλογ. εἰ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς δόξης τῆς βασιλ. σου καὶ ὕπερμ. καὶ ὑπερέν. εἰς τ. αἰῶν

3:55
εὐλογητός εὐλογημένος=Th
>καὶ αἵμερος
δεδοξασμένος ὑπερψωμένος S. 3:26, 52, 54.

3:58
*>κυρίου S. 3:61, 84.

3:61
*>κυρίου 3:59, 84.


3:69
πάγοι καὶ ψύχος· πάγη κ. ψύχη Hamm, III-IV, p. 361.

3:70

3:78 + Vss. 62-63

3:81
tetragramma +καὶ τὰ κτήματα Conflation, Hamm, III-IV, p. 371.

3:88
*ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐλυτρώσατο ἡμᾶς 4,5,1,2,3 88-Syz=Th

3:90
*σεβόμενοι +τὸν κύριον =88-Syz Hamm, III-IV, p. 383, om. art. >ύμνειτε ηρ.

3:92(25)
*δρακθεὶς 88-Syz=Th

3:95(28)

3:96(29)
*φυλακῇ κ. >πάσαι OG tends to omit repeated elements. κύριον >τὸν Hamm, III-IV, p. 415
*οἰκία· οὐσία 88-Syz=MT Hamm, III-IV, p. 417.

4:9(12)
*ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 3,4,5,6,1,2 Hamm, III-IV, p. 437
*ἐνόσσα. +τὰς νοσσιας· ἐωτών Hamm, III-IV, p. 437.

4:8(11)
μεγάλη +καὶ Hamm, III-IV, p. 441.

4:10(13)
μου >καὶ S. καὶ οἶδα 4:7(10); 7:2, 13, 15.
*ἀπεστάλη ἐν ισχύ 2,3,1 Cf. Hamm, III-IV, p. 443.
4:11(14)  
*εἶπεν >αὐτῷ

4:14a  
παρεδόθη >καὶ Hamm, III-IV, p. 455.  
*πέδαις καὶ >ἐν

4:15(18)  
κρινόντων +αὐτῷ

4:16(19)  
*ἐθαύμασεν θαυμάσας 88 simplifies to finite verb. S. 1:2.  
*κατέσπευδεν αὐτόν· κατασπευθεῖς Same as above.

4:19(22)  
*καρδία +ἐν? S. Th 4:34(37); Sir. 48:18, 2 Macc. 1:28; 3 Macc.2:17.  
*δύνατον υψώθη Hamm, III-IV, p. 464.

4:20(23)  
*τὸ δένδρον καὶ ἐκκόψαι· 3,4,1,2 88-Syh = MT

4:26(29)  
*μήνας δώδεκα· trans.

4:27(30)  
*καὶ οἶκ. βασιλ. μου ἐν ἑσ. κρατ. μου· 5,6,7,8,1,2,3,4 88-Syh = MT  
>εἰς τιμήν τῆς δόξης μου Hamm, III-IV, pp. 477, 479. Bracket.

4:28(31)  
συντελεῖα· - =88-Syh, vs. cj. by Zieg. but cj. probably correct.

4:29(32)  
*τὴν βασιλ. (τ. βασιλείας) >σοῦ

4:30(33)  
*πάντων τούτων· trans. =Syh
έπεδήθην· ἐδόθην Hamm, III-IV, p. 493.


4:33(36)

ἐκείνῳ τῷ καυρῷ· ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρῃ S. 3:7, 8. (καυρός for ἱερον) Cf. Hamm, III-IV, p. 501, who looks to 12:1; but 3:7, 8 are the obvious parallels.

4:34(37)

*βασιλεύς· κύριος S. 2:47. Hamm, III-IV, p. 505.

4:34a

λαός μου +καὶ

χώραι >μου
eἰς >τὸν θεὸν τοῦ err.

*καταλημ. λαλ. τι· λαλήσωσιν Hamm, III-IV, p. 513.

4:34b

*γλώσσαις >πάσαις Hamm, III-IV, pp. 517, 519.

*χώραις >ἐν =88

4:34c

βασιλείον αὐτοῦ >βασιλείον err.

Daniel 5 Preface

*θεοῦς >τῶν θεῶν

*τότῳ · πότῳ = cj. by Segaar, s. Zieg., p. 148.


5:6

*ἡλλοιώθη >καὶ φόβοι The evaluation of this variant depends on several factors. If 967 is correct, then the OG may render ἤλθεν ὁ βασιλεὺς similar to 4:16(19), where it also appears. καὶ φόβοι or its Vorlage might then be a later harmonization to 4:16(19) where it could be argued that καὶ φοβηθεῖς τρόμοι λαβόντος αὐτῶν is a later correction. The same two terms are collocated in 5:10 (omitted/different Vorlage?) and 7:28 (dynamic rendering or contextual guess?) This view is supported in 2:29, 30 where the translator has clearly guessed at the meaning of ἠλθεν. συνεταξότατοι +αὐτοῦ S. Geissen, p. 56.
καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ Ἑκατάτους καὶ homoiotel.

*γραφής καὶ εἶδεν εἰς τ. γραφ. κ. τ. σύγκ. τ. γραφ homoiotel. according to Geissen, p. 147, but it is probably a later expansion. Without this addition the reading is still longer than MT, and we should not be overly biased in accepting great differences between OG and MT because that is what we have in chs. 4-6. Remember that 967 proves itself considerably shorter than 88-Syh elsewhere. The καὶ is probably original while the remainder is composed of doublets from 5:7-8.

*πᾶς ἢ 88-Syh=MT

5:13
*εἰς ἡμέρης εἰςηνέχθη 88-Syh=Th

5:29
βασιλεὺς + Βαλτασαρ

5:30
βασιλεῶν + αὐτοῦ Geissen, p. 56.

5:31(6:1)
*’Αρταγζέρης S. 9:1.
*Mήδων + βασιλεὺς S. Syh mg

6:5(6)
οὐκ ἔξαγαγεν οὐ καταξίωσεν S. 6:7, 12.

6:10(11)
*ἔποιει + ἐτ = Syh Improbable addition.

6:12(13)
οὗτοι αἱ ἀνθ. 2,3,1 =MT
*οὐχ ὁύχ Geissen, p. 171.

6:14(15)
αὐτοὶ αὐτῶν
+ ὁ βασιλεὺς
*ἐφοβήθης ἐμφανεῖ 88-Syh, vs. cj. by Katz, s. Zieg., p. 161.
+ ἐως
6:16(17)
Δαρείος ὁ βασιλ. 2,3,1 S. 2:46 and 3:14. Here MT has no name, but the usual order is to be preferred.

6:21(22)
tότε· τόν

6:22(23)
*θέος· κύριος
>αὐτόῦ καὶ ἑναντίον homoioiot.

6:25(26)
+καὶ Δανιηλ κατεστάθη ἐπὶ πασῆς τῆς βασιλ. Δαρείου Misplaced from 6:28. It is probably best explained as an addition that accompanies the change in the order of the chapters in 967, and so its position was not fixed.30

6:26(27)
μένων καὶ ζῶν: trans.

6:27(28)
>τοῦ Δανιηλ homoioiot.

6:28(29)
*tο γένος· τους πατερας =Syhmg S. Geissen, p. 191.
αὐτοῦ >καὶ Δαν. . . βασιλ. Δαρείου S. 6:25.

7:7
καταπατοῦν +καὶ =MT, Th

7:8
>καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐν κ. . . κέρασιν αὐτοῦ homoioiot.
*τ. κερ. τ. πρώτων: 1,4,2

---

30Munnich, "Origène," pp. 209-210 suggests that this text has the obelisk in 6:28 because Origen "recourt, pour placer les signes critiques, à un modèle grec identique à 967."
7:12
χρόνου καὶ καροδ: trans. =Iust. Both ἡμι and ἡμί are translated by καροδ, but the latter is never rendered by χρόνος elsewhere (2:8, 9, 7:25[3x]; and particularly 2:12) while the former is in 2:16, 21.

7:13
*ὁς νίς ἄνθρ. ἥρχετο 4,1,2,3
αυτόν: αυτῷ S. above.

7:14

7:19

7:20
ἐνὸς τοῦ (+διλου τοῦ 88-Syh) +λαλούντος καὶ 967 The addition of 88-Syh is regarded by Zieg., p. 172 as a gloss, and 967 is then explained by Jeans., p. 86 as an err. on the gloss.
τρία: τρεῖς Geissen, p. 115.

7:25
ἐως >καροδ καὶ homoiotel.
>ἐως = Iust., Dial.32:3, Th S. Roca-Puig, p. 22.
*ἡμίςους: ἡμίςου =Th

7:26
>καθίσεται homoioarc.

7:27
τ. βασιλ. καὶ τ. ἔξον. trans.
αὐτῶν: παντῶν

8:5
>καὶ σῶ ἤπετε τῆς γῆς homoiotel.
*αὐτοῦ 88-Syh = MT.
8:6
*πρὸς· ἐν
πρὸς· ἐπι 967 may have read τὴν. S. Jeans., p. 52.

8:7
*ἴσχυς ἐν τῷ κρίῳ 2,3,4,1
ἐπάραξεν· ἔρραξεν ἐπιστρ. is (1-4), while ἐρρ. (2-8) is also in 8:10, 11 (8:11=Th).

8:13
*ἑτερος >τῷ φελμονι τῷ λαλοῦντι 88-Syh=MT, Th ἐρημώσεως· ἐρημωθήσεται S. Geissen, p. 51.

8:14
καθα· ἐ-ρι·-ε·-[σ]ήσεται Contrary to Geissen, p. 129, 967 probably does reflect a variant reading from καθωρεύω whereas 88=Th.

9:1
οἱ· ὅσοι

9:2
*ταῖς βιβλιοι· τοῖς βιβλίοις OG employs both forms (s. 7:10; 12:1), so read with 967 as the better witness.
*ἐτῶν· ἡμερῶν S. Geissen, p. 191.
*τῇ γῇ κυρίου S. Mont., p. 361.

9:3
κ. σάκκω κ. σποδω· κ. ἐν σπω. κ. σάκ. 967's order is against MT, but it is also an unusual order. The prep. was a later add.

9:4
ἴδοι κύριε trans.
+ό κύριος

9:5
*ἡδικήσαμεν ἡσεβήσαμεν: trans. A decision is impossible. Both Greek words are HL in OG. [τὴν] is a HL in Daniel. [האר] as a vb. is 4x (9:15; 11:32; 12:10) and as an adj. 2x (12:10). 967 by default.
*ἀπέστημεν κ. παρέβημεν trans. ἀφίστημι is one of OG’s favourite words (12x)\(^{31}\) and is used to translate both [ 위하여] (9:9) and ῥόρ (9:11; 11:31; 12:11) in the only other places where they occur. παρεβαίνω is a HL in the book, so as in the above there is no way to decide. 967 by default.

+καὶ παρέβημεν

9:6
*βασιλεῖς > ἡμῖν 88-Syh =MT, Th

9:7
*Iουδα >καὶ

9:11
«ἐν»γεγραμένος Compound not found in LXX.

9:12
*ἐπεγ. > ἐφ ἡμᾶς OG omits as unnecessary.

9:13
κακά +καὶ
[ἐξε]ζητήσαμεν 967 harmon. to more common simple form. HL in Dan OG.

9:14
*>ἡμῶν
πᾶν[τα] ὡ[σα] ὡς is quite common in OG (11x).

9:16
θυμὸς σου +ἀφ’ ἡμῶν Add. vs. MT, Th. Not from Vorlage, s. Geissen, p. 205, but a later addition for clarification.
*ἀγ’ω >σου
>καὶ ἐν τ. ἀγν. τ. πατ. ἡμῶν homoiotel.

9:17
δέσποτα +κύριε doubt.
*ο’μ’ου >καὶ S. Geissen, p. 207.

\(^{31}\)See CH 4.Π.2.
9:18

[ἐπ]άκουσόν

>μου  Add. vs. MT, Th.

*κύριε ἠλέησον ἐπάκουσον τοῦ λαοῦ σου δέσποτα  Geissen, p. 209. Presumably, this was omitted from 88-Syh through homoiotet.

+kύριε doub. to δέσποτα

9:19


9:20 Very poor shape in 967.

>μου καὶ τὰς διαφανίας homoiotet.

9:21

λαούντος «ἐμοῦ trans. 967=MT, Th. S. 10:12.

9:24

*ἐξεδομάδες ἐκρίθησαν

*ἐλαόν σου ἐκρίθησαν

πόλεν +σου =MT

9:25

+ἡ Beginning of vs.

*ἀποκριθηναὶ διανοηθηναὶ =SyrMB. Has 967 harmonized to earlier appearance of διανοηθησαί or does 88-Syh betray Th influence? Th influence is fairly extensive in 967 and in OG as well. Finally, OG probably read בֵּשָׁר (s. also 11:24, 25).

9:26 Very poor shape in 967

*μετὰ +τὰς


*βασιλεία βασιλεύς There is no Vorlage, but a king of the nations makes better sense. «διαφθείρετ; Only the last two letters are visible, but there is room on the line for add. letters. S. Geissen, p. 215.

9:27

*ἡ διαθ. εἰς πολλὰ 3,4,1,2 88-Syh=MT, Th

*μετὰ +ἐτῶν
10:1

*ένιαυτῷ ἐτει S. Giessen, p. 50.
*εὐδοκηθῇ ἔδοθη εὐδοκηθῇ would be a HL in OG (never in Th) and would render the meaning. However, the choice would not conform to OG's TT. In six other occurrences of πὴρ ΟG employs ἐκφαινω or ἀνακαλύπτω (2:19, 22, 28, 29, 30, 47). Also OG uses compounds of δεικνύω in 17 other places.32 Therefore, if OG were going to employ δεικνύω, it would more likely appear in the compound ὑποδεικνύω. 967 has the OG which employed a favourite vb. (over 40x). to render the meaning of the Vorlage (s. analysis of 1:1-10 in CH 5.II.). This was later revised closer to MT by the changing of a few letters, on the assumption of scribal error. Presumably, OG employed the more general term as an adequate equivalent.

10:2

*ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις; 3,1,2 88-Syh=MT
*τρεῖς ἐβδομάδας S. 10:3, below.

10:3

*ἀρτον· ἄρτων OG makes MT explicit.
*κρέας >καὶ
*τοῦ συντελ. με ἡ γω? συντελέσω 88-Syh=MT
*τρεῖς Only the vb. συντελέσω is complete on this li. of the ms. and the next line begins δας, which is the ending of ἐβδομάδας. The problem is that the ms. averages around 18-20 letters per line. Geissen's reconstruction following Syh-88, which reads τρεῖς would require space for 23 letters (συντελέσω τας τρεις ἐβδομακα). Of the approximately 25 (out of 44) lines completely or almost completely preserved on this leaf, there are only 2 with as many as 22 letters (s. Geissen, pp. 222, 224, 226). Only 2 others have 21, and there is only one li. following this one with as many as 20 letters. Most have 18 or fewer. Therefore, we suggest that τρεῖς is omitted in 967 and is OG.

10:4 Almost completely missing.

10:5
[εἰδόν This is Geissen's reconstruction. However, the previous li. of the ms. would read πρα [τ]ους οφθαλμους μου και and τον begins the next line. Geissen's reconstruction following Syh-88 means the previous line would have 22 letters (S. 10:3). Furthermore, it is not characteristic of 967 to omit the ε for εἰδόν. Therefore, we suggest that either μου or και was omitted in the previous line, and that the ε was present at the end. That would bring the total number of letters on the line to 20.

*cj. >μου OG often omits suf.
*βουσίνω (2nd): χρυσίων 88-Syh harmon. to earlier.

10:6

10:7
>ούκ Om. to give reason for the fear.
*ἐπ' αὐτούς· αὐτοῖς 88-Syh=Th, MT

10:8
*και ἐγὼ· κάγω Crasis. Thack. §9.11.
*οὐκ ἐ<γ>κατελείφθη: οὐ κατελείφθη ἐπεστράφη· ἀποστραφέν S. 10:16.

10:9
*>άς cj. from Schleusner, s. Zieg., p. 195. 88-Syh have οὐκ. μου +και S. Geissen, p. 231.

10:10
χεῖρ[α] 967=88-Syh vs. cj. by Katz, s. Zieg., p. 195. Uncertain, but there is room for the ms. to read with 88-Syh. S. Geissen, pp. 230-231.

10:12
(ἐ)με S. 9:21.
Like Th (15/15), OG (8/10, 5x OG=0) usually employs καρδία (s. also 11:27) as a SE for בָּבֶל, בָּל. 967 offers the better rendering here.

καὶ ταπεινωθῆναι homoiotel.
κυρίον τ. θεοῦ: 2,1,3

*cj. >τοῦ θεοῦ OG prefers κόριος. τοῦ θεοῦ is a later add.
*σου +καί Add. vs. MT, Th Cf. Geissen, p. 233.

>κ. ἐγὼ εἰσήλ. ἐν τ. ῥήμ. σου homoiotel.

10:13
στρατηγὸς· στ...ος? Not enough room, perhaps στράτος? Geissen, p. 233.

ήμεραν >καί
>Μιχαήλ

πρότατον +η Introduces the gloss, below
+εἰς τῶν ἅγιων ἅγγελων.

10:14
(δ)τι

ὅρασις· ὀρα =88-Syh, vs. cj. by Mont. and Ralfs, s. Zieg., p. 196. Shows the antiquity of the reading. However, like 10:5, it is difficult to accept as original and can be explained as a later corruption.

10:15
>*κατὰ =88-Syh, vs. Zieg.'s cj., p. 196.

10:16
κυρίε + καί =88-Syh Om. is cj. by Katz, s. Zieg., p. 197. 967 is uncertain, but there is room for about 9-10 letters following μου. The last letter is o because the following li. reads πασις. κε would allow for 6-7 letters, so καί is probably present in 967.

10:17 Almost missing.
*ἐστι· ἐστιν? =88-Syh, uncertain in 967 but, based on 1:4, 5, vs. Zieg. cj.

10:18 Most is missing.

10:19

ὑγίαινε +καί S. Geissen, p. 62.
*λαλῇ. αὐτ. μετ' ἐμοῦ: 2,3,4,1 S. 10:15.
10:21
μάλα +καὶ
ὑποδείξω δείξαι leg. e Later error based on misunderstanding of the person. OG prefers the compound (12x). S. 10:1.

*ξι >η S. Hamm, II-IV, p. 413.

+cj. >δ ἀγγελος Either this reading or the following + is OG. In favour of ἀγγελος is the similar use in 12:1. However, στρατηγος renders ὅσο in this chapter (10:13, 20[2]; cf. once in 10:13, but it may be Th. Also employed in 3:2), so ὁ στρατηγος ὁ δυνατος has a strong claim to being original, whereas ὁ ἀγγελος ὁ ἐστως ἐπι των υιων του λαοῦ is a harmonizing addition from 12:1.33 ὁ ἀγγελος was placed first because of 12:1 and the explanatory nature of the two other titles. The hexaplaric text resulted from later harmonization to MT.

+στρατηγος ὁ δυνατος This reading has a strong claim as OG, but should perhaps be bracketed in order to indicate that there is some doubt.

11:1
*>καὶ S. 3:1; 4:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1; cf. 2:1.

11:2 Most is missing.

>παντὶ βασιλεί ἐλλήνων κ. στησεται homoiot.

11:3 Most is missing.

11:4
tou ouroanou της γης S. 7:2; 8:8.

11:5
*βασιλεύς βασιλειαν =88-Syh vs. cj. by Katz. S. Zieg., p. 199.

11:6
eis(e)xelwsetai Conflation. OG uses both prep. in compounds, but not together.

33Cf. P. David, pp. 254-255, who argues that 967 represents an alternative Vorlage and forms an inclusio with 12:1. It is more likely that the similarity prompted the addition, and the parallel remains regardless.
ιαχύν +καὶ ὁ βραχίων αὐτοῦ οὗ συστήσει ιαχύν  corresp. of previous added fr. mg

11:7

εὐστόν. Only one is extant.


11:10

ἐπὶ ἑς ὁσιου στρέψει Geissen, p. 251.

11:11


Ἀγάπητου > καὶ πολεμήσει

11:13

οὕτην +ἡ Introduces ἐπ᾽ οὕτην (which Zieg., p. 201, has in brackets) as a variant to the previous εἰς οὕτην. S. 10:13.

*εἰ. > ἐπ᾽ οὕτην doubt.

11:15

>οὐ = 88-Syh, vs. Mont., p. 440, s. Zieg., p. 202, but the cj. is no doubt correct.

11:17

οὕτη-δὲ Difficult to know.


11:18

ὄρκυν· ὥκῳ err.? S. Geissen, p. 255, Bevan, pp. 184-185.

11:23

ὁλυσσάμην· ὄλυσα τῷ S. Th.

11:24

μάθην· ἀμαρτίαν S. Geissen, p. 257.

11:25

Ἀγάπητου > ἐν ὦχλῳ πολλῷ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγάπητου homoiotel.


Geissen, p. 259, suggests the add. is a corruption from παροργισθήσεται (s. 11:11) which was a variant to ἐρεθ.

οχλῳ +πολλῷ καὶ  From the portion om. by homoiotel.

11:29
ἐσχάται +καὶ ἐλεύσεται  Add. from earlier?

11:35
ἐκ· ἐν
συνιέντων· συνείτων  Change here by err. led to change of prep. above.

11:36
*>καὶ  at beginning. Om. vs. MT, Th
συν(e)τελεσθῆ >ἡ  haplog.

11:37
>καὶ ἐν . . . προνοηθῆ  homoiotel.? There are obvious textual problems for vss. 37-42, so it is difficult to judge these omissions and the plus.
>ὁτι  Due to previous om.
ὑπωθήσεται +καὶ θυμωθησεται? ἐπ' αὐτοῦς?

11:40
καὶ ἐν ἱπποῖς πολλοῖς: >καὶ ἐν πλοίοις πολλοῖς  homoiotel? 967 begins here so it is difficult to judge the variants.

11:41 om. in 967, homoiarc.?

11:45
*τῆν +τιμῆν  Difficult to explain why it would be there, but equally as difficult to explain why it would be added. If original, it would easily have been omitted later.

12:3
κατίσχ(υ)οντες  =88-Syh, vs. cj. by Katz, s. Zieg., p. 210, but cj. probably correct.

12:6
τῷ ἐπάνω· ὦ ὁ κύριε  Later interpolation.
μοι +ποιήσεις (ποιήσεις)  Dependent upon previous.
12:8
*τίνες τί Syh (88=τίνος by error) exhibits correction for grammatical agreement.

12:9
κατακεκαλυμμένα >καὶ ἐσφραγισμένα homoiotel.

12:10
>καὶ οὐ μὴ διανοηθῶσι πάντες οἱ ἁμαρτώλοι homoiotel.

12:12
*καὶ ἕτετο 88-Syh=MT
συνάφει-ξάτο =88-Syh vs. ej., s. Zieg., p. 213. The reading is not impossible but it is more likely the result of a later orthographical err.
*>εἰς 88-Syh=MT.

12:13
*ἀναπαύοντι ἀπόφθε -88-Syh harmon. to following vb. and/or Th influence.

IV. Summary

In Section II there are 668 variants. The statistics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographical</th>
<th>548 (168 accepted as original)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>62 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minuses</td>
<td>38 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluses</td>
<td>20 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>668 (227)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Section III there are 501 variants. The statistics are as follows:

| Substitutions  | 182 (98)                      |
| Minuses        | 172 (90)                      |
| Pluses         | 89 (31)                       |
| Transpositions | 60 (37)                       |
| Total          | 502 (256)                     |

The totals for the variants are then:

<p>| Orthographical | 548 (168) |
| Substitutions  | 244 (128) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minuses</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>(112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluses</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transpositions</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>(483)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, if we discount the orthographical variants, then just about half (311/622)\(^{34}\) of the other readings have been accepted as OG. The substitutions and minuses are the most significant types of variant readings in 967 for the reconstruction of OG\(^{35}\), though there are a few important pluses as well.\(^{36}\) There are two other conclusions that are worthy of note. First, there are a number of occasions where the Syh or its marginal reading agrees with 967 against 88 in giving the original reading.\(^{37}\) This confirms the accuracy and the reliability of Syh.\(^{38}\) Second, on the one hand, the original readings of 967 demonstrate the amount of Th/MT influence on 88-Syh,\(^{39}\) while on the other, 967 also betrays significant corruption from Th and correction toward MT.\(^{40}\)

On the basis of this evaluation we are in a better position to analyze the TT of OG as well as the relationship between OG and Th in CH 5. However, prior to that evaluation it is necessary in CH 3 and 4 to establish the methodology that will be employed for the analysis of TT.

---

\(^{34}\)Three additional readings have been accepted as original that are purely conjectural: 1:17, 20; 10:21.

\(^{35}\)For example, see the important readings in 1:8, 13(2), 20(3!); 2:1, 8, 28, 29(2); 4:16(19); 9:2; 10:12; 12:13.

\(^{36}\)3:3; 9:18; 10:21?.

\(^{37}\)2:12(2), 44; 3:3, 21, 95(28); 4:30(33); 5:31(6:1); 6:10(11), 28(29); 9:25.

\(^{38}\)See also, Zieg., p. 13.

\(^{39}\)For example, 1:8, 2:10?, 25, 29, 35, 40, 41, 43; 3:2, 7, 10; 4:20(23); 5:7, 13; 8:14; 9:6, 27; 10:2; 12:3, 12.

\(^{40}\)For example, 2:2, 8(2), 11, 20, 33, 45; 3:27, 34, 51; 6:12(13); 7:7; 9:24; 12:12.
Chapter 3

**TT and the Focus on Literalism**

The purpose of this chapter is to examine critically those studies that have focused on literalism as the means to describe TT. In order to make the criticisms more intelligible there is an introductory section on defining a literal approach, followed by a section explicating the criteria for literalism.

I. Defining a Literal Approach

Scholars generally use the term literal to refer to a translation which mechanically reproduces each and every element of the source text while following the same word order and employing lexical equivalents consistently (stereotyping). Clarity to the definition of the term is given by Galen Marquis who defines a perfectly literal translation as one in which "it would be possible to retranslate from the Greek the original Hebrew [and Aramaic, presumably] words of the source." In the traditional sense used in this discussion, then, literal is an adjective that describes a translation exhibiting **formal equivalence** to the source text from which it was translated. According to Eugene Nida, a translation that exhibits formal equivalence "is basically source-oriented; that is, it is designed to reveal as much as possible of the form and content of

---

1. After this chapter was written certain works came to the attention of this writer that express some of the same criticisms of literalism. The principle articles are A. Aeijmelaeus, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator," in **VII Congress of the IOSCS**, SCS, 31, ed. C. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 23-36; I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Zurück zur Hebraismenfrage," in **Studien zur Septuaginta - Robert Hanhart zu Ehren**, MSU, 20, ed. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J. Wevers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 35-51. At the same time, the influence of these scholars' earlier works on the formulation of this writer's thoughts can hardly be denied.

the original message."3 This sense of literal is to be distinguished from that which would understand literal to mean a translation that has successfully transferred the meaning and intention of the source text into the target language.4 This latter type of translation is commonly described as one which exhibits dynamic equivalence. Nida describes a dynamic equivalent translation as one in which:

...the focus of attention is directed not so much toward the source message, as toward the receptor response. A dynamic-equivalence (or D-E) translation may be described as one concerning which a bilingual and bicultural person can justifiably say, "That is just the way we would say it." It is important to realize, however, that a D-E translation ... is a translation, and as such, must clearly reflect the meaning and intent of the source.3

As Nida emphasizes, even if a translator uses the method of dynamic equivalence in his/her translation, the translation is intended to render the meaning of the parent text. The translator is just not so concerned to have a one-to-one, word-for-word relation between the Vorlage and the target language (see CH 4.11.4.). We should also note that the description of a translation in the LXX as "literal" or "free" is only a general characterization. As Barr has already pointed out, the study of TT "has to concern itself much of the time with variations within a basically literal approach."6 Likewise, a generally literal translation will often exhibit good idiomatic renderings.7

---

3E. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964), p. 165. In the words of S.P. Brock, a literal translation "acts, as it were, as Aristotle's unmoved mover, and the psychological effect is to bring the reader to the original." See S. P. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies, 20 (1979): 73.

4B.G. Wright also makes this distinction in "Quantitative Representation," p. 312.

5Nida, Science, p. 166. Nida's discussion of formal vs. dynamic equivalence (pp. 22-26; 166-176) is set within the context of the approach to contemporary translation work, but it is well worth reading.


7It is for this reason that Soisalon-Soininen prefers to distinguish between "slavish" (literal) renditions and "idiomatic" (free) ones. See, "Hebraismenfrage," pp. 37-38.
A good example of the difference between formal and dynamic equivalence is provided by the opening adverbial phrase in Dan. 1:1:

**Th** = Ἐν ἐτεὶ τρίτῳ τῆς βασιλείας Ἰωακίμ βασιλέως Ἰουδαία

**MT** = מִן חֲלֹא שָלוֹשׁ לַעֲלֹמֶה יְהוָה וְלֵךְ מָלֵךְ יְהוָה

**OG** = Ἐνι βασιλέως Ἰωακίμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἔτος τρίτον

Th adheres to the word order of the Hebrew exactly and, with one exception, renders every morphological element as well. The one morphological change occurs with the translation of לֶונֶב. לֶונֶב consists of three morphemes: ל is an inseparable preposition (bound morpheme) that specifies the particular third year, i.e. of Jehoiakim’s reign. מ is the stem (free morpheme) meaning kingdom/reign. Finally, לֶונֶב is also in the construct state with the attributive genitive כַּנָּה, and the relation in this instance is marked by a zero morpheme. In this example, the ל and the construct both serve to specify the particular reign to which is being referred; so the Greek genitive is sufficient to signal the same relationship. It would have been unnatural Greek to have added another element because of the word order in any case. In contrast to Th, the OG rearranges the word order of the Hebrew and this enables the translator to omit βασιλείας as redundant. However, despite the fairly substantial difference between the two translations, both render the meaning of the Vorlage.⁸

Since literalism focuses on those aspects of the translation that mirror the formal aspects of the source text, a literal translation is viewed very positively and as more trustworthy than freedom in translation. Dynamic equivalent translations are viewed more suspiciously than literal ones because freedom in translation is frequently, but incorrectly, associated with the notion that the translator took liberties with the source text. This will become

---

⁸ The above example is quite typical of what we will encounter when comparing the translations of OG and Th. Th uses a method of formal equivalence but makes minor adjustments in the translation in order not to commit grievous grammatical errors. OG writes more in keeping with Greek idiom. However, our example is atypical in the sense that OG does not depart from the style of the Vorlage nearly so often as it could. Although we prefer the use of the designations formal vs. dynamic equivalence in this discussion, we will continue to use literal vs. free for stylistic variation.
apparent in our analysis in CH 5.\textsuperscript{9}

It must be admitted, however, that the analysis of what is meant by a literal or free translation takes literalism as the more natural starting point because the majority of the LXX books are "more or less" literal.\textsuperscript{10} The basically literal approach of the translators means that we can see that the LXX follows its Vorlage so closely that it can be loosely characterized as Hebrew written in Greek characters. Therefore, studies focusing on formal equivalence are helpful if for no other reason than the fact that they reveal the degree to which the different translators followed their Vorlage. With the advent of computers and the CATSS data base the process of examining the features of literalism has been greatly simplified, and we can even express statistically the degree of literalness/formal equivalence in specific features of the individual translations.\textsuperscript{11}

II. The Criteria for Literalism

In \emph{TCU}, Tov proposes five criteria for literalness in a translation: consistent representation of terms in translation ("stereotyping"), segmentation and representation of the constituent elements of the Hebrew words, word order, quantitative representation, and availability and adequacy of lexical choices.\textsuperscript{12} All of the aforementioned criteria save the last are capable of being measured relative to how consistently they formally reproduce the elements in the source text as the primary means of determining the literalness of a translation.\textsuperscript{13} The primary tool that facilitates the analysis of the formal features of the LXX is the CATSS database. Indeed, the focus on formal criteria for analysing TT has been greatly influenced

\textsuperscript{9}See also the review of McCrystall beginning p. 26, above.


\textsuperscript{11}See the recent volume by B.G. Wright for a classification of books in the LXX according to four criteria for literalism, \emph{Difference}, pp. 19-118.

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{TCU}, pp. 54-60.

\textsuperscript{13}Wright, \emph{Difference}, pp. 27, 30-31.
in the work of Wright and Marquis by the actual format of the CATSS database, because the parallel alignment file presupposes a formal relationship between the OG and MT.14

In order to understand the criteria for literalism and the criticisms that we will make of the methodology it is useful to provide a brief overview of how these criteria are generally defined. Stereotyping15 describes the tendency of translators to use consistently the same Greek term to render a term in the HA,16 though there is some disagreement regarding the degree to which the Greek term must be employed as an equivalent in order to qualify as a "stereotyped" rendition (SE). Sollamo suggests that if a term is used to render the same word in 50% of its occurrences in a book, then it should be considered a SE.17 Marquis, on the other hand, regards any term rendered more than once by the same Greek word as a consistent translation.18 Marquis' use of terminology robs the use of "consistent" of any meaning, and even Sollamo's arbitrary choice of 50% does not seem quite high enough. Wright chooses 75% which seems more reasonable,19 though statistics are always relative. The fact that one word is employed in three of the four places where the same

---

14 See the Introduction, fn. 35. Such an alignment is understandable and useful for comparing the texts, but it leads, as we later argue, to an inappropriate methodology for the study of TT.

15 The term was first coined by M. Flashar in "Exegetische Studien zum LXX-Psalter," ZAW 32 (1912): 105. Other terminology employed has been "verbal linkage" by Rabin and "systematic representation" by Rife. See C. Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," Textus 6 (1968): 8; J.M. Rife, "The Mechanics of Translation Greek," JBL 52 (1933): 244-252.

16 TCU, p. 54.

17 Sollamo, Semiprepositions, p. 13.


19 Wright, Difference, p. 105. Since Wright attempts to reconstruct the Hebrew from the Greek he also starts from the Greek usage rather than the Hebrew (p. 92). This leads to its own set of problems. For example, when he counts how many times a Greek term renders a given Hebrew word he fails to take into account the fact that the one Greek term may be used as the equivalent for more than one Hebrew term.
Hebrew term is should be regarded differently than a word that is used 30 times out of 40.

There is no doubt that translators often chose to translate a word in the Vorlage with the same Greek word. Rabin suggests that a stimulus-response reaction took place as the translators would tend to render words or phrases with the words they used first.\textsuperscript{20} Tov has also demonstrated that the later translators consulted the Pentateuch as an aid to their work.\textsuperscript{21} At the same time, we must be cautious about the significance of statistics concerning the use of SE since in many instances the choice of a translator was an obvious one.\textsuperscript{22}

Amongst other things, Olofsson has emphasized the significance of a SE being "doubly consistent"\textsuperscript{23} and the role of semantics in the translators choice.\textsuperscript{24}

The difference between segmentation and quantitative representation is not clearly defined either by Tov or Barr. Barr, who actually employs the term segmentation, defines it as the division of the Hebrew text into elements or segments. He then goes on to discuss the quantitative addition or subtraction of elements from the

\textsuperscript{20}Rabin, "Process," p. 7. We find his suggestion that the translators had a primitive word list which they used as a lexicon less compelling (p. 21), though it is accepted by Marquis, "Lexical," p. 409 and Wright, Difference, p. 92 and 279 fn. 80. The belief that the translators worked from some kind of word list is rooted in Bickerman's suggestion that the translators may have borrowed the techniques of the Aramaic dragomen. See E. J. Bickerman, "The Septuagint as a Translation," PAAJR 28 (1959): 16-23.


\textsuperscript{22}Barr, "Typology," p. 306.

\textsuperscript{23}That is, it is more significant when a Greek term is used consistently for only one semitic word and the semitic word is rendered by only the one Greek term. See Olofsson, LXX, pp. 18-19; Barr, "Typology," p. 311.

\textsuperscript{24}Olofsson points out various difficulties in analysing stereotyping as a criterion for consistency in "Consistency as a Translation Technique," SJOT 6 (1992): 14-30.
Hebrew text as something different. 25 There is a lack of clarity here, for we could say that the same elements which are added or subtracted from the Hebrew are the ones which are segmented. In practice, Barr uses quantitative addition to refer to the addition of elements by the translator for the purpose of clarity (eg. making the subject explicit) or exegetical comment. 26 In his examination of segmentation he is far more interested in the ways the translators handled the division of words into their constituent (morphological) elements. For example, Barr notes that the translation of idioms posed special difficulties for a translator who was striving for a one-to-one correspondence with the source text. 27 In TCU, Tov explains "the representation of the constituents of Hebrew words by individual Greek equivalents," (segmentation) as the translators' tendency "to segment Hebrew words into meaningful elements, which were then represented by their individual Greek equivalents." Yet, on the very next page, he defines quantitative representation with the words "literal translators did their utmost to represent each individual element in MT by one equivalent element in the translation." 28 Since Tov only entertains a brief discussion of his criteria, it is difficult to know how he would differentiate between the two.

Wright notes the ambiguities in the work of Barr and Tov, 30 so


26Barr's discussion of quantitative addition and subtraction dwells mainly on Targumic material (pp. 303-305). However, the kind of interpretive comment we find in the Targums is not characteristic of the LXX. The only example he gives of omissions is the Greek text of Job (p. 304).

27Ibid., pp. 297-300. The translation of idioms is ultimately a problem best viewed as a semantic one, which Barr recognizes. Furthermore, an idiom should be treated as one linguistic unit since its meaning is derived from the specific combination of the words rather than the sum of their parts. Barr's discussion of segmentation below the word level (pp. 300-303) also reveals a concern for semantic problems.

28TCU, p. 57.

29Ibid., p. 58.
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he restricts the usage of the term segmentation to "the translator’s technique of dividing Hebrew words into their constituent parts in order to represent each part in the Greek translation." On this basis Wright is able to analyze a target text at both the word and multi-word level for how well it formally reproduces its source. On the other hand, his system does not take into account the subtle semantic aspects of translation which Barr examines.

Adherence to word order can reveal the extent to which the translators followed their Vorlage because there are certain aspects of Hebrew word order which are fixed. For example, adjectives and demonstrative pronouns follow substantives and genitives follow their constructs. Since the Greek allows for great freedom in word order it could reconstruct HA syntax quite easily though it would not necessarily yield typical Greek usage. As Wright points out, "Variations in Greek from these must be stylistic in nature," though that in itself does not remove the necessity of examining the differences to see if there are other factors involved as well.

The one grammatical feature of Greek that would always introduce a change in the word order of HA is the use of postpositive conjunctions. In fact, it is generally agreed that this accounts for the relatively infrequent appearance of postpositives in the LXX.

31 Wright, Difference, pp. 55-56.
32 Ibid., p. 56.
33 For his discussion and statistics see, Difference, pp. 55-91.
34 G. Marquis, "Word Order," pp. 59-84; Wright, Difference, 35-54.
36 Wright, Difference, pp. 37-38.
On the surface, the evaluation of word order would appear to be the easiest of the criteria of formal equivalence for which to determine statistics. However, the very fact that Marquis and Wright produce different results in their statistics using the same database reveals that even a seemingly straightforward analysis of word order presents difficulties.38

III. Reservations Concerning the Focus on Literalism

Although there is much to be gained from the investigation of the features of literalism in the LXX, serious questions can be raised about the adequacy of the methodology as a means to describe TT.39 Some of these difficulties were touched on in the previous section. In the following, rather than selecting specific instances where the presentation of material or statistics to do with literalism has been inaccurate or misleading,40 we will concentrate on the methodology as a whole. The criticisms will be balanced by the presentation of the proposed methodology in the fourth chapter.

III.1. The Assumption of Literal Intentions

The basic difficulty of the literal approach has been the assumption that the translator intended to produce a literal


translation. 41 This assumption is clear in the following comment by B.G. Wright:

... a translation could be described as "literal" if the translator has attempted to reproduce in a rigid way in Greek the actual form of the various elements of the parent text. 42

In books which are extremely literal such an approach may be very helpful. However, and one cannot emphasize this point enough, the fact that a translation reproduces a great deal of the formal features of the source text does not mean that the translator intended that the reader could retranslate back from the Greek to the Hebrew. The translators' reverence for the text is evident in the desire to follow the word order and represent the various elements of the words in the source, but they were able to do this while faithfully attempting to translate the meaning of the text as they understood it. 43 In many cases this attempt led to very unusual Greek usage, but the majority of these Hebraisms do not violate Greek grammar. 44 On the other hand, Hebraisms illustrate the tension which existed for the individual translators between using formal (i.e. faithfulness to the language of their literary source) vs. more dynamic (i.e. faithfulness to their own language) expressions. It was only at a later period, partly due to the debates over the use of scripture between Christians and Jews and partly due to the belief of the inspiration of scripture, that literalism became more of a conscious methodology. 45 For example,

41 See also the recent article by Aejmelaeus ("Intention") in the seventh congress volume of the IOSCS.

42 Wright, *Difference*, pp. 29, 32 and 36.


45 Barr, "Typology," p. 324; Tov also notes that "Jer-R's revision is remote from the slavish literalness of *kaige*-Th and Aquila," (Jeremiah and Baruch, p. 167). Aejmelaeus ("Intention," p. 25)
even though Th exhibits a high degree of formal equivalence to his parent text, he does not leave the impression that he intended to provide, or expected someone else to look for, a one-to-one equivalence between his translation and his parent text.46

If the translators did not strive for literalism then why are the translations generally literal? Barr, referring to the fact of how the LXX frequently follows the semitic word order, gave the answer to this question when he stated that it was "probably to be attributed to habit and the quest for an easy technique rather than to any literalist policy."47 The translators were concerned to render the meaning of the text and chose those constructions which seemed to them to express that meaning adequately. In other words, the translators worked instinctively by choosing in an ad hoc manner the rendering which they believed suited the context best.48

Since the translators were not intentionally striving for literal translations, then we must question the validity of using this gauge to measure how well they achieved the standard. It does not matter if it is alleged that a value judgment is not placed on how well a translator formally reproduced the text. The fact is the focus on literalism is foreign to what the translators were doing. The following criticisms will place the preceding comments in better perspective.

III.2. Literalism Offers an Incomplete Description of TT

Since the translators were not practising a policy of literalism, but were guided by their own instincts of what would constitute a suitable rendering in the context we come naturally to a


46 See the conclusions in CH 5 VII.


second criticism. That is, literalism fails in most important aspects as a means to offer a complete analysis of TT. This is best understood by considering two different but closely related points.

III.2.i. *The focus on literalism fails to account for dynamic features of translation.*

Since all of the books of the LXX are more or less literal, there is more to be learned about the individual translators from those instances in which the translation departs from the technique of formal equivalence. Why did a particular translator forsake a formal correspondence in favour of a more idiomatic Greek expression only with certain constructions or only in some of the instances of a given construction? In linguistic terminology, why is it that the translator departed from his normal or "unmarked" usage to employ a different or "marked" rendering? Does the translator use favourite terms to render the Vorlage when he is uncertain about the meaning? The answer to these kinds of questions are crucial to understanding how the translator went about his work. At the very least, we realize that focusing on features of formal equivalence neglects significant features of translation. This point is seemingly self-evident.

A very different kind of analysis and description of TT emerges if we turn the focus on literal features upon its head. In other words, if it is the features of dynamic equivalence which reveal the most important tendencies of the translator, then we can state the axiom: *it is the type and frequency of non-literal renderings in the translation units which provide the most distinguishing characteristics of TT.*

A relatively minor lexical example is provided in Dan. 3:12 in which McCrystall has argued that τῷ εἰδωλεῖ is used instead of τοῖς θεοῖς because of the translator's concern to identify the statue as an effigy of Nebuchadnezzar. However, the

49 Aejmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," p. 362. Aejmelaeus states, "Free renderings are like fingerprints that the translators have left behind them."

50 McCrystall, pp. 5-6. He also notes (following Delcor) the addition of the personal pronoun σοι after εἰκόνι as further evidence that the OG changes the meaning of the MT. See M. Delcor, "Un cas de traduction 'Targumique' de la LXX à propos de la statue en or de Dan. III," *Textus* 7 (1969): 30-35.
rendering of הַלּוֹדֵת (הלודֵה) by εἰδολεῡμ is not without precedent in the LXX.\textsuperscript{51} Furthermore, εἰδολεῡμ is employed in four other passages by OG to designate idols in contrast to the one true God of Israel and renders הַלּוֹדֵת (הלודֵה) in every case.\textsuperscript{52} In 3:12 and 3:18 OG employs εἰδολεӯμ when the three refer to Nebuchadnezer's "idol," whereas in 3:14 OG has θεοῖ when the king commands them to serve his "gods." OG's translation preserves a nice distinction between the two parties and their conception of what the statue represents. If OG's translation were intended to carry the significance discerned by McCray, then we would also expect OG to use the first person pronoun in 3:14 when the king asks, "Why do you not worship my image which I set up?"

III.2.ii. The focus on literalism cannot account for the detailed aspects of translation.

It is not just the type and frequency of dynamic translations which illuminate the TT of the individual translators. In a similar fashion, we have to consider favourite renditions and syntactical constructions employed by the translator in his work. For example, one translator may employ a formally equivalent expression to render his Vorlage, but it may be different from the way any other translator reproduced the same expression.\textsuperscript{53} Up to this time, the studies concentrating on particular criteria for literalism have revealed the inherent difficulties of the methodology for offering an adequate analysis of TT. The point is that one should begin from a perspective which is more amenable to the analysis of language as a whole, though one of the major problems of the literal method has been the lack of detailed analysis.

\textsuperscript{51}Num. 25:2 bis; 3 Kings 11:2, 8, 33; Ps. 37:19.

\textsuperscript{52}3:18; 5:4, 23. 6:28(27) where MT=0, is the exception. εἰδολεῡμ (1-5) is also used the same way in 1:2.

\textsuperscript{53}See Soisalon-Soininen, "Fragen," pp. 431-432 where he criticises Tov and Wright's use of consistency as the means to indicate literalness. Wright (Difference, pp. 31-32) has responded by stating that it is the "mechanicalness or woodenness of representation combined with the consistency of that mechanical approach [which is] a major exponent of literalness." Unfortunately, Wright fails to deal with the heart of Soisalon-Soininen's criticism, i.e. the inadequacy of the purely formal approach when comparing OG to MT.
A good example of the lack of attention to details is Wright’s volume, No Small Difference: Sirach’s Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text. Wright’s text was chosen because it is the most extensive published treatment examining the criteria for literalism. The inability to treat details adequately is evident in several places where Wright includes references to the possibility of investigating the types of deviations from literalism more closely, and in his discussions concerning which elements have to be excluded from his data. For example, it is true that the inclusion of the postpositive ָּ in the data for word order makes a difference in the statistics for literalism. However, it is not so much the frequency with which the conjunction is used that is significant for TT (though that is important), but the different ways and the extent to which ָּ and the other conjunctions are used as alternatives for קָיֵי by the different translators.

One might argue that it is unfair to criticize Wright in this way since he was not strictly concerned to examine the differences in details. We would respond by noting that the matter under dispute is the most appropriate methodology to describe TT. Furthermore, there is also reason to be concerned about the way in which deviations from formal equivalence are actually examined in practice by Wright. For example, Wright provides a list of types of quantitatively longer and shorter translations, but tends to treat them universally. He states:

Only when the data for segmentation and quantitative representation are fully analyzed can one effectively determine whether or not quantitatively longer elements are likely to represent elements in the translator’s parent text, and thus, constitute an equally segmented Hebrew.

However, the global statistics for a translation will only provide a

54 Wright, Difference, pp. 41-43; 59-63; 71-72; 79-82; 103.
55 Wright, Difference, pp. 41-42.
56 See Aejmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," pp. 369-370. For an example of a thorough examination of the treatment of ָּ, see Parataxis, pp. 34-46.
58 Wright, Difference, p. 78.
general indication of what the translator might have done in any specific instance. In order to achieve a clear understanding of any particular variant we must group the various types of longer elements in the OG and compare them to the instances in which the same types of renderings faithfully reflect the source. Factors such as the context of each individual variant and the possible motivation for a change must also be considered.

Wright offers a perfect illustration of the importance of the methodology for the analysis of longer (or any difference in reading for that matter) texts when he states:

There is no way a priori to tell whether or not לְ in Sir 3:17 was in the translator’s Hebrew. Only an analysis based on principles of formal equivalence will give an indication of the probability that לְ was or was not in the grandson’s Hebrew text.\(^{59}\)

If, by this statement, Wright means that we must investigate every instance of לְ and בַּע in Sir. in order to understand the relationship between the two terms as well as examine the other ways the Hebrew was (not) rendered in the Greek or Greek was (not) added to the Hebrew in order to determine whether there were any similar constructions to compare to Sir. 3:17, then we agree. What he seems to mean, based on our reading of his text, is that if בַּע represents לְ in X% of its occurrences, then it probably does so here.\(^{60}\) Wright’s statistical probability is only of use if there are no other means available to help explain the reading of the OG. The problem is his lack of attention to details.

The ability to isolate the individual traits of the translator within his overall approach to translating presupposes a thorough analysis of both the source and target texts. In most cases where we examine the idiosyncratic traits that characterize a translator we are dealing with a small percentage of the actual renderings for a given HA expression. Therefore, by grouping the various ways in which a construction has been translated we can examine the differences in usage. Then we can both attempt to explain the deviations which

\(^{59}\) Ibid., p. 80.

\(^{60}\) We have no way of knowing what he does mean of course, but our representation is faithful to the argument of his text.
might stem from the TT of the translator and discern the characteristics which differentiate the individual translators. 

Indeed, it may be that there is no apparent reason for the change(s) other than stylistic variation, but often there is. Therefore, to expand upon the previously stated axiom, we must say that it is the idiosyncrasies of the individual translators that provide the most distinguishing features of TT.

A good example of the subtle distinctions made by translators is given by J.W. Wevers in a recent article. He notes that the phrase "sons of Israel" occurs 53 times in Exodus in the nominative, dative, and accusative, and has the article in every case. However, in 12 of 35 cases in the genitive (τῶν ισραήλ) the article is omitted. The difference in the twelve cases is that the phrase is used in the context to modify "assembly" (i.e. συναγωγή ισραήλ).

If we were only concerned to measure literalness according to a strict set of criteria, then we might fail to take sufficient note of why the translator of Exodus omitted the article for the construct-genitive in 12 cases and why the translator of Daniel rendered άλα (αλα) by ἐδολον. To borrow from a well known expression, the focus on literalism for the analysis of TT is like counting the fir and pine trees in order to describe the forest in which they grow.

III.3. The Inadequacy of Literalism's Statistics for Textual Criticism

The primary reason for the research of the LXX and the attempt to reconstruct the OG of each book has been text-critical. We have also noted already that it is the understanding of the TT in the individual book/unit that is essential for the critic to attempt to

---

61 See Soisalon-Soininen, "Fragen," p. 435-443 which expands on the introduction to his volume on Die Infinitif in der Septuaginta, pp. 5-16. This type of methodology is evident in the work of Aejmelaeus and Sollamo.

62 This will be illustrated from the OG and Th versions of Daniel in chapters four and five.


64 See the excursus following CH 1.
reconstruct the HA Vorlage of the OG. Since the statistics produced by those focusing on formal correspondence measure literalism, then by definition these statistics are chiefly concerned with quantifying the degree to which the translation faithfully reproduces the Vorlage. In other words, the majority of the cases where the translation is literal is useless for text-criticism because it reads with the MT! Now, it may be helpful to know as a general rule that one translator used formal equivalents more often than another, but the use of the LXX for textual research primarily concerns those instances when it does not literally reproduce its Vorlage.\(^{65}\)

A good illustration of the above principle can be provided from Galen Marquis' article on the consistency of lexical equivalents.\(^{66}\) According to Marquis:

The percentage of singular translations which reflect the source text faithfully can be taken to be approximately the same as the percentage of consistent translations, which by virtue of their consistency, reveal a faithful reflection of the source.\(^{67}\)

On this basis he suggests that the remaining percentage indicates singular translations which may reveal deviations from the source text.

As an example, Marquis looks at the rendering of \textit{יהי} in section a of LXX Ezekiel. It is translated in five cases by \textit{διέπωμαι} and twice by \textit{ναθανίλ}, \textit{παραδό}, \textit{έπάγω}, and \textit{διάγω}. Four of the seventeen equivalents for \textit{יהי} occur as singular translations: \textit{διαπορεύομαι}, \textit{πορεύομαι}, \textit{ἀποτροπίασθαι}, and \textit{ἀφορισμός}. The percentage of singular translations for \textit{יהי} is then 23\% (4 of 17) while consistent translations make up 77\% of the renditions (13 of 17). The percentage of singular translations which reflect the source text would be equal to the percentage of consistent translations of the whole translation. So, by multiplying 77\% of 23\% one gets 18\%. Marquis then adds 18\% to 77\% in order to calculate the percentage of all renderings that faithfully reflect the Vorlage, i.e. 95\%. The percentage of possible free renderings or those

\(^{65}\)For the present purpose we put aside the fact that in some cases (Jer., Josh., Job, Sam.) the OG witnesses to a much shorter Vorlage, while in Dan. 4 we have a substantially longer text and in ch. 5 a shorter text.


\(^{67}\)Ibid., p. 412.
which may reflect a variant Vorlage is 5%, or one word (from the singular translations).  

There is a seductive logic to Marquis' basic premise that the percentage of singular translations faithfully reflecting the source is equal to the percentage of consistent translations. However, as Wright points out, on what basis can Marquis conclude that the percentage of singular translations that faithfully render the source text is about the same as the percentage of consistent translations? Our examination of vocabulary in Daniel will reveal that the use of singular translations has far more to do with the translator's use of variety in translation than differences in the Vorlage. Furthermore, Marquis' view that every consistent rendering accurately reflects the source text by virtue of the fact that it is used more than once to render a word is questionable. The relationship between the use of words in one language and how they are used to translate words in another language is a complex matter and cannot be reduced to simple mathematical formulas.

Language is a means of communication, which "consists of words (or other units) which are organized, according to 'the rules of grammar' into particular types of combinations." The symbols (words) of a language which a speaker uses in a given situation depend both on the type of situation, (we would not employ the same vocabulary writing to our auto mechanic as we would to a politician), as well as the particular speech event, including among other factors the whole discourse, the paragraph, the clause, and the preceding and following words, i.e. context. So, in a discourse our choice of words is limited by the subject about which we are writing. However, there

68 Ibid., p. 414.
69 See Wright, Difference, pp. 97-98 for his criticisms of Marquis; Soisalon-Soininen, "Hebraismenfrage," p. 50.
70 Greenspahn also notes that HL "consistently comprise one-third to one-half of the vocabulary in any given body of linguistic material." See F. Greenspahn, Hapax Legomena in Biblical Hebrew, SBLDS, 74 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984), p. 32.
are still an infinite number of ways in which we can combine these remaining words to communicate our message. The choice of a particular word by a particular writer in a particular context is the result of a complex series of competing choices in that particular speech event, which in turn is influenced by prior experiences of the speaker/writer. We will "flesh out" the preceding comments in more detail later (CH 4.II.4). For the present, we will consider two words from Daniel and how they are rendered by OG and Th as an illustration.

Two words from the semantic domain of mercy/compassion are employed in 1:9: רע and יָּפִּים. רע appears 2x in Daniel, 1:9 and 9:4. OG's choice of יָּפִּים in 1:9 is unusual and involves some innovation regarding how Daniel was viewed by the chief steward (honourably, as opposed to mercifully), but the overall sense of the passage is conveyed. In 9:4 OG employs מָלֶס which offers a closer formal correspondence (Th uses מָלֶס on both occasions). יִשְׁתַּנָּה is found 4x in Daniel. Once again, OG's choice of יִשְׁתַּנָּה in 1:9 is dynamic and OG also has a very free rendition of the term in 2:18, though the overall meaning is transferred. 73 In 9:9 and 18 OG uses a word whose range of meaning is closer—מָלֶס. So, OG can use מָלֶס to translate both the words found in 1:9, but it does not use them for either in this particular context. Th's מִיתָרָה for יָּפִּים is a SE (4/4).

Unfortunately, in this instance, we cannot discern an apparent motive to explain why the OG translator did not use מָלֶס for either term in 1:9, other than to regard his choice as a reflection of his understanding of the meaning of the semitic text.

However, in order to appreciate their vocabulary choices better and to demonstrate the inadequacy of merely counting word frequencies, it is helpful to examine how OG and Th use the four Greek words we have encountered in vs. 1:9. For example, OG has מִיתָרָה 2x (s. the dynamic use in 2:13), but Th never uses it. On the other hand, מִיתָרָה is never found in OG, while Th uses it on one other occasion (4:24) to give a good dynamic rendering for one of the 2x that the vb.

73 In 2:18 the translator offers a good example of how the same message can be communicated by choosing alternative words and combining them differently.
occurs (s. also 6:12). Besides 9:9, 18, OG has ἔλεος 8x. In 9:3 it is a dynamic translation of ἱδρυμά (1/4) and 9:4=Th for ἔλεος; 6x MT=0. Th uses ἔλεος only 8x in total: 1:9, 9:4=OG, and 9:20 for ἔλεος; 5x MT=0. OG employs τιμή only 3x (s. also 2:37 and 4:27[30] =Th) while in Th it is a SE (7/8) for ἔλεος. However, we should note that in 11:38 OG employs the vb. τιμήσει for ἔλεος and gives a dynamic rendition of the clause. The non-translation of ἔλεος in this vs. seems to be due to the fact that OG did not know the meaning of ἔλεος and so offers a contextual translation (motivated by the connection of τιμή for ἔλεος) with the vb. τιμήσει. The only other occurrence of ἔλεος in MT is earlier in 11:38 where OG's contextual guess is not quite so successful.

To investigate these relationships even further we note that OG renders γνῶσι with ἔλεος in 9:3 (1/4) while Th employs ἔλεος to render γνῶσι (1/1) in 9:20. The translations of 9:3 and 9:20 are both good dynamic renderings, but the Hebrew terms come from the semantic sub-domain of prayer terminology. On the other occasions where OG meets these words it translates with Greek words from the domain of prayer. In the case of γνῶσι, OG has δεήσις–9:17, 23 and προσευχαίς–9:18. In 9:20 OG translates ἔλεος with δέομενος ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς. The choice of δεήσις on the two occasions is actually quite interesting because the word is only found 4x in OG. In one of the other two passages MT=0 (4:30a), and δεήσις is used in 2:18 where OG offers the dynamic translation of γνῶσι. Th uses δεήσις only 3x, but it is as a SE (3/4) for γνῶσι. The one vs. where Th employs an alternative is 9:18 where Th crosses semantic domains once again with the use of οἰκτιμόν.

In the above example we considered every occurrence of ἔλεος, γνῶσι, ἔλεος, ἔλεος, χάριν, τιμή, τιμήσει, δεήσις and οἰκτιμόν.

74 Th uses the n. 6x in total. The remaining instance is 9:18, see below.

75 3:35, 38, 42, 43, 89, 90.

76 3:35, 38, 42, 89, 90=OG.

77 See also 2:6; 7:14; 11:38. 4:33(36); 5:18, 20, OG=0. 7:14 may involve a textual variant. On one occasion Th uses ἐντιμον (2:37).
and their inter-relations.\textsuperscript{78} We have glimpsed the complex network of relationships that exist in the use of vocabulary, and, of all the texts considered, there is a question of a textual variant only in OG 7:14 where \(\mathfrak{p}\) is omitted. As we have seen, it is hardly possible to examine the relationship between the vocabulary of the source text and the translation on the basis of a formal one-to-one correspondence and use the statistics for textual criticism. This is especially the case with OG, but even a translation like Th is very complex.

In a paper read to the IOSCS several years ago which discussed the methodological approach for the research of TT, Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen expressed the extent of his concern about the mechanical approach to the analysis of TT when he suggested that the use of computers in this way was "a great loss for the research into the syntax of the Septuagint."\textsuperscript{79} We have to agree with his concerns about methodology; hence the present thesis. However, it is not the use of computers \textit{per se}, but the manner of their employment that is the problem. Computers are a great asset to the scholar because they can search machine readable texts and present the results far more quickly and more accurately than one can do manually. However, whether the results are of any practical value depends on the adequacy of the researcher's methodology.

IV. \textit{Summary}

The examination of the focus on literalism as a methodology for the study of TT has found serious difficulties with the approach. First, the focus on literalism presumes that every translator intended to produce a formally equivalent translation at all times even though this is a trait of the later recensionists. Second, the focus on literalism fails to account for the most salient features of a translation, which are those instances in which the translation departs from the technique of formal equivalence. The features of dynamic equivalence reveal the most important tendencies of the translator because they reveal the distinguishing characteristics of how the translator

\textsuperscript{78} The semantic relationship shared by terminology from the sub-domains of wisdom or prayer would be even more complicated.

\textsuperscript{79} Soisalon-Soininen, "Fragen," p. 438, "ein grosser Verlust für die Forschung der Septuaginta-Syntax."
rendered particular words and phrases. In a similar fashion, we have to consider favourite renditions and syntactical constructions employed by the translator in his/her work which may be literal, but may be different in some way from other translators. We have summarized the importance of analysing the unique features of a given translation by stating the axiom *it is the idiosyncrasies of the individual translators that provide the most distinguishing features of TT*. They bear the signature of the individual translator. Third, we have noted that the focus on literalism is inadequate as a methodology for analysis of TT for the purpose of using an ancient version for the textual-criticism of the Hebrew Bible. It is on the basis of an analysis of the finer points of the translation that the critic's judgement rests on the surest grounds.

The contention of this thesis is that a linguistic approach in which the source and target texts are compared while considering the contrasting structures of the two languages is the way forward for the analysis of TT. The soundness of this approach is demonstrated in the work of I. Soisalon-Soininen and his students, as well as by H. Szpek. In the following chapter a linguistic methodology for the analysis of TT will be presented. At the same time the usefulness of the model will be demonstrated by working with the OG and Th texts of Daniel in the following chapter.
Chapter 4

A Methodology for the Analysis of Translation Technique

The purpose of this chapter is to offer a theoretical basis for a methodology for the analysis of TT that incorporates linguistic principles.¹ This is necessary in order to justify the preceding criticisms of the methodology that focuses on the characteristics of literalism. A theoretical basis is also required in order to support the contention that a linguistic approach is the way forward for the analysis of TT. As previously mentioned, H. Szpek has recently offered a linguistic model for TT, and we agree with much of her presentation. However, Szpek does not discuss in any detail the basis for adopting a linguistic approach, nor does she locate her discussion within the context of contemporary research in TT. Though TT has not received the attention of scholars that other areas of biblical studies have, there have been a number of articles and monographs published that are directly or indirectly related to the field. Since this thesis is concerned to argue for a specific methodology, then it is important to account for previous studies and offer some evaluation of what is helpful for someone engaging in TT research.² The presentation of the theory behind the methodology is also necessary as background to the textual criticism of MT.


²Some works have already been mentioned in the previous chapter and the reader is also directed to the bibliography. For an excellent overall resource for what has been written, see S. Olofsson The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint, ConBib.OT, 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990). The title is something of a misnomer because the volume does not offer a methodology for the analysis of TT nor does it offer much critical evaluation of what has been written about TT. On the other hand, the companion volume is an excellent investigation of TT in the Psalms. See God is My Rock, ConBib.OT, 31 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990). Tov also includes an excellent bibliography as an index to his article "Nature and Study," pp. 354-359.
The qualification that this is a "preliminary" methodology has to be employed for two reasons. First, the science of linguistics is relatively young, so there is little scholarly consensus in some branches within its study; and the ongoing research will bring changes in methodology. Second, the study of TT of the ancient versions in biblical studies is itself barely out of its infancy stage, so there will be continued refinements in this discipline as linguistic principles are applied to TT research. In recognition of these two limitations it follows that this chapter is an attempt to isolate the most significant areas of linguistic study for the analysis of TT.

The discussion will proceed in the following order. First, a definition of TT is given in order to clarify what it is that we are studying. Second, five basic concepts that are presupposed for the analysis of TT will be introduced and some of the implications of these concepts will be discussed. Third, the model itself is introduced. It should be noted that neutral terms like translator, source text, and target language will frequently be employed in this discussion because of the general applicability of the model to the analysis of texts. Examples will be drawn from the translation of the LXX, specifically the OG and Th versions of Daniel, in order to illustrate the principles being discussed. The reader is also encouraged to consult the works which are cited in the notes.

1 This despite the fact that the foundations were laid 150 years ago in Z. Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta, (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841).

I. Definition of Translation Technique

The purpose of the study of TT of the LXX is to describe how individual translators engaged in the task of translating a unit of scripture for a community. There are five aspects of this definition that require comment. First of all, the definition is stated in terms of the translator's approach to the source text as a whole, but it is not meant to exclude employing the phraseology TT as a description of how the translator treated individual elements. Second, analysis of TT has to concern itself primarily with individual units of scripture rather than the entire corpus of the LXX. Since various books and portions of scripture were translated by different individuals it only makes sense to treat the units separately. For example, our knowledge of how OG renders infinitive absolutes is not going to tell us how the OG translator of Micah approached them. An analysis of OG will provide possible renditions, but we have to examine Micah in order to know how the translator approached infinitive absolutes in that book. A unit of scripture accounts for a translator who was responsible for more than one book and also for the situation where two or more translators worked on separate sections of the same book. Third, the reference to the community of the translator recognizes that these translations were not carried out in a sociological and historical vacuum. A translation of the Bible, whether the LXX or a modern day version, is intended to meet the needs of a constituency. Therefore, it is the needs of the intended audience that will determine the kind of translation produced. For example, the later recensions of the LXX tended to be revised toward MT, though Symmachus is a notable exception. It is also to be expected that some of the terminology and expressions employed will reflect the cultural background of the translator and the community in which s/he lives. In fact, in some

---


cases of the ancient versions we are dealing with the community's understanding of scripture in the translation. Fourth, we speak of the attempt to describe how the translator engaged in his task. It could be said that the study of TT attempts to expose the translator's discourse analysis of the parent text. Our task is not to do a discourse analysis ourselves, but the analysis of TT ought to illuminate how the translator understood the Vorlage. Finally, we refer to individual translators out of the belief that individuals worked alone on the task of translation. This view seems to be supported by the characteristic features evident throughout individual units. However, the methodology could be usefully employed in the analysis and description of a recension involving more than one editor or with any texts sharing a reciprocal relationship.

It hardly needs to be stated, but the whole process of analysing TT must assume that a direct relationship exists between the receptor text being analyzed and the source text to which it is being compared. The investigation of the TT of the ancient versions is complicated by corruptions which have entered the text of the source and receptor

---


9 That the translators of the LXX worked mainly with fairly small units of text (phrase and clause) and did not consider larger units is fairly obvious from the texts. See the excellent discussion in I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer," in Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume, ed. A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983), pp. 319-29.

10 Aeigmelaeus ("Connectors", p. 362) speaks in a similar vein when she writes that the analysis of translation technique is an attempt "to see the translator behind it [the translation] and to appreciate his work." See also Barr, "Typology," p. 288.
languages in the course of transmission. However, in most books of the LXX and in the other ancient versions the correspondence between the source and receptor texts is so close that we are justified in assuming that a direct relationship does in fact exist.\textsuperscript{11} It is on this basis that we are able to use the LXX for textual criticism of MT and to help reconstruct the complicated textual history of the Hebrew text.\textsuperscript{12}

II. Five Presuppositions for Translation Technique

There are five concepts that are presupposed here as fundamental to TT analysis. The first four derive from the study of linguistics proper while the last is specific to TT. There is some overlap in the discussion of these five presuppositions because they are interdependent.

II.1. TT is Descriptive.

By descriptive is meant that the analysis of TT is concerned with describing how a translator rendered the source text into the receptor language as opposed to evaluating the grammatical correctness of the translation.\textsuperscript{13} There is no point in depicting a particular rendition as "barbaric" or otherwise, because these "barbarisms" arose chiefly due to the competing demands of remaining faithful to the message of the source while making that same message intelligible in the receptor language. The difficulties, which beset the translators in their task, and how they responded, are well stated by Aejmelaeus:

With the source language and the target language differing


\textsuperscript{12}See the Excursus to CH 1.

\textsuperscript{13}Linguists describe how language is used as opposed to prescribing how it ought to be used. For example, in North America one frequently hears statements like, "He did good." Traditional grammars teach that the adjective "good" is incorrect in this position whereas the adverb "well" would be proper English. Another example would be the so-called split infinitive. See H. A. Gleason, An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, Rev. ed. (London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), 195-209; J. Lyons, Language and Linguistics, (Cambridge: University Press, 1981), pp. 46-54.
as greatly from one another, particularly with regard to their syntactical structures, as Hebrew and Greek, a Semitic and an Indo-European language, the translators must have often faced a conflict between two requirements, the requirement of rendering the contents of the Scriptures in intelligible and fluent Greek and the requirement of following the original as closely as possible. Some of the translators more than others have yielded to the former by use of various free renderings, whereas literal and even Hebraistic renderings are the result of the latter. The study of the translation techniques aims at describing the translators exactly from this point of view and finding criteria by which to measure their freedom or literalness.¹⁴

Unless a grammatical anomaly may have resulted from the translator's misunderstanding of the Vorlage (due to textual difficulty, error or ignorance), it does not matter that it exists in the target text because the objective of TT is to describe what the translator has done.

II.2. TT is Primarily Synchronic.

"Synchronic linguistics investigates the way people speak in a given speech community at a given point of time,"¹⁵ as opposed to diachronic linguistics which focuses on the change of language through time.¹⁶ The primary implication of this principle for TT is that TT is a description of a particular written communication given at a


particular time. The orthography, morphology, lexical choices, and (to a lesser degree) the syntax of the translation will reflect the conventions of the language in the time and place in which it was produced. At the semantic level, the meaning of the translation for its intended audience is determined by the context, both the linguistic context and the historical context, as far as it can be reasonably reconstructed.

There are two consequences of a synchronic description when it comes to the evaluation of the meaning of the translation. From the perspective of the reader of the target language there is no difference in meaning (though s/he may at times be confused), because this reader has no direct access to the source text. In our case, the LXX was usually read and understood by Greek speaking Jews and Christians without reference to the Hebrew. However, the perspective of the translator and the evaluator of the translation is different from the intended/presumed reader because both have access to the source text. The translator may have intended to give a synonymous translation or to clarify the meaning of the source text when it was ambiguous or confusing; but from the perspective of the reader this does not make any difference because they have no direct access to the source text.

---


18 Context is everything when it comes to determining meaning. Understanding the meaning of a given communication involves far more than determining linguistic reference, however. Referential (eg., the identity of the little horn in Dan. 7) and emotive (eg., the reaction to so-called "four letter words") meaning is determined by understanding the historical context. See S. Ullmann, Principles, pp. 60-82; Nida, Science, pp. 37-43, 57-144; the detailed treatments by A. Lehrer, Semantic Fields and Lexical Structures (London: North-Holland, 1974); J. Lyons, Semantics, 2 vols. (Cambridge: University Press, 1977). In Biblical Studies the work of Barr (Semantics) is a classic; see also Silva, Biblical Words, pp. 137-169; E. Nida and J. P. Louw, Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament, (Atlanta: Scholars Press. 1992).

19 It would be a worthy project to produce complete commentaries on the books of the LXX because of the effect that the translation process had on the biblical books and the authoritative status of the LXX amongst both Jews and Christians at the turn of the common era. The literary critical comparison of Daniel 2-7 in the MT and LXX by Meadowcroft (1993) offers a good example of the fruitfulness of examining the meaning of the Greek text in its own right, though his decision to use Rahlfs' edition as representative of the OG text is hardly defensible.
evaluator the translation may actually be confusing, have a different meaning or even impart the exact opposite sense of the Vorlage.\textsuperscript{20} The possibility that a variant reading stems from an alternative Vorlage must always be considered, but there are cases when questions about the text from which a particular translation equivalent was derived are unwarranted. Besides the types of corruptions that can enter the text during its transmission and the various ways that the translators could have misread the text they translated,\textsuperscript{21} many renderings, which at first appear to be inexplicable, can be explained when we consider the synchronic and diachronic nature of language. A synchronic view of language ensures that we are aware that some puzzling translation equivalents are present in the translation, because the translators encountered words or concepts for which there was no adequate translation equivalent in the source language.\textsuperscript{22} In

\textsuperscript{20}Szpek, pp. 59-60. Most discussions of the meaning of the LXX have taken problems of lexicography as their point of departure. See T. Muraoka, ed.,\textit{ Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography, SCS, 28} (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990); "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography," in VII Congress of the IOSCS, ed. C. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 205-22; J. A. L. Lee, \textit{A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch, SCS, 14} (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983). Muraoka ("Hapax," p. 217) concludes, "What a given Greek word or phrase means can mostly be worked out, or should be able to be worked out, from within the Greek." E. Tov has been the main proponent of the view that the Hebrew meaning of words sometimes has to be considered in Septuagint Lexicography. See E. Tov, "Three Dimensions of LXX Words," \textit{RB} 83 (1976): 529-44. In a recent article J. Lust acknowledges that the majority of readers of the LXX had no knowledge of the semitic original (p. 112). However, Lust insists that a LXX lexicon should "refer to the semitic original, at least in those cases where the deviations between a Greek word and its semitic equivalent can be explained on the level of word forms, but also when the Greek words are incomprehensible because they are transliterations or because they adopted the meaning of the underlying Hebrew or Aramaic." See J. Lust, "Translation Greek and the Lexicography of the Septuagint," \textit{JSOT} 59 (1993): 120 and the introduction to \textit{LEH}, pp. VIII-XV.

\textsuperscript{21}The following discussion assumes that the reader is well acquainted with the nature and causes of textual corruptions. See \textit{TCU}, or any standard introduction to textual criticism.

\textsuperscript{22}Cultural differences are particularly fertile ground for these kinds of differences because "a particular language will reflect in its vocabulary the culture of the society for which it is the medium of expression." See J. Lyons, \textit{Structural Semantics}, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), pp. 40-41; E. Nida, \textit{Exploring Semantic Structures,}
such cases the translators could attempt to restate or paraphrase the meaning of the source text or resort to one of three options: loan translation, shifts in application, or transliteration. The process of loan translation is one way of introducing a change in a language because it involves coining new words (neologisms). For example, the compound ἀρχιεσχύλος (Dan. 1:3, passim) comes from combining the Greek translations for the individual Hebrew words יִשָּׁר and מֹשֶׁה. Since Greek is a highly inflected language it lent itself to the combining of words and affixes in this way. Loan-translations should not present any difficulty for the evaluation of variant readings, but a "shift in application" may be more challenging. By a "shift in application" we mean that the translator used a familiar word in an innovative way and, thereby, added a new sense to the lexeme. The difficulty for the textual-critic is deciding whether the translator has merely extended the meaning of a word as a translation equivalent for a term in the Vorlage, or whether that word is employed because the Vorlage of the translation was different. Finally, the


24 It need hardly be explained that this practice is related to "etymological" renderings.

25 Such "shifts in application" occur mainly through metonymy or metaphor and may result in polysemy. See Ullmann, Principles, pp. 114-125. Silva, Biblical Words, pp. 82-85, 92-94. For examples, see the extensive list by Thack., pp. 39-55; also those noted by Tov for the translation of causatives in E. Tov, "The Representation of the Causative Aspects of the Hiphtil in the LXX. A Study in Translation Technique," Bib 63 (1982): 421.

26 Silva notes that metaphor is by far the most common cause of semantic change in his study of the vocabulary of the NT. He also warns that since these changes involve slight extensions of meaning, it is always possible that the semantic development was already present within the native language. This is just as true for the LXX as the NT. See M. Silva, "Semantic Change and Semitic Influence in the Greek Bible: With a Study of the Semantic Field of Mind," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Manchester, 1972), pp. 103-134.
translators sometimes chose to transliterate, particularly in the case of technical terms or proper names. 27

The diachronic nature of language also has bearing on the analysis of TT and has corresponding implications for textual criticism, because the temporal distance of the translator from the environment in which the source text was produced may have been the cause of confusion or misunderstanding. Lexical items in a language are continually being added and deleted, or their semantic range is changing. Therefore, a translator who knows the source language very well at a given point in time may not have access to the meaning of a word which has been dropped from usage. The obstacles presented by vocabulary are particularly acute when it comes to translating *hapax legomena* (HL) or vocabulary that occurs only rarely. In the case of Daniel, the problem is exacerbated by the bilingual nature of the source text and the high degree of borrowing between the two Semitic languages. 28 There were three main ways that the translators of the LXX resolved the difficulties presented by unknown lexemes. At times they merely transliterated a word into Greek characters 29 or omitted to translate the word altogether. For example, OG leaves Μ' untranslated not only in 7:15 where it occurs in the difficult phrase Μ')::l, but all 10x that it appears in Daniel. 30 On other occasions


28 Thus Charles (pp. xlvi-xlvii), Zimmerman, and Ginsberg argued that the whole of Daniel was originally written in Aramaic, while Grelot believes that chs. 4-5 of the OG were translated from a Hebrew revision of the Aramaic. See F. Zimmerman, "Aramaic," pp. 255-72; "Some Verses," pp. 349-54; Grelot, "Daniel iv," pp. 1-23; "Chapitre v," pp. 45-66; H. L. Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel, (Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948), pp. 41-61. Cf. this view with that of Jahn (pp. iv-vi) and Lust ("Daniel VII," p. 66) who argue that the Septuagint is a translation of a Hebrew text.


30 S. 3:6, 11, 15, 21, 23, 24(91), 25(92), 26(93); 4:7(10). See also E. Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?," in De Septuaginta, ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox (Mississauga: Benben, 1984), pp. 55-56.
they attempted to determine the meaning by some means of contextual 
guess, and we can distinguish four distinct types of conjecture: 
exegetical, etymological, generic renderings, or contextual "changes." 31

Exegetical renderings refer to the attempts of the translators to 
render a difficult term on the basis of their exegesis of the context. 32
Etymological renditions refer to cases where the translators guessed at 
the meaning of the word based on its etymology. 33 For example, OG 
uses κληροδοσία to translate תחתכלק in 11:21, 34 and תחתכלק in 
11:32. κληροδοσία only appears in three other passages in the LXX [Ps. 
77(78):55; Ecc. 7:12(11); 1Macc. 10:89], and never for אלפ which is 
usually rendered by μερίς, μερίς. However, κληροδοσία is related to the 
nouns κληρονομία and κλήρος and the verbs κληρονομέω and κληρώ 
whose semantic domain overlaps with that of μερίς, μερίς. It also happens 
that the semantic domains of two of the main Hebrew terms which 
these Greek words translate also overlap: הילל, meaning in various 
contexts "possession," "portion," or "inheritance;" הילל meaning 
"portion," "share," "possession." 34 In 11:21, 34 (32?) the translator 
incorrectly guessed that תחתכלק "flatteries" was derived from אלפ

31 Tov's ("Did the Translators," pp. 53-70) terminology has been 
borrowed, but the categories are organized differently. Tov includes 
renditions based on parallelism as a separate category.

32 See the example, τιμήτει on p. 120 above.

33 See TCU, pp. 241-250. The volume by X. Jacques is an important 
aid for identifying etymological roots. See List of Septuagint Words 
Sharing Common Elements, (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1972). In his 
article "Did the Translators," pp. 67-69, Tov distinguishes two types 
of etymological renditions. The other type of etymological rendering 
involves instances where the translators recognized the root of the 
word in their Vorlage and employed a Greek equivalent from a word 
group which rendered the semitic root elsewhere. Of course, not all 
of those instances constitute a guess because sometimes the 
translation conformed to Greek usage. The examples given below 
illustrates both ways that the translators employed etymology in their 
translations.

34 BDB, p. 635.

35 BDB, pp. 323-324.
and chose to translate with κληροδοσία.\textsuperscript{36}

The third means of conjecture open to the translator was to use a general term whose meaning seemed to fit from the context. For example, in 9:26 the translator employed ἀποσταθήσεται for ἄναμ (niphal imperfect, HL in Daniel). The MT is usually interpreted as a reference to the killing of Onias.\textsuperscript{37} McCrystall argues that the LXX rendition is a case of Tendenz and that the translator intends the passage to be a reference to the deposition of Jason rather than the killing of Onias III.\textsuperscript{38} Although McCrystall does not discuss how it is that ἀποσταθήσεται is better understood as a "deposition," we would understand him to mean that the general sense of the verb in the context is "to be removed." In contrast to McCrystall, P. David argues that there was "probably" a different verb in the Vorlage which referred to the removal of a high priest. Apparently, however, David does not feel it is necessary to justify this argument by indicating what verb this might have been.\textsuperscript{39} Either suggestion is possible, of course, but it is more likely that the translator was attempting to reproduce his Vorlage in Greek to the best of his ability and used a favourite verb in this context. The likelihood that the translator resorted to a favourite "generic" translation equivalent is indicated by the frequency of occurrence and the variety of words rendered by

\textsuperscript{36}Other instances where a cognate of κληροδοσία translates ἄναμ are Jos. 12:7; Ps. 15(16):5, 53:12; Hos. 5:7; Is. 53:12. Cf. McCrystall (pp. 86-88) who characterizes κληροδοσία as an example of Tendenz because it is not a "normal" Septuagint translation. The fact is OG decided not to render ἄναμ with μερίς, and OG never uses μερίς at all.

\textsuperscript{37}Mont., p. 381.

\textsuperscript{38}McCrystall, pp. 252-253, sees 9:26 as an historicizing of the prophecy and argues that the 139 years add up to the deposition of Jason.

\textsuperscript{39}David, p. 311, suggests Jason as a possibility, but apparently is unaware of McCrystall's work. David argues that the earlier Vorlage which can be reconstructed from the LXX envisaged the restoration of the temple and the vindication of the High Priest. His interpretation in vs. 26 depends on the "probability" of the different verb as well as the dubious emendation of χρίσμα to χριστος based on the reading of έπνοι (vs. ἐπνοοῦ) in MT (pp. 296-297, 312-313). How can there be any controls on methodology if he wants to propose a Vorlage for the LXX but prefers a reading of MT in order to justify it?
Even a glance at HR under ἀφιστάν, ἀφιστάναι, ἀφιστάνειν would reveal there are twelve occurrences of ἀφιστήμι for five Semitic verbs in OG. In OG, and the rest of the LXX, the verb is most often employed in the sense "turn away, depart"—whether it is ἀπέστημεν ἀκόσω (i.e. God, Dan. 9:9) or ἀποστῆμαι ἀκὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (Dan. 9:13) and "remove, withdraw." This latter sense overlaps with the meaning of the Hebrew הָסִּיב "will be cut off," so the OG translator employed one of his favourite words in the general sense of "will be removed." This explanation is confirmed by the very similar situation in 11:4 where the OG uses ἀποσταθήσεται to translate מִטְהַר (a niphal imperfect of a verb which is a HL in Daniel!). Confronted by an unfamiliar verb in the niphal imperfect, and a context in which it could be guessed that the meaning of the verb in 11:4 was something like "will be removed/destroyed," the translator opted for the exact same form of a favourite verb which had been employed earlier.

Finally, the last type of contextual guess refers to times when the translators seem to have read the consonantal text differently in order to produce their translation. That is, their reading is based on an adjustment of one or more letters in the consonantal text. For

40 ἐφίστημι: 7:12 (aph.); ἐφίστημ: 9:9; ἐφίστημ: 9:5, 11 (q.), 11:31 (hi.), 12:11 (ho.). 11:4 is also problematic (HR marks with a dagger) and is discussed below. 3:29, 35; 4:15–MT=0; 2:5, 8 are hexaplaric. The vb. is only 7 times in Th.

41 See Jer. 40(33):8; Sir. 2:3; 1 Ki. 16:14.

42 See Dan. 3:35; Jer. 14:19; Jud. 13:14; 1 Ki. 6:3.

43 See also the similar use in Prov. 23:18. An examination of the renderings for מִטְהַר in the LXX also reveals that the translators employed various equivalents. See the list of equivalents in E. C. Dos Santos, ed., An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch–Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint. (Baptist House, Jerusalem: Dugith, n.d.), 95.

44 McCrystall, pp. 90–91, argues for the future middle in 11:4 (ἀποσταθήσεται) which is attested in 967, though he never explains the importance of the point. In our view it is at least as likely that 967 omitted αθ from the future passive and produced the middle form due to parablepsis or phonetic error as it is that the letters were added to an original future middle (See also 3:24 in CH 2.11.2). The fact that the future middle would be a hapax legomenon casts further doubt on the probability of the reading.
example, in Dan. 8:25 the MT has the difficult reading, מְגַנְבָּא "without hand," which CG renders with καὶ ποιήσει συναγωγήν χειρός "and [then] he will make/cause a gathering by [his] hand." However we construe the Greek, the reading seems to be derived from the translator having read מְגַנְבָּא as a hiphil perfect of מְגַנְבָּא (מְגַנְבָּא). 45 The argument that the translator has reread the consonantal text is based on the fact that the addition of the auxiliary verb ποιήσει was one of the means of the translator's to render causatives 46 and συνάγει frequently renders κολύ. In effect, the translator read a א for ב, transposed the letters כ ב, and read the changed letters as a hifil perfect with י consecutive. The motivation for this change was that the translator did not know the meaning of the HL כ ב. Now, it may be that a variant had already arisen in the text before the translator, but given the evidence it is more likely that the translator adjusted the text so that he could make sense out of it. As Tov suggests, the translator may have assumed (or at least justified his approach in his own mind) that a scribe had made a transcriptional error. 47

II.3. Langue and Parole.

Another distinction made by Saussure was that between langue and parole (there are no generally accepted translation equivalents in English). Langue refers to language as an abstract system, which is common to all speakers of a language community, while parole refers to the actual discourse of individuals within the community. 48 Both of these aspects of language play an important role in the study of TT. In the act of translation the original translator has to read the


47 Tov, "Did the Translators," pp. 61-64.

48 Lyons, Semantics, p. 239.
source text (which as a written document is an example of parole), and attempts to decode the meaning of that text on the basis of his/her knowledge of the grammar of the source language (langue). The translator then has to encode the message of the source text in the receptor language (parole) based on his/her knowledge of the grammar of that language (langue). These are minimum requirements for what the translator does though we cannot be absolutely sure how the neurological process takes place.\textsuperscript{49}

TT analyzes language as it is employed in the receptor text, so it is an investigation of the parole of that particular unit of translation. The basis for the comparison is the source text (see 11.5 below), but TT is an analysis of how the translator chose to render the source text in the target language. Another word to refer to the choices made by an author in speech or writing is style.\textsuperscript{50} Since style is at the very essence of TT we cannot agree with Szpek who regards style as one of the four main elements of a translation (along with grammar, syntax, and semantics) to be analyzed. She defines style as "elements of choice which an author can impart to a text for aesthetic reasons," and limits the investigation of stylistic elements to three areas: sentence type, figurative language, and idiom.\textsuperscript{51} The analysis of style could be limited in the way that Szpek does, but it tends to foster ambiguity because there are a multitude of features in a discourse that contribute to the aesthetic quality (and meaning) of the text. Even though the content of the translation is highly influenced by the source text, the translator still chooses particular words (sometimes based on phonology), syntax, and rhetorical devices in the creation of the translation.\textsuperscript{52} The elements

\textsuperscript{49}Chomsky has argued that the faculty for language is genetically encoded in the brain; but, even if this is true, we do not know how the process takes place. See N. Chomsky, \textit{Rules and Representations}, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980), pp. 3-87, 185-216; Lyons provides a useful overview in \textit{Language}, pp. 248-257.


\textsuperscript{51}Szpek, pp. 24, 201-257.

\textsuperscript{52}For an excellent volume on style and discourse as it relates to biblical studies, see Nida et al, \textit{Style and Discourse: With Special Reference to the Greek New Testament}, (Cape Town: United Bible Societies, 1983). A full discourse analysis of the translation is
that Szpek treats as aspects of style are readily treated under other categories (see III.1.i.).

While TT is a description of the *parole* in a particular translation unit, it is important to recognize that the translator's interpretation of the source text is based on his/her understanding of the *langue* of the source language as it is applied to that particular text.\(^5\) It is for this reason that we can say that the study of TT will expose the translator's discourse analysis of the parent text.\(^4\) Another way of describing the process of translation and the perspective of the one engaged in the study of TT is to visualize it as we have it in Figure 1.

In Figure 1 the S stands for the source text while the R stands for the receptor text. The Transfer System is the translator. There beyond the parameters of TT because of its concern to compare the translation with its Vorlage.


\(^4\) Whether the translator renders words or phrases more or less in isolation from the larger context, or attempts to bear in mind the larger context as s/he treats the smaller units, s/he is grappling with the structure of the discourse. Furthermore, the fact that a translator makes a more or less word-for-word formally equivalent translation does not necessarily entail that s/he did not consider the larger context. See Barr, "Typology," p. 297; Soisalon-Soininen, "Methodologische Fragen," p. 431.
are other factors which enter into the process of decoding the meaning of the source text such as the translator's knowledge of vocabulary and cultural differences, but the present focus is the interplay of langue and parole for the translator who acts as the medium of transferring the source text into the target language. As a point of interest the reader of the receptor text has been included in the diagram in order to point out that s/he has no access to the original text or the translation process. The diagram also makes clear that the analyst of TT stands above the source and receptor texts, able to view both simultaneously and, therefore, is in a position to describe how the translator (Transfer System) went about the task of translation. Ideally, the analyst of TT would be omniscient regarding the language, time and place in which both texts were produced and would have both texts in their original form.

It is obvious from the discussion thus far that we are far from the ideal position to an analysis of TT of the LXX. However, despite the deficiencies in our knowledge regarding the production and copying of both the MT and LXX, the task is not impossible. We can never attain absolute certainty in our results but we can achieve a high degree of probability.

II.4. TT is an Analysis of Structure.

The emphasis on structuralism in linguistics once again originates with Saussure. The thesis of structuralism is:

\[ \text{that every language is a unique relational structure, or system, and that the units which we identify, or postulate as theoretical constructs, in analysing the sentence of a particular language (sounds, words, meanings, etc.) derive both their essence and their existence from their relationships with other units in the same language-system. We cannot first identify the units and then, at a subsequent stage of the analysis, enquire what combinatorial or other relations hold between them: we simultaneously identify both the units and their interrelations.} \]

We can illustrate this thesis at any level of language. For example, at the level of phonology the \( b \) in big is said to be syntagmatically related to \( i \) and \( g \). If the \( b \) were combined syntagmatically with the

\[ 55 \text{Lyons, Semantics, pp. 231-232.} \]
letters a and r a different word would result, bar. At the same time
the b is paradigmatically related to d, f, g, j, p, r, t (tig is a
children's game in England which is called tag in North America), w,
and z. Linguists use minimal pairs such as big pig tig etc. in order
to determine the abstract system of sounds (phonemes) in a language,
which distinguish meaning in the actual sounds that we hear and say.56
The same principles are employed when the word big is examined as part
of the sequence the big dog. In this phrase big is said to be in
syntagmatic relation with the and dog. We could also substitute the
paradigmatically related words brown, shaggy, or small for big and
still have a grammatically correct and semantically acceptable phrase
(or syntagm), though its meaning would be different. Just as the
selection and combination of different phonemes to create different
words reflects the structure of the phonological system, the selection
and combination of different words reflects the lexical structure.
"The theoretically important point is that the structure of the
language-system depends at every level upon the complementary
principles of selection and combination."57

The selection and combination of different units also affects
the semantic information of the message.58 This is most obvious at
the paradigmatic level. For example, the words the big dog do not
convey the same meaning as the brown dog where colour, and not size,
is the point of emphasis even though the referent is the same. The
role of syntagmatic relations (context) in determining meaning can be
illustrated by comparing the big poodle with the big German Shepherd.
A better example would be to contrast the big man (fat or person in
charge) with the big brother (older or guardian). A more extensive
discussion of the structural relations between the senses of words is
given below (III.1.iii.).


The same principles apply to the morphological and syntactical
structure. Syntax will be discussed below. For an example of this
approach applied to the morphology of the Hebrew verb, see Gleason,
Linguistics, pp. 67-73.

good discussion of the theory of semantic fields, see Lehrer, Semantic
Fields, pp. 15-43.
The connection between the structure of the language system and semantic information conveyed is critical for the analysis of TT, because the structure of two different languages will inevitably reveal differences. In the process of translating the translator is immediately confronted with the clash between structure and meaning. That is, if the translator attempts to render the source text using the same surface structures in the target language (*formal equivalence*), then there is liable to be some loss of meaning. Loss of meaning occurs because the surface structures of the target language do not convey meaning in the same way as the surface structures of the source language. Conversely, the decision to render the meaning of the *Vorlage* will often require the choice of different surface structures in the target language (*dynamic equivalence*). In the LXX the translators were able to reproduce the formal structure of their semitic *Vorlage* largely because of the freedom allowed in Greek word order. This ability to mimic the semitic text resulted in unusual, but rarely "grammatically incorrect" Greek. More often is the case that grammatically correct Greek is found, but certain constructions occur with unusual frequency; and/or typical Greek idioms are not encountered as frequently as would otherwise be expected. However, as the criticisms in the third chapter revealed, in the midst of the basically formal approach there is relevance in the variations that we do find. At this point it is best to offer some examples to illustrate the differences between the linguistic structure of Hebrew and Greek, and how they relate to TT.

One area where significant differences in the structures of two

---

59 Nida, *Science*, pp. 159-176. For the most part we only have to be concerned with the surface (as opposed to deep) structure of grammar because the LXX translators reproduced so much of the formal structure of their source. However, occasions where the translators made additions to the text to make an element explicit that was only implicit in the source text, or made transformations (eg. changed an active verb to a passive) do reflect their understanding of deep structure. For explanations of deep structure (transformational) grammar, see J. Lyons, *Chomsky*, (London: Fontana, 1970); A. Radford, *Transformational Syntax: A student's guide to extended standard theory*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1981).
languages will appear is syntax,\(^60\) and one subject within syntax to study is how clauses are connected to one another through the use of conjunctions. Conjunctions do not have referential meaning but function on the syntactic level to indicate the logical relationship between two or more clauses. For this reason they are referred to as functional or grammatical morphemes.\(^61\) Since clause connectors indicate the relationship between clauses, their translation in any given instance depends on the connection between the clauses in which they appear. In theory, a translation would express in the appropriate style and syntax of the target language the logical relationship of the two clauses in the source language. The process of reproducing these logical relationships from one language into another presents certain challenges, because no two languages use conjunctions in the same way. For example, the extensive use of ' in HA means that discourse is chiefly paratactic in style; whereas Greek tends to prefer elaborate subordinate clauses and participial constructions. Due to the different means of expressing the relationships between clauses in HA and Greek, and the fact that Greek has such a variety of conjunctions and syntactical possibilities at its disposal, there are often a number of possible ways for the Greek to express the meaning of the HA. However, despite the options available the LXX more often than not renders the ' with καί. Καί has a high rate of occurrence throughout the LXX, while ήτι appears relatively seldom. In original Greek the situation is reversed.\(^62\) As Aejmelaeus has so cogently argued, the significance of the translation of ' for TT is not so much the use of καί (since that was the formal equivalent),

\(^{60}\) Syntactical criteria for the analysis of TT have been the focus of Soisalon-Soininen, Aejmelaeus, and Sollamo in their investigations of the Septuagint. Besides the works previously mentioned see the bibliography. A handy compendium of I. Soisalon-Soininen's work has been published as Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax, AASF, B, 237 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987).

\(^{61}\) Yule, Language, p. 61; Ullmann, Principles, p. 59.

\(^{62}\) This was noted to be the case in the OG and Th versions of Daniel by Wikgren, "Comparative Study," pp. 18, 25; see also R. A. Martin, "Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation Greek," VT 10 (1960): 295–310. Aejmelaeus ("Clause Connectors," pp. 368–371) finds that γάρ and οὐδὲ are also comparatively infrequent in the LXX.
but the type and frequency of alternative renditions. Different patterns of usage may also indicate different translators of scriptural units or later recensionists. Depending on the consistency of TT, a particular usage may be valuable for textual criticism as well.

Other ways that syntactical differences between languages affect TT have to do primarily with how the translator fills the required positions of the source language in the target text. These categories are commonly referred to as "slot and filler." Here we have to do with paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations on the syntactic level. For example, the clause He barks consists of a noun phrase (subject) and a verb phrase (predicate). We could replace the noun phrase with any number of different options such as Lassie, The ferocious dog, or The ferocious one. We could also expand the noun phrase by adding some kind of qualifier such as, The dog on the porch, or The dog who is on the porch, etc. It will be noticed that it is possible to add slots in various positions on the syntagmatic level, but that only certain classes of structures can fill (are paradigmatically related) particular positions. Ferocious and on the porch cannot fill one another's slots, while on the porch and who is on the porch are interchangeable but are composed of different structures.

The point of all this discussion for TT is that differing languages, such as Hebrew and Greek, not only arrange their slots differently; they also can fill them differently. When transferring

63Aejmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," pp. 369-370. See particularly her criticism of McGregor (Ezekiel, pp. 51-54) who describes the statistical differences in how 'is rendered in the Pentateuch as meaningless.

64This type of comparison is the basis of several investigations, such as those by Thackeray, Tov, and McGregor. See H. St. J. Thackeray, "Bisection," pp. 88-98; "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX," JTS 9 (1908): 597-601; the works of Barthélemy (1963), Shenkel (1968), Tov (1976), Bodine (1980), Greenspoon (1983), and McGregor (1985).

a message from one language to another the translator first has to decode the syntactic structure of the source text and then has to choose appropriate structures in the source language to encode the translation. A translator following a model of formal correspondence attempts to fill each slot in the target text with the same structure and in the same order as the source text. However, there are often other options available for the translator to employ. For example, in Dan. 1:5 the Hebrew reads: יַעֲבֹד הַשָּׁבָעָה. OG substitutes an adjective in the attributive position for the definite noun in the genitive and translates with ἀνώ τῆς βασιλείας τραπέζης. The Greek language allowed the translator to choose a structure which can fill a different slot in order to convey the same meaning. Compare Th who translates with ἀνώ τῆς τραπέζης βασιλείας.

Structural divergences and the ability to choose alternative renderings can result in various types of changes in the formal structure of the target text when compared to the source text. The example in the previous paragraph illustrated a change in word order as well as in word class (morphology). The addition or omission of articles, prepositions, conjunctions, and pronouns in a translation is also common due to differing linguistic structures. What is required in one language is redundant in another. The number of changes will be affected by the degree to which the translator attempts to adhere to the formal structure of the source text, but


66 This is the emphasis of J. Heller's investigation in which he states, "Man muß auch gleich . . . die Frage stellen, inwieweit die Abweichungen des LXX von ihrer Vorlage durch die sprachlichen Möglichkeiten des Griechischen bedingt wurden." See "Grenzen sprachlicher Entsprechung der LXX," MIO 5 (1969): 234.


68 See Nida, Science, pp. 226-238.
even in Th there are times when additions or omissions occur. Some of these changes may at times reflect a formal rendering of a text that was slightly different from MT, but extreme care and judicious arguments must guide any argument in a specific text. A slightly different cause of a change can be a structure which is ambiguous in the source text. In the choice of a specific rendering the translator may have to resolve the ambiguity. On the other hand, the translator may not have perceived any ambiguity at all. For example, in 4:24(27) MT has אֲבַרְכָּהּ לְפַלְלָה, which could be translated as "length of your prosperity." However, Th has μακρόθυμος τοῖς παρακτώμασί σου "forbearance toward your sin" by reading the pointing of MT as אָבַרְכָּהּ לְפַלְלָה. It is easy to see how אֲבַרְכָּה "healing" and לְפַלְלָה "lengthening" (the marker of the vowel 1 may not have been written), and נֵפֶשׁ "neglect, error" and אֶזְרָה "ease, prosperity" (with the addition of the pronominal suffix they were written identically in a consonantal text, יְזָרָה) could be confused. The decisive reason why the pointing of MT is accepted as correct by commentators is the fact that the adjective נֵפֶשׁ "at ease" appears in 4:1. We will explore the significance of the morphological and lexical structure of language for TT in further detail below (see III.1.i,iii), but our discussion has demonstrated that TT has to be concerned with the detailed analysis of structure. Structure and meaning—or form and content—are integrally related in a language and no two languages are exactly alike. Therefore, in the process of translating from one language into another the ancient translator had to resolve the tension of reproducing the meaning of the Vorlage in an acceptable form in the target language. The overwhelming preference in the LXX was to encode that meaning in the target language using similar structures as the source language, but this was not always practical

69 See the discussion of non-variants in TCU, pp. 217-228; Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know?" pp. 58-89; Wevers, "Versions," pp. 15-24.

70 See Mont., p. 243 and Goldingay, p. 81. Meadowcroft, p. 309, incorrectly suggests that "while this translation could owe something to a broadening semantic range of the Aramaic, it also, has a theological point to it." It is true that the resulting text of Th has a different theological slant, but the difference is based in a different reading of the consonantal text and was not due to any interpretive activity.
or desirable. Different translators departed from formal equivalence for divergent reasons. For this reason, the analysis of TT is based on the detailed study of the structure of a translation unit—word by word, phrase by phrase, clause by clause—by comparing and contrasting how the translator made a particular rendition in a specific context with all other renditions of the same element.

II.5. TT takes the Source Language as its Point of Departure.

Considering what we have already written about the translation process, there should be little need to establish this last point. As we have emphasized, the aim of TT is to describe how a translator rendered the source text; therefore, the point of comparison for the renderings in the target language is always going to be the parent text. This methodological presupposition was clearly established in the work of Frankel in 1841, and was followed in the later work of Thackeray and Wifstrand. During the recent resurgence of studies in the field of TT this principle has been taken for granted. However, there have been several works that have not followed this principle and must be used with great care. There is little gained as far as TT is concerned if the investigator compares the use and frequency of a certain Greek construction in the LXX without investigating the HA from which the uses were derived.

Emphasizing that TT analyses how the translator rendered the

---


74 This is particularly true of M. Johannesson, Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta, (Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1925); Der Gebrauch der Kasus in der Septuaginta, (Ph.D. Dissertation, Berlin 1910). The same can be said of Rife's investigations ("Mechanics" and "Daniel"), though at the time he was concerned with the question of whether the gospels were translations of semitic originals.
source text does not mean that the target language is ignored, because
the significance of the renderings employed for a specific construction
are better understood when compared to contemporary writings in the
source language. Such a comparison yields information concerning
the degree to which the translators conformed to contemporary usage
of the target language, or, on the other hand, the influence of the
source language. In the case of the LXX, the pervasive influence of
the LXX on the NT and the appearance of Septuagintisms (e.g. χαὶ
τῷ ναῶς) at one time engendered fierce debates about the semitic
character of the gospels. Ideally, we would compare every element
in the translation to its use in contemporary literature. This
procedure is feasible when only one feature of translation is
examined, but impractical when studying a whole translation. For
this reason we will have to limit detailed analysis to selected
features.

In conclusion, the description of the TT of a unit of
translation requires the comparison of the translation equivalents of
the unit with the elements of the source text from which they were
derived. The comparison of the translation equivalents with their

75 Sollamo, "Improper prepositions," pp. 473-475; Semiprepositions,
pp. 3-10.

76 Aejmelaeus ("Clause Connectors," p. 363) notes that the degree
of difficulty involved in the source text is another factor to
consider in the analysis of TT.

77 A. Deissman was the leading exponent of the view that the
language of the NT was not a Jewish Greek dialect although the NT does
contain semitisms which were mediated through the LXX. See A.
Deissmann, The Philology of the Greek Bible: Its Present and Future,
(London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), p. 65; A. Thumb, Die griechische
Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus, (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner,
1901). Silva gives a very lucid analysis of this debate from the
perspective of the distinction between langue and parole in
"Bilingualism," pp. 198-219. See also Rife ("Mechanics" and
"Daniel"), Wikgren ("Comparative Study"), and Martin ("Syntactical
Criteria" and Semitic Evidences) for discussions of the
characteristics of translation vs. original Greek.

78 One of the strengths of the work of Soisalon-Soininen,
Aejmelaeus, and, particularly, Sollamo is their comparison of the
translation equivalents of the LXX to the standard usage of those
equivalents in a selection of writings from the large corpus of extant
Greek literature.
usage in contemporaneous texts of the target language will also illuminate the degree to which the translation adheres to the standard of usage in the target language. On this basis we are able to:

1. Describe the general character of the TT employed.
2. Describe in detail any feature in the translation.
3. Determine the idiosyncrasies or features of the translation and thereby isolate the distinguishing characteristics of the individual translator or recensionist.
4. Apply the knowledge gained from TT to textual criticism.

III. A Model for Translation Technique

Having established some presuppositions and discussed their implications for the analysis of TT, we can now present the model for analysing a text. As previously mentioned, the approach presented here has been anticipated in many respects by Heidi Szpek's recent examination of the Peshitta to Job. For this reason, it is appropriate to employ her terminology and categories as much as possible in order to promote standardization. However, there are significant differences in the approach presented here that will be explained in due course. First, there are some introductory comments on the model.

It will be recalled from our diagram in Sec. II.3. that the act of translation requires the use of a transfer system (a translator) to decode the message of the source text and encode that message in the target language. To break down that picture even further we would say that the translator has to first decode individual structural elements of the source text. The translator then has to encode that message in the target language, but s/he must make adjustments in the formal structure of the message due to the different linguistic structures of the two languages. The number of adjustments will largely depend upon the inherent differences in the two languages and how closely the translator attempts to maintain formal correspondence with the source text. There are of course other reasons why adjustments were made in the case of the ancient versions (eg. textual difficulties, errors by the translator). Finally, we have to do with the actual translated element in the target text. What is the effect on the meaning of the
structure which has passed through the transfer system? Is it basically synonymous, or has some alteration taken place? Viewed in this way the "act of translation can be conceptualized as a systematic process involving four interconnected components." To adopt the terminology of Szpek, the names of these four components are: 1. Element of Translation; 2. Adjustment; 3. Motivation; 4. Effect on Meaning.

As the diagram in Sec. II.3. makes clear, the analyst of TT stands above the translation process and seeks to describe what happened. Therefore, if the translation process involves four steps as outlined above, then we can utilize the same four categories to analyze an existing text. Each of the four main components can be broken down into various subcategories as depicted below in Figure 2. The diagram is based on the one provided by Szpek except for changes introduced to account for the results of our research.

In the remainder of this section each of the four main components of translation will be discussed in order to clarify any significant issues and to indicate where our approach differs from Szpek. There is no necessity to define and give examples for every subcategory individually because Szpek has already done so. We have also discussed many of the subcategories in Sec. II. above, and they will be amply illustrated in the analysis in the following chapter. The majority of space is given to the treatment of the first main category for two reasons. First, the most significant differences between Szpek and myself are in how to subdivide the structure of the text. Second, the discussion concerning the elements of translation will entail some remarks about the other categories because the latter presuppose the former.

---

79 Szpek, p. 13. As previously mentioned, we do not know exactly how this occurs as a neurological function. The division of the translation process into four components is merely an aid for organization and explanation.

80 See Szpek, p. 15. The additions made to her diagram are indicated by bold lettering, while omissions are separated from their column and placed in brackets.

81 Szpek, pp. 16-59.
Model of Translation Technique

Element of Translation

- Linguistics
  - Morphology
  - Syntax
  - Lexicology

Adjustment

- Universally Oriented
- Syntactically Oriented
- Lexically Oriented
- Addition
- Omission
- Substitution
- Transposition
- Redivision
- Generalization
- Specification
- Interpretation
- Lexical Leveling
- Transliteration
- Clarification
- Harmonization

Motivation

- Language Difference
- Linguistic Interference
- Implicit to Explicit
- Ideology
- Ambiguity
- Redundancy
- Error
- Textual Difficulty
- Phonology
- Harmonization
- Literary Technique
- Versional Influence/Parallel

Effect on Meaning

- Reader
- Translator
- Evaluator
- Clarity
- Confusion
- Synonymy
- Antithesis
- Innovation

Figure 2
III.1. Element of Translation

The analysis of TT is based on the presupposition that we first have to define what the translator has done before we can begin to answer how and why s/he did it. In order to explain this distinction it is helpful to recall the diagram in Sec. II.3. and the discussion in the introduction to this section. If "the translator has to first decode individual structural elements of the source text [before s/he] encode[s] that message in the target language," then the analyst of TT begins by comparing the similarities and differences between the structural elements in the source and receptor texts. It is by means of this formal comparison that differences are discovered that were introduced by the transfer system (the translator). Therefore, it is only after this initial comparison that the analyst can begin to formulate answers to the questions about the transfer system, i.e. how the translator made changes (Adjustment), why the changes were made (Motivation), and finally the effect that these changes had on meaning.

According to the TT model the elements of translation can be classified under three subcategories: Morphology, Syntax, and Lexicology. Since these translational elements are the basis for the investigation of TT; we will examine each of them individually. First, however, we will discuss the differences between Szpek's approach and the one proposed here.

The classification proposed here is different from Szpek's in three areas. The first is very trivial. Where Szpek uses the term Grammar we use Morphology. Many linguists and the vast majority of biblical scholars would understand the study of grammar to include both morphology and syntax; therefore, this distinction should be kept in the model to avoid confusion. The exclusion of Style and the substitution of Lexicology for Semantics as categories are more substantive changes.

Style is excluded because it cuts across all linguistic categories so that each choice is to some degree representative of style; therefore, a separate category to mark so-called aesthetic
features of style is arbitrary.\textsuperscript{82} Szpek lists three topics under Style: figurative language, idiom, and sentence type. Changes due to the use of figurative language (simile, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche), and differences in sentence type are readily described as adjustments at the lexical and syntactic level involving substitution. Idiomatic expressions pose a difficulty not only for translators but also for our classification. However, they can be considered as additions, omissions, or substitutions at the lexical level.\textsuperscript{83}

The third difference between our model and Szpek's is the inclusion of the category Lexicology as opposed to Semantics. By introducing Semantics—which by definition has to do with meaning—at the initial stage, Szpek presents two sources of possible confusion. First, lexicology is a more appropriate term for the analysis of vocabulary because the analysis of words for TT is not strictly a matter of meaning. We could say that Lexicology is a more neutral term than Semantics. This point is illustrated by occasions where the translators utilized a SE to translate a word in the Vorlage without regard to the semantic range of the SE as an adequate choice for those particular contexts.\textsuperscript{84} Furthermore, TT is primarily concerned to describe what the translator did regardless of why it was done or the effect of the adjustments on the meaning of the text. Meaning is important for the determination of how the translator understood the text, and, therefore, the translation equivalents that s/he chooses to render the Vorlage. However, if we are going to conceptualize translation as a process, then it is more appropriate to isolate

\textsuperscript{82}See Sec. II.3. above for the discussion of style. Szpek, herself, speaks of stylistic preference with regard to word order on pp. 108-109.

\textsuperscript{83}Idiomatic phrases can be treated as single semantic units because the meaning of the whole is not derived from the individual meanings of the parts (eg. hit the ceiling, in the doghouse, up the creek). See especially, W. L. Chafe, Meaning and the Structure of Language, (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1970), pp. 44-50; also E. Nida, Componential Analysis of Meaning, (Paris: Mouton, 1975), pp. 113-115; Nida and Louw, Semantics, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{84}It is for this reason Tov ("Three Dimensions, pp. 535-538) argues that Greek words became, more or less, "mere symbols representing Hebrew words," (p. 535) and that the description of the meaning of such words in the LXX could be dependent on the meaning of its Hebrew equivalent.
semantic considerations of the actual choice of renderings to the transfer system. This distinction between the encoding process in the transfer system and the formal surface structure chosen to be employed in the translation is based on the recognition of a clear distinction between the meaning (semantic structure) one is attempting to communicate and how that meaning is converted into a surface structure. 85

Second, Lexicology is more appropriate as a subcategory because it is more definitive with regard to the subject of study: words. As it happens, the majority of Szpek's discussion of Semantics is devoted to problems of lexical semantics. 86 However, semantics is not limited to the meaning of words, but includes the phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, and discourse as well. To use Szpek's method consistently the analyst of TT would have to examine the semantics of the phrase, clause, and sentence in addition to and separately from the formal syntactic devices (word order, inflection, articles, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.) employed by language for the conveying of linguistic relations. The fact that Szpek was working with two Semitic languages in her analysis meant that the syntactic systems were very close; therefore, her inclusion of semantics did not pose particular difficulties. However, there is little point in examining the formal structures of syntax in isolation from the meaning of these structures, because there is no linguistic basis to expect the morphology of the syntactic systems of two languages to agree. 87 The Semitic languages and Greek are prime examples of this fact. That is why we have argued that TT should begin with a formal description of the Morphology, Lexicology, and Syntax of the translation as compared to the source text before considering how the meaning has been affected. In this way all the elements of the translation can be classified consistently and systematically analyzed as to how they

85 See Chafe, pp. 15-91.
86 Szpek, pp. 133-199.
87 See Ullmann's (Principles, pp. 24-40) discussion of the distinction between the formal signals of lexical and syntactic morphology on the one hand, and their meaning on the other. This conclusion is also borne out by the early attempts of generative grammar to treat syntax apart from semantics.
have been employed to translate the elements of the source text.

The difference in our classification may be illustrated from two of Szpek's examples. Szpek refers to a participle in Job 1:12 as an adjustment at the phrase level of semantics and states, "P[eshitta] adds the participle... 'is delivered', implicit in the Heb... Thus, in this example it is through addition that P adjusts the semantics of the Heb. phrase to the translator's explicit style of expression."\(^{88}\) Szpek is correct. However, we propose to classify it initially as an addition at the phrase level of syntax. There is very little difference in the two methods until we compare the addition of the participle in 1:12 to the addition of the dative "to him" in 1:14.

Szpek describes the addition of the dative as an addition at the phrase level of syntax,\(^{89}\) but there is no formal distinction between the addition of the participle in 1:12 and the dative "to him" in 1:14. Therefore, our model would treat them both as variations in syntax. Ultimately, the difference in methodology is similar to the objection to the use of the Style criterion. Every syntactic choice reflects the translator's understanding of the meaning of the source text; the difference between those structures which convey a synonymous (or nearly so) reading and those which do not is only a matter of degree.\(^{90}\)

By postponing the treatment of Semantic issues and treating Lexicology and Syntax as separate entities it is possible to provide a clear and comprehensive formal comparative description of the source and receptor texts.\(^{91}\) In the end, every relationship between two texts, both the similarities and differences, can be described as additions, omissions, or substitutions in the forms of the words, the choice of particular words, or in how the words are put together to form larger meaningful units of discourse. We will now examine these

---

\(^{88}\)Szpek, pp. 23-24. Note the use of style in the sense of choice in this example as well.

\(^{89}\)Szpek, p. 21.

\(^{90}\)Here we are assuming that the translator is attempting to convey the basic semantic content of the text and is not adding material due to theological Tendenz. See also Barr, "Typology," pp. 290-291.

\(^{91}\)So also Sollamo, "Prepositions," p. 775, who refers to "vocabulary, morphology, and syntax."
subcategories in more detail.

III.1.i. Morphology

As a working definition a morpheme could be described as "a minimal unit of meaning or grammatical function." For example, the phrase the old players consists of three words but five morphemes. The and old are both free morphemes because they can stand alone, but the former is regarded as a functional morpheme since it does not have meaning by itself. The word players has three morphemes. Play like old is a lexical (it has meaning) morpheme, and, like many other free morphemes, play can serve as the basic building block (stem) for other words. Words are constructed through the addition of bound morphemes such as er (meaning "person who does something") and s (indicating plural) to a stem. There are two types of bound morphemes: derivational and inflectional. Inflectional morphemes like s are used to grammaticalize (represent a meaning through the choice of a specific form) number, tense, mood, etc. Derivational morphemes like er are used to form new words and often the new word is part of a different grammatical category. For example, the addition of ly to the adjective quick makes the adverb quickly. Finally, it is necessary to point out that the same morpheme can be realized in more than one form (referred to as allomorphs), and, conversely, there are phonemically similar morphemes. To illustrate allomorphs we can contrast the plural indicator s in players with the infix e in men. For an example of phonemically similar morphemes, contrast that same s indicating plural with the s in the clause he walks, which indicates third person singular.

It has already been established that the semitic languages Hebrew and Aramaic have a morphological structure which differs from the Indo-European Greek language. Therefore, for the purposes of TT it is important to identify the morphemes in the source text and compare how the morphemes are represented in the translation, while

---

bearing in mind the differences in morphological structure between the two languages. The morphological elements identified by Szpek for the Peshitta to Job are number, gender, person, word class, pronoun, suffix, tense, and voice. She also notes that mood might be another category to investigate, and we would add definiteness to this list as well. Different languages grammaticalize for different aspects of language and communication, but these categories should be sufficient for the TT of the LXX, Peshitta, Targums, and Latin versions.

All of the aforementioned morphological categories require attention for the analysis of the LXX. Generally speaking, functional and bound morphemes tend to be particularly numerous and diverse in their usage in all languages, so it is not surprising that they pose particular difficulties for the TT of the LXX. For example, the fact that the bound morpheme ָּ has diverse functions in Hebrew (as a preposition used spatially, temporally; with the inf. cons.; marker of dative, apposition, idiom with ְּ denoting possession, etc.) means that a mere percentage indicating how often the morpheme is formally represented by a distinct preposition or article in the Greek text would be useless. The function of the morpheme in each case has to be determined in order to compare how it is translated in all passages where it has a similar grammatical function. For example, in Dan. 2:2 the ָּ is bound to an infinitive construct to form ָּ, but the aorist active infinitive ָּ is all the OG requires for

---

93 Szpek, pp. 16-20. Interchanges of active/passive, noun/verb, and noun/adjective in the source text and the translation are transformations involving the deep structure of grammar. For a discussion, see Nida, Science, pp. 195-201, 228; for examples, see Rabin, "Indefinite Subject," pp. 60-76.


95 Tov classifies many of these morphological differences as non-variants (TOU, 219-228) for the purposes of textual criticism because it is so difficult to determine whether the addition or omission of these morphemes in the LXX reflects the actual reading of the Vorlage.

96 See Waltke and O'Connor, pp. 602-610 for uses with inf. cons. and 205-212 as a preposition.
translation. Likewise, in 2:24 the \( \lambda \) marking the dative and the emphatic state of the noun marked by \( \& \) in the word לְלָכַּה are both represented in the Greek texts by the article τῶν.\(^{98}\)

Very important morphological differences between HA and Greek also exist in the nominal and verbal systems.\(^{99}\) For example, aspect/tense and mood are far more distinctive in the morphological structure of Greek than in HA.\(^{100}\) Therefore, when the translators of the LXX had to grammaticalize a verb in the translation, they had to impose features of tense and mood which were not part of the formal structure of the HA text. On the other hand, the system of verbal stems of HA makes different distinctions in Aktionsart than does Greek.\(^{101}\) These distinctions are partially compensated for in Greek through the grammaticalization of voice, but in certain cases (causatives, intensives) the translators could only convey the meaning..."
through their lexical choices. These examples indicate that TT has to be concerned with how the morphological features of the source text (MT) were conveyed in the target text (LXX).

III.1.ii. Syntax

Syntax is the study of the structure and ordering of morphemes and groups of morphemes (i.e. words) in meaningful combinations. We have already dealt with the nature of syntactic combinations and their relevance for TT in the discussion of structure in Sec. II.4. Syntagmatic or paradigmatic concerns may contribute to differences at the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level of the translation. We need only add that the choice of Greek conjunctions can entail differences in word-order (e.g. yap, δὲ, ὥν) or require a particular grammaticalization of the verb (e.g. ἐνα, ἔπειτα + subjunctive).

III.1.iii. Lexicology

Lexicology is concerned with the analysis of individual lexemes (words) as translation equivalents for the vocabulary of the source text. As with Morphology and Syntax, the analysis of vocabulary for TT essentially involves a comparison of contrasting lexical structures. Gleason illustrates this principle when he contrasts how speakers of various languages classify the colours of the rainbow. While English classifies the colours in six categories (purple, blue,
green, yellow, orange, red), Shona uses four and Bassa only two. Clearly there is no difference in the denotational field described, it is the languages which make different types of distinctions. The fact that English (and by extension the English speaker) makes more distinctions between the colours does not make it "better" nor more "advanced." Every language has the capacity to refer to all aspects of human experience, they just do so differently. This example also helps to demonstrate that the meaning of each colour term in each language is to a certain extent determined by its relation to the other terms on the colour continuum. The same principle of structural relations applies to the use of most vocabulary. This is not to deny that there are some words with a very high denotational value (e.g. technical terms), but "the vast majority of words have at least some significant relational value and, ... this relational value is of more basic importance than denotation."

Linguists refer to the analysis of a conceptual field, such as colour in the preceding paragraph, as an example of a "semantic field." The analysis of semantic fields involves the collection and investigation of the relationship between the set of words that belong

---

103 Gleason, p. 4.

104 Words are not, therefore, labels for concepts like exhibits in a museum (the "museum myth"). See J. Bennett, Linguistic Behaviour, (Cambridge: University Press, 1976), pp. 5-10; Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 30-33.

105 Lyons, Semantics, p. 250, states, "the grammatical and lexical structure of different languages will tend to reflect the specific interests and attitudes of the culture in which they operate. What it does not mean, however, is that every grammatical and lexical distinction must be correlated with some important difference in the patterns of thought of the society using the language." See also E. Nida, Language Structure and Translation, (Stanford: University Press, 1975), pp. 184-191; Science, pp. 50-56.

106 Lyons, Structural Semantics, pp. 38-39. Although the study of Berlin and Kay indicates that the majority of speakers in any language identify a common foci for colour terms, this does not nullify the basic fact that speakers of different languages draw distinctions on the colour continuum differently. See B. Berlin and P. Kay, Basic Colour Terms: Their Universality and Evolution, (Los Angeles: Univ. of California, 1969).

to a domain (subject area). For example, we could investigate the words that belong to the domain of *colour*, or the subdomain of terms that constitutes the domain *red* (pink, scarlet, wine, red). The advantage of this type of analysis is that it emphasizes and contrasts the paradigmatic (see Sec. II.4.) choices that are available in a particular domain.

The significance of the paradigmatic relationships (or sense relations) between words in differing languages becomes obvious as soon as one undertakes the task of translating, or, as in our case, the analysis of TT. As Lyons states,

> It is not so much that one language draws a greater or less number of semantic distinctions than another which prevents the matching of their vocabularies one-to-one (although the normal bilingual dictionaries encourage this view). It is rather that these distinctions are made in completely different places.

Assuming that the translator understood the meaning of a given word in its *Vorlage*, the analysis of TT attempts to understand how the translator matched the structural relations of the vocabulary of the receptor language to that of the source text. At one and the same time, the analyst has to keep one eye on the paradigmatic relations between the words in the source text and the other eye on the paradigmatic relations that exist in the target language between the

---


111 For example, it has been discussed in some detail that there were instances where cultural differences, the use of rare words or diachronic changes in the language caused the translators of the LXX considerable difficulty (Sec. II.3). There were also instances where the translator was confused about the meaning of words due to polysemy or homonymy. The distinction between a simple figurative extension of meaning vs. polysemy, on the one hand, and polysemy vs. homonymy on the other is often difficult to discern. See Ullmann, pp. 114-137; Silva, *Biblical Words*, pp. 113-114.
possible translation equivalents for the words in the Vorlage.\textsuperscript{112} The interaction of these opposing forces had significant consequences on the vocabulary of the LXX.\textsuperscript{113} It is also why we have some semitic words which are rendered with half a dozen or more equivalents; and in other cases the same translator employed a SE for the majority or even all of the occurrences of a different lexeme, even if the semantic range of the translation equivalent did not match that of the source lexeme. On still other occasions the translators employed the technique of lexical levelling, i.e. using one lexeme in the target language to render two or more from the source language.

The use of multiple equivalents, SE, and lexical levelling in the LXX reflects the same tension that we experience when we encounter the problem of translating the related set of meanings of different lexemes and the differing meanings of the same lexeme from one language into another. The challenges which the translation of the semitic vocabulary presented to the LXX translators (not to mention the times they did not know the meaning of the text), also teach us that the examination of vocabulary has to be very detailed. With regard to the technique of using SE or lexical levelling, we should also emphasize once again that it is the departure from an otherwise uniform approach (the "marked" use) that is instructive to our understanding of the TT in a translation unit. For example, in the Hebrew portions of Daniel both OG and Th employ λαλέω as a SE for רָאָה,

\textsuperscript{112}See the examples of ἀμήν and γάρν from Dan. 1:8 in CH 1.11.3 and the discussion in Harl, Septante, pp. 243-253.

\textsuperscript{113}See fn. 20, above. The fact that words do not have any "core" meaning (if they have meaning at all) and the significance of their structural relations underscores our desperate need for a proper Lexicon of the LXX. Fortunately, this need has been partially met by the recent publication of Muraoka's lexicon which treats exhaustively, but not exclusively, the Twelve Prophets. See T. Muraoka, A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets), (Louvain: Peeters, 1993). Muraoka offers definitions and not merely glosses as in the conventional approach (exemplified in LEH) and he provides useful information regarding terms sharing the same semantic field as well as collocational uses. One can only hope that he, or others, continue this important project. The first volume of the new Hebrew dictionary produced by Sheffield is also a step forward, though it does not offer definitions. See D. J. A. Clines, ed., The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, vol. 1. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), 1993.
which occurs 19x in Daniel. In this case the translators are doubly consistent because they do not use *lalio* for any other term. However, in two cases (1:19; 11:27) OG departs from his normal pattern and employs alternative renderings to produce better idiomatic translations.\(^{114}\) Even though OG could have maintained the regular pattern like Th, and frequently did so, he manifests a greater tendency to choose an alternative rendering that captures the flavour of the original.

While most studies of vocabulary for TT have concentrated on paradigmatic relations as evidenced by the degree of the use of SE by the translator, the role of syntagmatic relations has been virtually neglected. This theory emphasizes the meaningful relationships that exist between particular combinations of words in a syntagm. For example, Porzig points to the relationship between biting and teeth; barking and dog; blonde and hair.\(^{115}\) The most significant aspect of the syntagmatic relationship between words is that it limits or defines the paradigmatic choices in any given context. Blonde is only used as a description of hair. Biting is only done with teeth, and there is very little done with teeth (eg. bite, nibble, and chew). Syntagmatic relations between words are also referred to as the study of their collocations.\(^{116}\) For example, the words strong and powerful may be used to describe a person, but strong would not be used in collocation with car though powerful could. Likewise, we refer to tea being strong but not powerful.\(^{117}\)

The understanding of syntagmatic relationships has obvious implications for TT. In general, the choice of many translation equivalents for the source text will be defined by the collocational restrictions of the vocabulary in the target language. However, at the same time, the target language will make adjustments and introduce

---

\(^{114}\) See the discussion of 2:1-10 in CH 5.

\(^{115}\) W. Porzig, *Das Wunder der Sprache*, (Bern: Francke, 1950), 68.


changes because of the different lexical structures and also because of cultural differences. One of the most significant ways that syntagmatic relationships may affect TT, however, is when the translator is forced to choose between particular translation equivalents. For example, Th prefers to render all words related to משלי (hi. substantive part.) occurs 5x in MT and in three instances Th uses the part. of סונינה (1:4; 11:35; 12:3). However, in 11:33 Th employs סונינה and in 12:10 he employs νομονες (1-10 in LXX), but we can account for these differences below. סונינה also renders all three occurrences of שלמהש (5:11, 12, 14) and סונינה is usually the equivalent for the vb. שלמה (3/5). In 8:25 the noun שלמה occurs in a difficult passage to refer to Antiochus' insight. There are then four instances where Th does not render שלמה with סונינה or related words. They may be accounted for as follows. In 7:8 (hithpa.) and 8:25 there is not the same specific emphasis on the quality of wisdom, so Th uses alternatives. In 9:22 the hi.inf.cons. שלמה occurs together with הָנָּה, and in the case of these terms with similar meanings Th has an even higher preference for סונינה to translate הָנָּה (4/5). Therefore, Th had to choose a different verb for the inf.cons. of שלמה. In this case Th chose the fairly rare term סומבחלמ (1-10 in LXX). The same phenomenon accounts for 12:10, except in this case מֵאָל is the subject of הָנָּה. In this instance Th uses νομονες for מֵאָל because he prefers to translate the verb with the 3.act.f.i. of סונינה. Even though סונינה is also cognate with סונינה, we can see

118 Lyons, Semantics, p. 265.

119 S. 9:13, 25. According to Zieg., in 1:17 Th has סומבחלמ for מֵאָל which is the opposite of the normal translation equivalents used by Th (s. 1:4). However, the 4th century Sahidic ms. 925 does transpose the terms and it is quite possible that it contains the original Th reading.

120 As we have mentioned, in 8:25 it is Antiochus who has insight, while in 7:8 ποσενον (1-8, never in OG) "I was thinking about" is an adequate translation of the sense.

121 See 2:21; 8:15; 10:1. The exception is 1:20 where Th uses επιστήμης. This is another HL (1-59 in LXX) for Th that is not found in OG.
that Th employed it for כְּנַסְיָה in 11:33 for the same reason that he made a change in 12:10, כְּנַסְיָה was the subject of יבִין.

In 9:22, 12:10, and 11:33 it is the appearance of two words in syntagmatic relationship, which Th normally renders with the same translation equivalent, that forces Th to make a choice between favourite renditions. Another main way that syntagmatic relationships affect TT is occasions where one language uses a syntagm while the other language may only require a single lexeme to render roughly the same meaning. For example, see Dan. 2:13 where OG translates מָצַּה "a decree went out" with ἀναγγελέω "it was decreed" and in 1:4 where מָצַּה is translated καὶ εὐθείας . . . καὶ γραμματικὰς καὶ σοφοῖς. Other syntagmatic features to consider are the construct genitive relation in ΗΑ or infinitive absolutes modifying another verb; Greek verbs that are followed by a particular case, infinitive, or object clause; and prepositions because they require a certain case.

III.2. Adjustment

Adjustment refers to the types of changes that have been made in the formal structure of the source text as it passed through the transfer system. Once again, we can approach the subject in general agreement with Szpek, but would offer some modifications. In the first place, all Adjustments in the translation can be generally classified as additions, omissions, or substitutions at the morphological, word, phrase, clause, or sentence level. For this reason, Szpek's "secondary" adjustments in the category of Universally Oriented adjustments (Harmonization and Clarification) have been omitted. At times it is difficult to distinguish between categories and it may be that the inclusion of Harmonization and Clarification blurs the distinction between Adjustment and Motivation. For example, Szpek defines harmonization as taking place when "an element is altered . . . in order to better accord with an element in the surrounding environment . . . achieved through addition, omission, or

---

122 These examples combined with Th's use of no less than four HL (νοημονεῖς, ἐπιστήμης, προσώπων, συμβιβασμοί) to render vocabulary in the domain of knowing that are not even found in OG indicate that Th was working to his own agenda.
However, she also includes Intra-, Inter-, and Parallel Verse Influence as three subcategories under Motivation. Likewise, her statement that Clarification is "due to an ambiguity in the source text with the intent . . . of bringing clarity to the text," focuses on the motivation for an adjustment, i.e. to achieve clarification.

On the other hand, Szpek's subdivisions of Syntactically and Semantically Oriented Adjustments are quite helpful. Two alterations have been made to the latter category. First, the category is renamed Lexically Oriented changes in recognition that these topics are concerned with adjustments to individual lexemes. Lexical semantics is a more appropriate description of the specific subject, but the change is consistent with the earlier remarks concerning Lexicology vs. Semantics as categories. Transliteration is also added as a topic because there were times when the LXX transliterated unknown or technical terms (see Sec. II.3.).

Numerous lexical adjustments are to be expected in a translation because of the differing lexical structures as well as the sheer volume of data with which we are working. There are two main approaches to examining lexical relations: componential analysis and sense relations. Componential analysis is actually an extension of field theory and is an attempt to ground it in a more rigorous, scientific methodology by analysing the meaning of terms on the basis of a set of sense components. It enjoys wide influence among semanticists and Szpek demonstrates the usefulness of the technique for the analysis of lexical relations for TT. However, as Lyons points out, componential analysis has been confined to limited areas

---

123 Szpek, p. 34.
124 See her definitions, Szpek, pp. 46-47.
125 Ibid., p. 34.
126 All of the topics dealing with Lexically Oriented changes have been discussed under previous sections examining changes in the translation due to synchronic and diachronic influences (Sec. II.3.) and/or Lexicology (Sec. III.1.iii.).
127 Szpek, pp. 36-38. For further explanations, see Lehrer, pp. 46-74; Lyons, Semantics, 317-335; Nida, Science, pp. 82-85; Componential. 32-67.
of vocabulary and it is possible to construct differing but "equally plausible analyses for the same set of lexemes." In the case of TT where the specific concern is to compare the lexical relations between two languages, the approach of sense relations should prove itself to be more useful. There are two basic types of sense relations: relations based on similarity and relations based on oppositeness.

III.2.1. Relations Based on Similarity.

These are the most important sense relations for the analysis of vocabulary because the majority of cases where alternative translation equivalents are employed in the translation of a lexeme are based on similarity. There are two types of relations based on similarity: overlapping and inclusive. Overlapping relations are those to which we usually assign the term synonymy. Synonymy recognizes that two or more words can be substituted for one another in a given context in order to produce the same meaning. Overlapping relations may be diagrammed as in Figure 3.

Figure 3

---

128 Lyons, Semantics, p. 333.

129 Nida, Componential, pp. 16-17; Semantic, pp. 31-32; Jackson, pp. 65-74; Lyons, Structural, pp. 74-78. W.E. Collinson distinguishes nine different types of synonymy, in W. E. Collinson, "Comparative Synomics: Some Principles and Illustrations," Transactions of the Philosophical Society, (1939): 54-77.

130 See the discussion of types of sameness in R. Harris, Synonymy and Linguistic Analysis, Language and Style, 12 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), 11-12. We accept Lyons assertion that "synonymy must be bound with context;" therefore, two words do not have to be synonymous in all contexts to be regarded as synonymous in any one context.
For example, in 12:3 OG employs φαίνει while Th has ἐκλάμαι for ἐλθεῖν "enlighten." Or OG can employ both ἐμβάλλει and πίπτει to translate ἔρχομαι, though in this case the distribution of the terms indicates the activity of different translators.¹³¹

Inclusive relations (hyponymy) explores the relationship between words by arranging them in hierarchies, i.e. the meaning of some words is included within the meaning of others. For example, collie, terrier, poodle and bulldog (co-hyponyms) are all included within the meaning of dog. By the same token dog is a co-hyponym with other species such as wolf, coyote, and fox which are all hyponyms of the superordinate animal.¹³² We could diagram these relationships as in Figure 4.

The higher one goes up the hierarchy the more general is the terminology while lower terms become more specific. The sense relationships could be diagrammed differently by the addition of different sense components in the hierarchical structure (e.g. household as opposed to wild animals). The point is that during the course of translation there are times that the translator may choose either a more general or a more specific term in the hierarchical structure as a translation equivalent. For example, in 1:4 OG employs εἰναι instead of the more specific infinitive of ἵστημι to translate the

---

¹³¹ See CH 5.IV.1.iv.

¹³² See the discussion of hierarchical structuring in Nida, Science, pp. 73-82; Lyons, Structural, pp. 69-72; Lehrer, pp. 20-24.
III.2.iii. Relations Based on Opposition (Antonymy)

Relations based on opposition are normally confined to dichotomous pairs. There are different kinds of lexical opposites, but we can begin by observing the distinction between graded and ungraded opposites.\textsuperscript{134} Graded opposites involve a degree of comparison, such as \textit{big}:\textit{small}, \textit{high}:\textit{low}. Size or height is always relative to a point of comparison whether or not that point of comparison is explicitly stated.\textsuperscript{135} Lyons reserves the term antonym for graded opposites because they tend to rely on polarized contrasts (\textit{good}:\textit{bad}) even though they are scalable. On the other hand, the denial of one member of a pair of ungraded opposites usually implies the assertion of the other. For example, compare the relations between complementaries, such as \textit{married}:\textit{single}, \textit{male}:\textit{female} and conversives such as \textit{buy}:\textit{sell}, \textit{give}:\textit{take}.\textsuperscript{136}

The significance of binary relations for TT is that the translator may choose to express the meaning of the \textit{Vorlage} through a translation equivalent or syntagm that is opposite in meaning to an equivalent in the target text, regardless of what he finds in the \textit{Vorlage}. For example, a translator might have chosen to employ πονηρός as the equivalent for λύμ (the SE in the LXX is ἀμαρτία), in a particular context in order to express a contrast with ἀγαθός. In fact, this does not happen in the entire LXX, but it is possible that the choice of a translator could be influenced by similar conditions. It is also possible that a translator could transform a negative

\textsuperscript{133} See also 1:19 and 10:17. In every case Zieg. has conjectured the more specific λύμ, but the readings of the witnesses should stand (see CH 2).

\textsuperscript{134} See the complete discussion by Lyons, \textit{Semantics}, pp. 270-290; the slightly different categorization by Nida, \textit{Semantic}, pp. 32-34.


\textsuperscript{136} Lyons, pp. 279-280. Conversives are especially helpful in defining social roles (\textit{doctor}:\textit{patient}, \textit{master}:\textit{servant}), kinship terms (uncle/aunt:niece/nephew), and spatial and temporal relations (\textit{above}:\textit{below}, \textit{before}:\textit{after}). Nida (\textit{Semantics}, p. 34) also distinguishes reversives such as \textit{tie}:\textit{untie}, \textit{alienate}:\textit{reconcile}.
statement and express it positively or vice versa. No certain examples of equivalents influenced by binary relations could be found in Daniel. There are probably only a small number in the LXX.

III.3. Motivation

The reasons that may have led to an adjustment in the translation are considered under the category Motivation. The list may appear overly extensive, but there are subtle differences that distinguish them. Once again, we are in general agreement with the categories as listed and defined by Szpek, though there are a few minor modifications. First, in keeping with the spirit of adopting the terminology of the model we have "substituted" the more general term Harmonization for Intra-, Inter-, and Parallel Verse Influence. There is no inherent reason for this choice other than the accepted scholarly use of the term harmonization seems sufficient to describe the phenomena.

In the second place, the differing nature of the LXX translation requires the addition of two topics: Phonological and Literary Technique. Phonological considerations that motivate a translation equivalent may be derived either from the source text or the receptor language. The former type have often been referred to rather inaccurately as homophones, i.e. the use of Greek words to render a similar sounding word in the Semitic text. J. de Waard correctly suggests that the use of the term "homophony" to denote Greek words translating Hebrew words of similar sounds should be discarded.

---

137 The reader is directed to Szpek, pp. 40-49, for her discussion, though the topics should be fairly self-evident.

138 It is not that important to distinguish by topic whether an element is harmonized with another element within the verse (Intra-verse), an adjacent verse (Inter-verse), or a more remote verse (Parallel) because the information will be given in the description anyway. On harmonization, see E. Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonization in Biblical Manuscripts," JSOT 31 (1985): 3-29.

Homophony does not apply at the inter-lingual level because the sound systems of two languages are never equivalent and, more importantly, confusion arises from the definition of homophony since it implies there is a difference in meaning between two words which sound the same. De Waard suggests that the classification "phonological translation" be employed in its place.

Though phonological translations were employed in the LXX, it is worthwhile to heed Barr's warning that translations based on phonetic resemblance were "a very minor factor in vocabulary choice." Barr suggests that a strong example of a translation based on phonetic resemblance should be characterized by two features: one phonetic and one semantic. "A Greek word must have a very striking and impressive likeness to the Hebrew word" (italics his) if it is to be considered as having a strong phonetic resemblance. He finds the definition of the semantic criterion more difficult, but suggests that there should be some ambiguity involved in determining whether the word chosen has the same meaning. This ambiguity is necessary, because if the word has a similar semantic range, then there is no basis for the term to have been chosen due to phonetic resemblance. However, the possibility that phonetic considerations may have played a role in instances where the translator had two or more possible equivalents cannot be ignored. In order to demonstrate that it was highly probable the translator was motivated by phonetic similarity in these

---


141 De Waard, p. 555, classifies five major types of phonological translations: I A. Neither lexical nor grammatical translation has been affected; I B. Only grammatical translation has been affected; II A. A shift of components of meaning has taken place without a grammatical change; II B. A shift of components has taken place with grammatical change; III. One component of meaning has been retained and one deleted or one component of meaning has been retained and one added; IV. A specific rendering has been given instead of a generic one; V. A synecdoche is the result of phonological translation. Thack., pp. 36-38, refers to translations using Greek words of similar sound to the Hebrew.

142 Barr, "Doubts," p. 77.

143 Barr, "Doubts," p. 6. De Waard's classifications are helpful in clarifying the type of ambiguity that may be involved.
cases, one must be able to justify it on the basis of the translation technique. For example, if an uncommon word was selected over the normal equivalent to translate a word in a given instance, then one could reasonably argue that it is phonetically motivated. In Dan. 3:4 OG has ἐφημέρι ἐφημέρι for ἀρπάξαντας θεοῦ. The phonological motivation for the choice of the verb is borne out by the fact that it is the only place where it occurs in OG, and Th translates with βοῶσα.

Phonological motivation may also derive from the receptor language, i.e. the translator may choose a word because it has similar sounds to words in the immediate context (eg. rhyming, alliteration). Here again we have to be cautious about making excessive claims that may be explained otherwise. However, there is no a priori reason to exclude this motivation either. For example, in 12:10 MT has הבשׁדב וַקָּשׁ, which Th translates with ἀνομίσσων ἀνόμοι. OG retains the play on sound, but with different equivalents, ἀμάρτωσιν οἱ ἀμαρταλοι.144

Literary Technique refers to translations that were motivated due to some type of literary consideration in the text. For example, ἐπὶ occurs in Daniel 3:17 and OG employs φοβεῖο as a translation equivalent instead of the more usual λατρεῖο. The motivation for this rendering was to supply a parallel with 3:12. In 3:12 OG translates the semitic idiom מְנַסָּה מְנַסָּה "pay regard to" (+ יִלָּ בְּ y pers.)145 with ὀκτεί ἐφοβήσαντι τὴν ἐντολήν "[they] do not fear your decree." According to OG, the three do not fear the king's decree because there is a God whom they do fear!146

III.4 Effect on Meaning

We have discussed the relationship of the meaning of the


145 See BDB, p. 1113.

146 It is surprising that Meadowcroft, pp. 159-160, can devote discussion to the unusual translation by OG, but fails to note the obvious literary connection between 3:12 and 17. Muraoka ("Literary Device," pp. 20-30) cites Job 1:1 and 2:3 as instances where the translator may have arranged words according to alphabetical order and Jer. 2:6 where the translator employed four adjectives beginning with privative alpha. See also D. Weissert, pp. 31-44.
translation to the source text and the difference between the perspective of the translator and the analyst of TT above (Sec. II.2). The topics are fairly straightforward and have been adequately treated by Szpek.\(^{147}\) Szpek delineates various degrees of synonymy based on the proposals of Ullmann and Collinson,\(^{148}\) but it is extremely difficult to grade one term as more intense or more emotive than another when comparing two different languages, especially ancient dead ones. In many cases such comparisons are also irrelevant because the translator's choice of lexical equivalents is limited in the first place, and may be even more restricted due to other factors (established equivalents, cultural usage, grammar).

IV. Summary

The aim of this chapter has been to provide a theoretical foundation for the analysis of TT based on linguistic principles. This has entailed three stages. First, we provided a definition of TT and commented briefly on five aspects of the definition: The purpose of the study of TT is to describe how individual translators engaged in the task of translating a unit of scripture for a community. Second, we laid the foundations for the proposed model of TT by giving five presuppositions for TT: TT is Descriptive; TT is Primarily Synchronic; TT accounts for Langue and Parole; TT is Structural; and TT Takes the Source Language as its Point of Departure. Each of these principles was thoroughly discussed and examples were given in order to demonstrate their relevance for TT. Finally, we outlined the proposed model of TT. Heidi Szpek has recently proposed a similar type of model and at some points we adapted her terminology in order to encourage standardization. There are differences in methodology that were clearly delineated in the course of the discussion, but, more importantly, we are agreed with Szpek that a linguistic approach is the most appropriate means for the analysis of TT.

The analysis of TT begins by comparing the similarities and differences between the structural elements in the source and receptor texts. It is only after this initial comparison that the analyst can

\(^{147}\)See Szpek, pp. 49-59.

\(^{148}\)Ullmann. Principles, pp. 142-143; Collinson, pp. 54-77.
begin to formulate answers to the questions about how the translator made changes (Adjustment) and why the changes were made (Motivation). The proposed methodology will satisfy the aim of TT as we have defined it, and also accounts for the effect that the process of translation had on the meaning of the text.
Chapter 5

Translation Technique in OG and Th Daniel

In the previous chapter a theoretical approach for the analysis of TT was presented. It is now time to put the theory into practice. The present chapter consists of an analysis of five passages from the book of Daniel: 1:1-10, 2:1-10, 3:11-20, 8:1-10, 12:1-13. Each passage includes annotated texts of Th, MT, and OG, which are arranged vertically in parallel alignment. The lines of the alignment are numbered consecutively in the left-hand margin to provide a means of reference for the analysis of the TT. The texts represent both the Hebrew and Aramaic sections of Daniel, and, except for two passages, were chosen at random. The first section, ch. 1:1-10, was chosen because it offered few difficulties, and, therefore, was a suitable means for the reader to become acquainted with the analysis. Chapter 8:1-10 was chosen because it was the section analyzed by Jeansonne. The concern in this passage will be directed primarily toward the relationship between OG and Th, because Jeansonne has commented on the texts.¹

I. Introduction to the Analysis

The texts have been aligned in a way that maximizes readability and facilitates the analysis. As we would expect, however, there are numerous occasions where the wording of OG does not formally correspond to the HA on the same line. The procedure followed for the annotation of the text is described below, and a portion from 1:10 is included as an illustration in Figure 5.

The OG has three types of markings. First, square brackets [ ]

¹See Jeans.. pp. 34-57.
are used to enclose words whose originality is questionable. Second, the text is annotated with letters (M in 1. 98) corresponding to the three areas of linguistics for the analysis of TT: M=Morphology, S=Syntax, and L=Lexicology. Third, possible pluses and omissions of words in OG are designated by the signs + and - (s. 1. 100). Most pluses and minuses have been isolated to their own line, but that has not always been possible. Therefore, a + at the beginning of a line designates that the whole line may be a plus, while -- marks omissions in a line of OG compared to MT. If a word (or words) occurs as a plus in a line with word(s) that translate the presumed Vorlage, the + occurs immediately before and after the plus. Omissions of some elements, which usually occur as bound morphemes in HA (suffixes, the definite article, the conjunction I, directive I, interrogative I), but in Greek as free morphemes (words), are not normally marked by -. In keeping with the linguistic approach, these items are normally considered in the discussion of TT. The same principle applies to small words such as personal and relative pronouns, the nota accusativi MK(MK), and inseparable prepositions. Likewise, the appearance of minor morphological elements in the OG, which could be retroverted into HA, are not normally marked by +.

The same markings appear in Th, but they are used differently. First, the use of superscript letters is more sparing than in the case of OG and often highlights features that distinguish the TT of Th from OG. This approach is justified on the basis of the close formal correspondence of Th to MT. Second, based on the close formal relationship between Th and MT, Th is more frequently marked with a + or - for minor morphemes. The omission of minor morphemes in Th, which are usually unmarked in OG, will often be indicated by only one -. Th is marked in a fourth way as well. Underlining is used to mark portions of Th that may indicate dependence on OG. Round brackets (l. 100) are used to indicate places where Th demonstrates significant independence in translation. This marking is for the purpose of determining whether Th is a recension of OG.

The analysis that follows the text will be divided into three sections, each of which addresses one of the major issues of this research. Immediately following the passage we evaluate the TT of OG.
and Th.² The discussion proceeds according to the major headings: morphology, syntax, and lexicology. Sometimes the frequency with which a Greek word renders a Hebrew/Aramaic word in the Vorlage is indicated in brackets separated by a slash (/). The frequency of words that are rare in Daniel and the OT are also indicated in round brackets, but are separated by a dash (-). The first number indicates the frequency in Daniel, the second in the LXX.¹ The frequency in OG and Th will be inclusive, i.e. they are not counted as separate works. If a word is referred to as a HL or a frequency such as 1-10 is given, then that is the only occurrence of that word including both Greek texts. The discussion will always clarify any ambiguous cases. The analysis of the passage will conclude with a summary.

Following the TT analysis there will be a preliminary discussion of the relationship of Th to OG, which is indicated in that particular passage. The purpose is to determine whether Th is a recension, but how do we distinguish between revision and translation? This is a difficult question, and has not been sufficiently addressed. With respect to Th the views of scholars seem more often to reflect a general opinion rather than a sustained examination using a definite methodology. From the survey of literature in the first chapter it was noted that Jeansonne is the only one who offers some statistics in support of her conclusion. However, we also noted that her statistics are misleading. The fact that Th reads the same as OG in 40% of the passage she analyses (8:1-10), does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that "θ retains the OG." ³ Jeansonne’s analysis betrays a basic assumption that scholars have made, i.e. common readings prove dependence. As we have seen in our review, many, if not most, modern-day scholars would be agnostic concerning the person of Theodotion,

²The OG reading in all cases assumes the critical text which we have reconstructed. The reader is directed to CH 2.

³It should be noted that HR is the source for the frequencies for the LXX, and the time has not always been taken to verify the accuracy of HR with the Göttingen critical editions. HR must always be used with caution and the OG of Daniel is an excellent example of the care that must be taken with its use.

⁴Jeans., p. 57.
yet common readings are assumed to indicate borrowing by Th. Now, that may be the case. On the other hand, a number of verbal agreements may be equally explained as coincidental or the result of textual corruption. As we have already pointed out, the most important criterion for determining whether a text is a recension is the isolation of distinctive agreements between that text and the text from which it was supposedly revised.

In the comparison of OG and Th, passages of Th will not be underlined that agree with OG, *if* they can easily be explained as derivative from MT. Neither does the fact that a passage is underlined indicate that Th necessarily borrowed from the OG. Underlining only indicates the *possibility* that Th is dependent on the OG or that they share a common reading. Invariably, there is an element of subjectivity to our discussion, but that cannot be avoided. However, by focusing on instances where Th seems to have borrowed from OG and those where it seems to be independent, it is possible to arrive at a clearer understanding of their relationship. There are at least three ways by which we could characterize Th's relation to OG. First, it could be a completely independent translation. Second, it could be a recension in the way that it is generally understood. That is, Th had the OG and proto-MT before him and copied the OG as long as it formally reproduced the Vorlage. In certain cases Th standardized the terminology, though not always consistently, and introduced corrections to the OG where it departed from his proto-MT Vorlage. These corrections may have resulted from Th's perception that OG translated incorrectly or too freely. A third way to view their relationship is that Th did have both proto-MT and OG (or may have

---

5See also the recent article by L. Grabbe who does not accept common vocabulary as an indication of dependence in his examination of a portion of the Hexapla of the Psalms extant in the Mailand text. See "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, SCS, 33, ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 505-56.

6See the Introduction.

been familiar with OG, but that Th translated his Vorlage more or less independently and employed OG occasionally or when confronted with difficult passages. As we begin the investigation we should allow the evidence to speak for itself and allow for any one of these possibilities to be the closest approximation to Th’s methodology.

We will conclude the investigation of each passage with a discussion of textual variants in the passage. The evaluation of readings will be guided by our understanding of the TT in the OG and Th. We will also consider the witness of the Qumran mss., as well as the Peshitta and Vulgate.

I apologize beforehand for the cryptic nature of the very detailed notes of the analysis. The list of abbreviations are included below for reference, but most should be easily recognized.

Grammatical Sigla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add.</td>
<td>addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>compare, i.e. for a different view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cons.</td>
<td>construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha.</td>
<td>haphel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi.</td>
<td>hiphil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hithpa.</td>
<td>hithpaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hithpe.</td>
<td>hithpeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td><em>hapax legomenon</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homoioarc.</td>
<td>homoioarcton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homoiotel.</td>
<td>homoioteleuton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impv.</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juss.</td>
<td>jussive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pass.</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni.</td>
<td>niphal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa.</td>
<td>pael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf.</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi.</td>
<td>piel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu.</td>
<td>pual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>qal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(ing).</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>stereotyped equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub.</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suf.</td>
<td>suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans.</td>
<td>transpose(ition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translit.</td>
<td>transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vb.</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>verse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. Daniel 1:1-10

The first passage for examination is 1:1-10. This passage was chosen because it opens the book and it offers few difficulties. Therefore, it is a good introduction to the analysis. The separate discussion of the relationship between OG and Th will be lengthier in this opening section in order to help clarify the issues involved. In the following sections more of the discussion of their relationship will take place within the analysis of TT, because the two are naturally considered together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:1 Th</th>
<th>1:1 MT</th>
<th>1:1 OG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1 Th</td>
<td>1:1 MT</td>
<td>1:1 OG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ἐν ἑτεὶ τρίτῳ | שֶׁבֶּית בֶּן | ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἰωακίμ |}
| τῆς βασιλείας | קְרָדָב | τῆς Ιουδαίας ἐτῶν |}
| Ἰωακίμ | Ἰωάκημ | ἱππότων |}
| βασιλέως Ἰουδαία | Βασίλειῶν Ἰουδαίων | ἱππότων ἔργων |}
| ἡλθε Ναβουχοδώνος | ἦλθε Ναβουχοδώνος | Ναβουχοδώνος |}
| βασιλεὺς Βαβυλῶνος | βασιλεῦς Βαβυλῶνος | eἰς Ἱεροσαλήμ |}
| τῆς Ἰεροσαλήμ | τῆς Ἰεροσαλήμ | ἔποιήσεις αὐτήν |}
| καὶ ἐποιήσεις αὐτήν | καὶ ἐποιήσεις αὐτήν |}
| 1:2 | 1:2 |}
| καὶ ἔδωκε κύριος | καὶ ἔδωκε κύριος | κύριος εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ |}
| ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ | ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ | 5 καὶ Ἰωακίμ |}
| τὸν Ἰωακίμ | τὸν Ἰωακίμ | βασιλεᾶ Ιουδαί |}
| βασιλέα Ιουδαί | βασιλέα Ιουδαί | καὶ ἵσμος τί |}
| καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους | καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους | τὸν Ἱερών σκεῦθον |}
| τῶν σκευῶν | τῶν σκευῶν | τοῦ κύριο |}
| ὁκον τοῦ θεοῦ | ὁκον τοῦ θεοῦ | καὶ ἵππηγκας αὐτά |}
| καὶ Ἐηνεγκεν αὐτά | καὶ Ἐηνεγκεν αὐτά | 5 καὶ ἵππηγκας αὐτά |}
| εἰς τὴν Ἰερίμ | εἰς τὴν Ἰερίμ | 5 τοῦ κυρίον |}
| εἰς τὴν Σενναρρ | εἰς τὴν Σενναρρ | 5 τοῦ κυρίον |}
| ὁκον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτόν | ὁκον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτόν | 5 τοῦ κυρίον |}
| καὶ τὰ σκεῦη | καὶ τὰ σκεῦη | 5 ἱππηγκας αὐτά |}
| Ἐηνεγκεν | Ἐηνεγκεν | 5 ἱππηγκας αὐτά |}
| εἰς τὸν ὁκον θεοῦ | εἰς τὸν ὁκον θεοῦ | 5 τοῦ κυρίον |}
| τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτόν | τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτόν | 5 ἰδολείψαν τοῦ |}
| καὶ εἰπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς | καὶ εἰπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς |}
| Ἀσφανείς | Ἀσφανείς |}
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25 τῷ ἀρχιευνοῦχῳ αὐτοῦ ἔφτιγνεν.
26 ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν ἐμαυθα财力
27 ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν ἐμαυθα财力
28 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος τῆς βασιλείας καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑπιλεκτῶν
καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑπιλεκτῶν
1:4
1:4
-Nazi
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καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν αὐτοῖς
ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰουδαί
Δανιὴλ καὶ Ἀνανιας καὶ Ἔσαιας
cαι ὁ ἄρχεινοιχος ὄνοματα
καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς
καὶ ἐπέθηκεν καὶ Τώρ
οἱ ἄρχεινοιχος ονόματα
- - τῷ ὁ ἂρχεινοιχος ονόματα
καὶ τῷ Ἀνανία Σεδρα
καὶ τῷ Ἄσαθω τῷ Μισαῆ
καὶ τῷ Αβδελαγων
καὶ ἐβεβαιωσεν ὁ θεὸς
τὸν Δανιὴλ
εἰς ἔλεον
καὶ εἰς οἰκτημόν
τὸν ἄρχεινοιχον
καὶ ἔδωκεν τῷ Δανιὴλ
τὸν Δανιὴλ
εἰς τῷ αἰών
τὸν ἄρχεινοιχον
καὶ εἶπεν
ὁ ἄρχεινοιχος
τῷ Δανιὴλ
Φοβοῦμαι ἐγὼ
II.1. Analysis of 1:1-10

II.1.i. Morphology

1. 9, 73, 96-In CH 2 we saw that OG sometimes adds a per. pro. against MT (1. 9), though it could be a later harmonization to 1. 8. On the other hand, in 1. 73, 96 OG omits the pro., which is unnecessary to the Greek. 8

1. 25-OG renders the Hebrew 3 m.s.suf. with a refl. pro. and also alters the order by putting the pro. in the attr. position.

1. 26, 43, 45, 56, 58-Th does not employ an article as a formal equivalent for as a marker of the inf.cons.

1. 30, 52-In both instances OG substitutes an adj. in the attr. position for a gen. This change also affects the word order.

1. 36, 39, 40-OG substitutes a pl. acc. for the n. + gen. cons.

1. 48-OG substitutes an inf. for the fin. vb. due to harmonization with the inf. in 1. 43 and 45.

1. 55, 78-OG substitutes a vb. for the gen. cons., which makes explicit the consumption of the wine. Quite possibly the motivation

---

8 S. Blud., pp. 53-54.
was that the translator did not understand the text and made a contextual guess. S. the discussion of Th and OG, l. 94-97.

1. 58-OG and Th render the juss. with the aor.a.inf. to indicate the final clause.
1. 98-OG substitutes s. for pl. S. the discussion of changes in number in CH 2.

II.1.ii. Syntax
1. 1-3-OG characteristically uses a gen. for dating and transposes the information regarding the king prior to the adv. phrase, which omits דֶּד as unnecessary.
1. 4, 16-OG substitutes the parataxis of MT with a hypotactic construction, part. + vb.
1. 7, 17-The prep. is added in keeping with Greek idiom, though in 1. 21 it is unnecessary in Th.
1. 8-The prep. is omitted as redundant.

1. 11-OG chooses to substitute the conj. for the sign of the acc., which results in a καὶ . . . καὶ (both/and) construction. It removes any ambiguity that might exist in the Hebrew concerning the removal of Jehoiakim.9

1. 13, 54, 85-OG omits the prep. as redundant.
1. 14-OG substitutes an attr. adj. for the gen. cons.
1. 17-OG omits redundant material in l. 18-22 (s. Text-Critical), but no information is lost.10
1. 35-OG substitutes the n. with an alpha privative to render the rel. phrase. Th omits וּכְ, but otherwise =MT.
1. 42-OG substitutes an acc. ptcp. for the rel. phrase, which renders מָשָׁה redundant. Th follows MT but adds the 3 s.vb. that is implicit in the Hebrew.
1. 43-OG employs בֶּאֵי (not in 967) and this makes it explicit that the

---

9S. Charles, pp. 4-5; Mont., pp. 113-115.
1088-Syh correctly mark the asterisked add. that conform to MT in l. 18-19.
on the inf. cons. signifies consequence.

1. 49-ἐλθεσιν is a substitution for ἥρον in order to make the meaning of the term explicit and the prep. phrase is added for clarification.

1. 55, 77-OG substitutes a relative clause (s. Morphology) for the gen. cons.

1. 63-64, 68-71-OG omits the conj. in 1. 64 in harmony with the previous omission, whereas in 1. 68-69 OG seems to have employed the Greek μέν/δὲ (s. CH 2), followed in 1. 70-71 by coordination with καί. There are no grounds to question whether the Vorlage was different in OG. Th coordinates the names with καί also in 1:19.

1. 67-The vb. ἦν probably was not in the Vorlage. S. the discussion of these lines in the relationship between OG and Th.

1. 74, 81-Th employs the same equivalent (ἄλληγρηθη) for λέγω while OG uses variety.

1. 79-ἀξιόω + acc. + ἵνα is an idiom (BAG, p. 78) so we would not expect the Hebrew prep. to be represented.

1. 97-OG and Th both substitute more appropriate Greek usage. However, OG uses ἵνα + subj. in a clause which is consecutive, while Th has a more idiomatic rendering with μημοτε (s. BDF §370.2).

1. 99 to 100-OG requires addition of the n. in 1. 100 to the part. διατείκω (1-4) in order to render the sense of the Hebrew.

1. 101-OG and Th employ παρά + acc. for the comparative. Comparative ἦν occurs 5x elsewhere. In 1:15 OG has κρέισσων + gen., Th ὑπέρ + acc.; 2:30 OG ὑπέρ + acc., Th παρά + acc.; 7:19 OG παρά + acc., Th gen. part.!!; 7:23 OG παρά + acc., Th fin. vb.!!; 8:3 OG ὑψηλότερον, Th ὑψηλότερον + gen. The comparative + gen. and the positive with παρά/ὑπέρ + acc. are common equivalents in the LXX. S. the discussion in 3:11-20, Syntax, 1. 51. Therefore, the agreement in 1:10 is not particularly striking, especially when we consider the OG and Th choices elsewhere. 7:19, 23 both involve the vb. λέγω + ἦν and it is Th who has the dynamic renderings.

1. 102-OG renders the relative phrase with the acc. part. (cj.) Th employs a complementary acc. in order to provide good Greek and follow the word order of the Hebrew.

1. 104—Added by OG for clarification of the identity of the other youths in training.

II.1.iii. Lexicology

1. 4—παραγιγνομαι is 2/2 for καθαρίσει in OG (also 2:2), never in Th.

1. 8—πολιορκία for ἕρα (both HL in Daniel) is a fairly common equivalent in the later literature of the LXX (8-30, excluding 7x in Pentateuch).

1. 9, 82—δίδωμι and its compound form with παρά is an expected SE in Th for ἀνασκαλεῖν (21/21)\(^{13}\) and βαφίον (20/20).\(^{14}\) There are 6 other instances of δίδωμι or one of its compounds in Th. There is no available Vorlage in 3:32 (=OG) and 34 (=OG). In 10:1 the vb. is an add. that makes the meaning of the Hebrew explicit, and in 9:27 both Th and OG read the 3 f.s.q.imp. of ἀνασκαλεῖν (HL). Finally, the simple form is found twice in 5:21. In the first instance it is a contextual guess for the rare vb. ἀνασκαλεῖν, which is only found twice in Daniel.\(^{15}\) In the second case, Th evidently read ἀνασκαλεῖν as ἐκθέτει due to influence from 4:14(17), 22(25), 29(32). The texts read as follows:

4:14(17), etc. ὁ λόγος ἡ τύχη τῆς ζωῆς

5:21 δέ σε διδόμενον ἐκθέτον

Th reads καὶ τί ἐν τῷ δόξῳ ἐξοργίζεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ in all four cases.

OG is similar to Th in his extensive use of δίδωμι and its compound forms for ἀνασκαλεῖν (16/18)\(^{16}\) and βαφίον (13/15),\(^{17}\) but exhibits

\(^{13}\) 1:2, 9, 12, 16, 17; 2:16; 4:14(17), 22(25), 29(32); 8:12, 13; 9:3, 10; 10:12, 15; 11:6, 11, 17, 21, 31; 12:11. Th has παραδείδωμι in 11:6, 11.

\(^{14}\) 2:21, 23, 37, 38, 48; 3:28(95); 4:13(16); 5:17, 18, 19, 28; 6:3(2); 7:4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 22, 25, 27. Th has παραδείδωμι (=OG) in 3:28(95) and ἀντιδίδειμι in 6:3.

\(^{15}\) It is untranslated by Th in 3:29(96).

\(^{16}\) OG has παραδείδωμι in 1:2; 11:11; ἀντιδίδωμι in 1:16; γίνομαι in 8:12 (textual difficulty); νορμάλα (1-5) in 11:6. OG=0 in 4:14(14), 22(25), 29(32).
greater variety in his employment of the compounds and uses them more frequently to render a greater variety of vbs. in MT. On seven occasions OG relies on the general meaning of רעש to translate the sense of the Vorlange. This is the case for רעש in 1:5, מプレゼ in 7:22, נב in 8:25, ליב in 9:24, and נל in 10:1.\(^{18}\) 11:17 and 18 both read ד今生, which is interesting because there is a difference in the K-Q in vs. 18.\(^{19}\) OG reflects the reading of the Q= الشخصية (K= الشخصية). On one occasion the translator uses the vb. when making a contextual guess. In 11:24 the translator did not understand the 3 m.s.q.impf. of ב (1-2), which is otherwise found only in Ps. 68:31.

1. 13, 57-The OG translation is somewhat surprising in 1. 57 when we consider that elsewhere רעש (7x) is rendered well.\(^{20}\) OG seems to take the m.pl.suf. of the n. to refer to the f. lo, but gives a very literal "Theodotian" type of rendering without including פָלָס to get the sense that it is "at the end of" the 3 years. Th's rendering using μέτα + acc. is more idiomatic.

1. 14-The adj. of OG gives greater specificity than the gen. cons. it replaces. Th's choice represents incomplete lexical leveling (s. 1. 44).

1. 16, 20, 26-In all three cases of רעש (hi.) OG chooses a different vb. לָשׂוּח in 1. 20 of OG is fairly rare (1-9) in the LXX. Th uses a form of תִּסְדָּו in the first two instances, but also gives a good rendition.\(^{21}\)

\(^{17}\)OG=0 in 4:13(16); 5:17, 18, 19; 6:3(2) and פָרָדָא in 2:38; 3:28(95).

\(^{18}\)S. CH 2 for a discussion of the textual variant in 10:1.

\(^{19}\)Vs. 17 MT begins בָּשִׁי and vs. 19 בָּשִׁי. In vs. 18 the Q has the former while the K has the latter. Th reads with K.

\(^{20}\)Also 1:15, 18; 2:42; 4:26(29), 31(34). In 4:31 OG=0. OG and Th share the reading פָּלָס n for רעש in 2:42.

\(^{21}\)MT has רעש in the hi. 10x. The OG equivalences elsewhere are גַּפֶּה in 1:18(2); אָנָא in 9:12, 14; לָשֶׁדֶח in 9:24; a textual problem in 11:6; אֲפֹתִּיש in 11:8. Th has common readings in 9:12, 14. Th has
1. 17, 32-Th translit. (s. CH 6, #94). OG’s use of ἐπιλεξτος (1-16) for ἄρματα (1-3) "nobility" (BDB, p. 832) in l. 32 is most likely an exegetical rendering based on the parallel with מַהְרִים, but OG manages to convey that the trainees are to be chosen from the cream of (Israelite) society. 22

l. 22-OG uses a more specific term in order to make the meaning explicit. S. p. 112, above.

l. 25, 66, 80, 87, 89-Th and OG share a common loan translation. Also 1:11, 18.

l. 33, 101, 103-יִלְרְוָּס (ם) appears 5x in ch. 1 and OG translates consistently with νεανισκος 23 (cf. CH 2 for 1:10), whereas Th prefers παιδάρια (4/5). Th’s agreement with OG in l. 33 is a common reading, though it could be due to textual corruption.

l. 36-Th has ḫπα also in 3:19, whereas OG employs it in 1:13, 15 for הָרָי. S. Lexicology in 3:11-20.

l. 37-The hi. substantive part. מֵשְׁכֵל occurs 5x. OG has several equivalents: ἐπιστήμων (1-12, 1. 37), ἐννοῶ (1-9, 11:33; s. Th in 9:23), συνήμι (11:35; 12:3), διανοηματ (12:10). Th employs συνήμι 3/5 and prefers to render all words related to םֶשֶל with σίωνις or its cognates. 24

l. 38-OG (5/7) and Th (8/8) both employ σοφία as a SE for ἡμέρα. 25 There are two additional uses of the n. in 5:11, but the omission by

eἰσάγῳ in 1:18(2); διγῷ in 9:24; φέρῳ in 11:6, 8.

22 Here we are taking the conjunctive in מַהְרִים as explicative. This position is argued in detail in the forthcoming thesis of R.G. Wooden at St. Andrews.

23 OG has νεανισκος 5/5 in 1:4, 10, 13, 15, 17. 11:6=0? Th has νεανις in 11:6.

24 See CH 4. III. 1. iii. for discussion.

25 OG and Th in 1:4; 2:20, 21, 23, 30. 1:17 OG has συνεσις; l:20=free; OG=0 in 5:14.
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both OG and Th as well as the content of the saying (חכמה חכמה) indicates that this is a later insertion.

1. 39-גנובא is a SE (2/2) for רם in Th (s. also 12:4).

1. 40-This is the only place where Th employs סְפִּימוּת for ֵנָב. It is usually the common equivalent employed by OG, but OG has rendered the syntagm with a dynamic equivalent (s. below).\textsuperscript{26}

1. 41-מדלי is only here and 1:17. OG employs the acc. pl. of ספִּימוּת to render ימְנֵי מִדְרָסִים in 1:4, but has a more formal approach with הַקְּשַׁרְתָּן in 1:17. Th possibly has פְּרוֹנְתִּיס in both cases.\textsuperscript{27} The related term מַדְלִי also appears in 2:21, 4:31(34), 33(36); 5:12. Th employs פְּרוֹנְתִּיס in ch. 4 while פְּרוֹנְתִּיס is found in 2:21; 5:12. OG only has an equivalent in 2:21, סינסיק.

1. 43-OG employs the more general זיווא, but the meaning has been retained.

1. 44-One might argue that Th's choice of אָכָה for יִדְרָשׁ is due to OG influence, but Th offers the same renderings in 5:5=OG and 6:19(18). For the most part, Th prefers אָכָה for both ֵנָב (11/12)\textsuperscript{28} and יִדְרָשׁ (3/7),\textsuperscript{29} and we can account for why Th does not render 3 of the other 4 with אָכָה. Both terms occur in 4:1 and Th chooses to omit יִדְרָשׁ as redundant; or it was not in his Vorlage. In 5:2 the context required a more specific word (וֹאָה) as opposed to the more general term. Now, we might ask why אָכָה is not appropriate in 5:2 when the referent is the same as 1:4? The difference is this. Th could say that Nebuchadnezzar took some of the holy vessels from "the house of

\textsuperscript{26} For a detailed discussion of the renderings for ֵנָב, see the section on 8:1-10, vs. 5.

\textsuperscript{27} It was noted in CH 4.I.iii. that the 4th century Sahidic ms. 925 does transpose סינסיק and פְּרוֹנְתִּיס in 1:17, and it is quite possible that this should be the original Th reading.

\textsuperscript{28} 1:2(3); 2:5, 17; 3:29(96); 4:1(4), 27(30); 5:3, 10, 23; 6:11.

\textsuperscript{29} 1:4; 4:1(4), 26(29); 5:2, 3, 5; 6:19.
God," (1:4) but it could not be said that he had brought them from "the house in Jerusalem," (5:2). Both of the Hebrew terms occur together again in 5:3 but neither one appears in the OG. The repetition of וַאֲבִימֵי in 5:3 and the non-translation of יִדְבַּר could be due to harmonization with the previous vs. On the other hand, יִדְבַּר has the air of a gloss and this impression is supported by the witness of the versions (s. BHS).30 The remaining vs. is 4:26(29) where the OG has the king walking ἐπὶ τῶν τεῖχων (walls) τῆς πόλεως and Th again employs ναὸς.

1. 48, 94—Elsewhere Th renders ἐπὶ (4/5) with καθιστημι where it has the sense "to appoint someone."31 Both διέταξεν (1-21, not in OG) and ἔκτάξαντα (1-6) (Ὑπακοήν) are fairly rare in the LXX. Both OG (16x) and Th (11x) employ ὑπακοήν frequently, but 1. 94 is their only common use. OG prefers to use the compound forms προστάσσον (6x)32 and ἔπιτάσσειν (6x),33 while Th only employs ἔπιτάσσειν in 6:10(9), and prefers to use ἔπιτάσσειν.34

1. 52, 53, 75—OG and Th have a common reading in 1. 52, 53, but both φρασεῖα and δείπνον represent good renditions for the difficult ἄβαθος (s.

30 Cf. the recent argument that the phrase ἡ ρήματα ἡ ἡ γραφή is the point of emphasis in the clause which is virtually verbatim from vs. 2. See B.T. Arnold, "Wordplay and Narrative Techniques in Daniel 5 and 6," JBL 112 (1993): 481. However, the question is whether this emphasis was in the original text or was it introduced by a later scribe?

31 S. 1:11; 2:24, 2:49; 3:12. OG also has καθιστημι in 2:24, 49; 3:12, though only in 3:12 do OG and Th have a common form (καθιστημας). In 5:26 ἰπαραμία is rendered by ἀριθμέω in OG and μετρέω in Th. In 1:11 OG has ἀριθμεῖναι.

32 S. 2:9, 12, 14; 3:10, 13; 4:11(14).

33 S. 1:18; 2:2, 46, 3:19, 20, 24. The use of συντάσσω (aor. ptcp.) is a dynamic rendering in 11:23. ἀριθμάτευσεν for ἴδη in 7:27 is a unique reading and the verb occurs as part of a plus in 11:37.

34 5:24, 25; 6:11(10), 13(12), 14(13); 10:21. ἀριθμάτευσεν is employed in 6:14(13) where Th has an omission and also as a dynamic rendering for the hi. of ἴδη in 11:39 (cf. the more literal rendering in OG). Elsewhere Th always employs κρύβει for ἴδη (11:3, 4, 5, 43). The simple form of ἀριθμάτευτος occurs in Th 6:13(12) and 11:17.
OG has \( \delta\varepsilon\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon \) 4/6 (s. 1:13, 15, 16) while Th prefers \( \tau\omicron\rho\acute{e}e\zeta\alpha \) 4/6 (Th=OG in 1:15).\(^{35}\)

1. 55, 78, 96-Th and OG translate \( \pi\lambda\omega\delta \) with \( \pi\omicron\sigma\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon \) (HL in LXX!) in 1. 96. The choice of \( \pi\omicron\sigma\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon \) could have been motivated by the similar sound in \( \beta\omicron\sigma\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 1. 95, but it is a distinctive agreement. Elsewhere Th translates with \( \pi\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \) (s. 1. 55, 78) and \( \pi\omicron\mu\omicron\alpha \) (1-4) in 1:16. OG has the vb. \( \pi\nu\dot{e}\omicron \) in 1. 55, 78 and omits in 1:16.

1. 56-OG (HL) and Th employ good as well as distinct renderings for the vb. Th also employs \( \tau\omicron\acute{e}\acute{e}i\upsilon\nu \) as a good rendition for the hithpe. \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu\tau\nu \) (HL, s. BDB, p. 1091) in 4:9(12).

1. 59, 86-Th prefers to restrict the rendering of \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) to \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \) (9/15), particularly in the opening Hebrew section (5/6), whereas OG uses a variety of equivalents throughout the book.\(^{36}\) The same is true in the Aramaic section of Daniel where Th prefers \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) for \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \) (19/41). At the same time Th does not depend on OG nor is Th a mechanical literalist. For example, of the 57x \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \) and \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \) occur in MT, Th shares a common rendering with OG in only 5 instances.\(^{37}\)

1. 65, 67-S. the discussion of Th’s relationship to OG.

\(^{35}\)The remaining reference is 11:26 where Th guesses with \( \delta\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon \) (f.s.acc.part.) "his wants (reading \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \)) will devour him" and OG with \( \mu\acute{r}\mu\mu\nu\nu \) "his thoughts (reading \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \)) will waste him." S. Collins, Daniel, p. 366.

\(^{36}\)S. 1:5, 9, 13, 18, 19; 2:2; 8:3, 4, 6, 7; 9:10, 18, 20; 10:12. Th has \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 1:18; 9:20; 10:12; \( \pi\omicron\varsigma \) in 8:3; the more literal \( \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\pi\rho\omicron\dot{a}\omicron\kappa\omicron\sigma\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon \) in 9:10; 11:16. The prep. \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) only occurs in three other places in Th, but is a good rendering in each: 3:3 for \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \), 3:40 MT=0, and 8:15 for \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \).

OG has \( \epsilon\mu\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\omicron\upsilon \) in 1:5; \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 1:9; 9:20; 10:12; 11:16; \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \) \( \hat{\mu}\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 1:13; \( \pi\omicron\varsigma \) in 1.18; \( \pi\omicron\alpha\dot{r} \) in 1.19; 2:2; \( \acute{\alpha}\omicron\nu\omicron\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 8:3; \( \epsilon\upsilon \) in 8:6; \( \kappa\acute{t}\nu\acute{e}\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 8:7; \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 8:4; 9:10, 18.

OG has \( \epsilon\mu\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\omicron\sigma\omicron\omicron\upsilon \) in 6:11(10); \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 8:4; 9:18; \( \epsilon\nu\omicron\dot{a}\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \) in 9:20; \( \acute{\alpha}\omicron\pi\rho\omicron\dot{a}\omicron\kappa\omicron\sigma\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon \) (for \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \)) in 11:22. The last case is a distinctive agreement, but note that it is Th who has the literal reading \( \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\pi\rho\omicron\dot{a}\omicron\kappa\omicron\sigma\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon \) in the previous use of \( \dot{\iota}\nu\nu \) in 11:16.

191
1. 68-OG and Th have a common transliteration of the name that agrees with the transliteration of the name of the king in ch. 5.

1. 74, 81-Th standardizes the translation of the vb. whereas OG uses variety. These are the only two occurrences of the vb. הָלַבַּי (2-11), 38 in Daniel, but 2 forms of the pi. and 1 pu. are found together in Mal. 1:7(2x), 12 in which the topic is the desecration of the Lord because of the food which the priests offer. Not only is there similarity in the themes—the priests polluting the altar, Daniel not wanting to defile himself—but the Greek vb. found in Mal. is ἀλισγεῖν. There is only one other occurrence in the LXX (Sir. 40:29). Therefore, the rendering in Th most likely has been influenced by Mal.

συμπανθη in 1. 81 is a HL. 88-Syh read with Th in 1. 74, but 967 has the OG reading with another HL ἀλί(ε)σθη (s. CH 2. III. and the discussion of 1:8 below).

1. 79-Th and OG have the same rendition of the Hebrew vb. (s. LEH, p. 43 and Syntax). An equivalent translation is found for the Aramaic מָגוֹר in OG and Th, 39 though elsewhere they give other renderings (cf. 1:20; 8:15; 9:3).

1. 84, 85-S. the discussion in CH 3.III.3.

1. 99- is a rare term (1-5, s. BDB, p. 277). Th gives a good dynamic rendering with συγκροτά (1-4, s. BAG, p. 758). OG, s. 1. 99-100, Syntax.

1. 102- is a HL in MT. 40 OG (1/3, s. IV Macc. 13:21, 24) offers a cj. συντρήσε (s. LSJ). Th uses συνῆλιξ (1-3), which is a good translation of the Hebrew.

1. 105- is rare in MT (1-2?, s. BDB, p. 295). Appropriately enough, OG κινδυνεύω (1-7) and Th καταδίκάζο (1-10) again use rare and

---

38 A weakened form of יָלַבַי, s. Mont., p. 133; KB, p. 163.


40 Bevan, p. 61, identifies this and the following term as Aramaic loan-words.
distinct vocabulary for the translation. The OG rendering catches the emotion slightly better. We might translate, "And I would lose my neck!"

II.1.iv. Summary

In 1:1-10 OG gives a faithful translation of a Vorlage that is generally very similar to, if not, identical with MT. OG exhibits characteristics of formal equivalence by following the word order and representing most of the lexemes and morphemes in MT. He does avoid some of the parataxis of MT by employing two hypotactic constructions with part. (1. 4, 16), and on one occasion uses a postpositive conj. (§ in 1. 69). OG’s dynamic approach to translation is evident in various ways. On several occasions he makes appropriate changes to a Semitic relative clause in order to render the semantic content (1. 42, 74, 81, 97) and omits elements that are redundant (1. 1-4, 16-22, 107). OG also introduces shorter readings by employing one lexeme to render the meaning of two in the parent text (1. 35-37, 39-40). However, in two cases he adds elements to clarify MT or to make it explicit (1. 49-50, 104). The most significant indication of OG’s dynamic approach is the variety in his lexical choices (1. 4, 72, 74, 81, 84, 85, 105, 106), though a couple resulted from guesses (1. 99, 102).

Th’s TT exhibits a high degree of formal correspondence to his Vorlage, but always with the intention of presenting the meaning of the parent text within the linguistic boundaries of the target language. Therefore, there are minor omissions or additions of morphemes and slight changes in the syntax to preserve the semantic content (1. 74, 79-81, 97, 102). On two occasions Th employs transliterations (1. 17, 32), and, generally speaking, Th exhibits his own pattern of translating MT (s. II.2. below).

II.2. The Relationship Between OG and Th

As an opening to our discussion of whether or not Th is a recension we will examine vs. 8 in which there is a high degree of verbal agreement between Th and OG. The argument that Th is a recension would go something like this: 1. Th has borrowed from OG in
1. 79 (s. *Lexicology*). 2. Th has borrowed the rendering of the vb. in 1. 74 from OG (1/2-5); therefore, 1. 81 is also dependent upon OG, because Th tends to standardize (s. 1. 74 - *Syntax*). 3. Th follows the loan translation of מְדִינָה ה. 4. Th has merely changed the prep. in 1. 73 and standardized terms in 1. 72, 75-78. On this analysis Th retains OG for 16 words, follows 1 omission, and is dependent upon OG for at least 2 more. We will make our total possible readings 30. There are 31 words in Th, but 1. 82 repeats 1. 74 and each time Th has one more word than OG. We now have 29, but we allowed for one omission of a prep. which makes the total 30. Based on this analysis Th shows the influence of OG in 19 out of 30 or 63% of its readings.

The above argument seems convincing, but is there another way to look at the evidence? For example, the above analysis assumes Th borrowed the rendering of the vb. in 1. 74. How do we know who knew the meaning of מְדִינָה? The fact that OG has a HL in 1. 81 supports the contention that 967 has the true OG rendering in 1. 74. O. Munnich has recently supported the same position by suggesting that the reading מְדִינָה is the result of pre-hexaplaric correction toward Th. Second, except for the rendering of the vb. in 1. 79, Th offers an expected formal correspondence to the MT that could be arrived at by any Hebrew student at the end of his/her introductory year. On this analysis, Th only has a common rendering of the vb. in 1. 79 and the loan translation for מְדִינָה in 1. 80. 2 words + 1 omission of a prep. 3 of 30 = 10%.

1. 7, 8-The add. of the prep. in 1. 7 is not remarkable; and even though the reading of the vb. is one of the more obvious choices (1/1) we should view it as a common reading.

1. 13 to 16-The reading of Th in 1. 13 looks like Th has rendered עד for the prep. יד and borrowed OG’s מְדִינָה for מְדִינָה, but it is a correct rendering. The distinct readings for the same Hebrew in 1. 57 confirm

---

41 That is, only if 88-Syh and not 967 is regarded as OG.

42 Munnich, "Origène," p. 188.

43 The translation of the vb. in 1. 72 is Th’s normal equivalent. S. the discussion of 1. 65-67, below.
that Th is not relying on OG in l. 13. L. 14-15 in Th show expected formal equivalence to MT (s. HR).

1. 25, 66, 80, 87, 89—OG and Th share a common loan translation for שֵׁבֶת חֹסִים (also 1:11, 18).

1. 26—Similar to 1. 16 it is possible that the compound was inspired by the simple vb. in OG, but the hi. of מֵבָא is translated the same way by Th 2x in 1:18 (cf. OG ἀγαγεῖν and ἑξήκοντα; s. CH 2) and it is an obvious choice.

1. 33—Th has the usual OG reading of νεανισκός, though this may be from textual corruption.

1. 44 to 46—S. Lexicology, l. 44 for ὁκφ. The remainder are expected equivalents, though γράμματα might be viewed as a shared rendering.

1. 50—Th’s use of κατά for ב is the only example in the book and the only occurrence of the preposition before 3:28. This might suggest that Th has borrowed from OG. Th also overlaps with OG in 9 other vss. (6:5[4]; 10:15; 11:4, 16, 36; but 4x the MT =0, 3:28; 42[2x]; 43). However, κατά ἡμέραν is a good Greek rendering of the Hebrew distributive meaning "every day" (Mayser, II.2. 430ff.), whereas OG uses ἐκάστην. Therefore, there is no reason to conclude that Th was influenced in this rendition by OG.

1. 52, 53—OG and Th have a common reading of τρόπες, though OG has δείκνυον in l. 75. It is possible that OG’s reading is corrupt because he prefers δείκνυον in 1:8, 13, 15, 16. However, Th does employ δείκνυον in 1:16. So this might be classified as a distinctive agreement.

1. 58—Th has already established this translation (s. l. 43), and it is a SE throughout the LXX.

1. 65 to 67—The first three lines read exactly the same in OG and Th, so we could very easily presume that Th has borrowed from OG. On the other hand, the only striking features of the reading involve the vb., i.e. it is the same in l. 65 and both omit it in l. 67. There are
fifteen possible readings of מַשְׂרָה in MT.\textsuperscript{44} One involves a Q in 11:18 (s. Lexicology, 1. 9), 6x OG=0, and in only 2 places OG employs מַשָּׁרַת (s. also 6:18[17]).\textsuperscript{45} In contrast, excluding 11:18, Th offers a good translation of מַשְׂרָה in almost every occurrence and employs מַשָּׁרַת 7x.\textsuperscript{46} When we consider the generally close formal correspondence of Th to MT we have to allow for the probability that the vb. in 1. 67 of MT is a later insertion (s. Text-Critical). OG and Th would only then agree in their reading of ἐπέστησαν; but it is Th who consistently employs מַשָּׁרַת.

1. 68-The shared reading of βαλτάσσαρ is distinctive, but there are no means to determine the direction of borrowing. Furthermore, it is likely the result of textual transmission.

1. 94–97-S. Lexicology 1. 48, 94 concerning the acc. part. in 1. 94. It is Th who used this form of ἐπέστησα previously in 1. 48 and this is the only place where Th and OG use a form of the verb in the same place. Th employs a more idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew vb. in 1. 97, so it is unlikely that Th is in any way dependent upon OG for the understanding of the syntax. There is also the exact verbal correspondence in 1. 95–96, which includes the unusual common reading of πόσιν in 1. 96 and the HL βρώσιν in 1. 95. Once again we have to ask, from whom did the reading originate? Is Th merely copying OG, or is the OG that we have a late revision based on Th? There is nothing particularly important about the use of βρώσιν for ὕπεμνα (10/30

\textsuperscript{44}1:7, 8; 2:5; 3:10, 12; 3:29(96); 4:3(6); 5:12; 6:14(13), 15(14), 18(17), 27(26); 11:17, 18. OG and Th=0 once in 1:7.

\textsuperscript{45}OG=0 in 4:3(6); 5:12; 6:14(13), 15(14), 27(26) and 1:7. Except for the use of δῶσαι in 11:17; 18, OG uses a variety of equivalents or more dynamic renditions for this particular vb. ἐνθομέσοιμα in 1:8; προστάσσω in 3:10; ὀφείλω in 3:12. The remaining two examples are in 2:5 and 3:29(96) where both Th and OG had trouble with MT (s. the discussion in 2:1-10).

\textsuperscript{46}S. 1:7, 8; 3:10; 4:3(6); 5:12; 6:18(17), 27(26). Even in 3:12 where Th has evidently read the vb. ἡμών the translation offers a good dynamic equivalent, and in 6:15(14) Th has θεωνίζομαι! τενάγη in 6:14(13) and τάξιν in 11:17 are then the only places where Th fails to use the expected equivalent.
in LXX), but it is interesting that in the three other occurrences of ἀρχιερατέας OG uses a vb. twice and leaves it untranslated in 1:16. Th, on the other hand, uses three different equivalents for ἀρχιερατέας, two of which are very rare in the LXX. The omission of ἀρχιερατέας in 1:16 may indicate that OG actually did not know the meaning of the Hebrew term, though this would be unusual for such a common word. However, in l. 55 OG could have employed the vb. quite easily as a contextual guess (and by extension l. 78), but the context did not allow it in 1:16. In any event, it is at least as likely that the rendering in l. 96 is due to revision of OG in the light of Th! The alternative explanation, that Th in l. 96 reflects OG, which merely omitted ἀρχιερατέας as redundant in 1:16, is less likely for two reasons. First, Th demonstrates considerable independence in the latter half of vs. 10, l. 99-107. This is obvious in the choice of terminology (s. Lexicology, 99, 101, 102, 105) and the syntax (s. l. 97 and l. 102). Second, the exact formal correspondence of OG and Th to MT is more characteristic of Th.

In summary, OG and Th have shared readings in l. 8, 13, 26, 33, 46, 52, 58, 65, 67, 68, 79, 94-96 and the five occurrences of ἀρχιερατέας. However, only νεανισκός in l. 33, πόσις in l. 96, and βαλτασσαρ α in l. 68 could be called distinctive agreements. There are no means to determine the direction of borrowing for either of the last two, though there is good reason to believe that πόσις is due to Th influence on OG. Given Th’s consistent use of παιδάρια for μαχλήν, it is possible that l. 33 is due to textual corruption. L. 13, 26, 58 are such obvious equivalents that they cannot be considered as evidence of any dependence by Th on OG, and in l. 65, 94-96 OG may also be dependent upon Th. The omission in l. 67 probably reflects an original reading; and the other common readings in l. 8, 46, 79 are not particularly important either. There may be significance in the common reading of ἀρχιερατέας, but technical terms and common names are particularly susceptible to harmonization.

The evidence that Th has actually borrowed any readings from OG in 1:1-10 is practically non-existent. On the other hand, there are numerous distinctive disagreements which indicate that Th was translating independently. Overall, Th offers a consistent
translation of MT that does not presuppose OG, and he employs unique or his own distinctive vocabulary in l. 37, 41, 48, 56, 74, 81, 99, 102, 105. The existence of only three distinctive agreements (of which one may stem from Th), so few common readings, and the number of distinctive Th readings in this section leads to the conclusion that Th is not a recension of OG in this passage. The agreements may represent Th's occasional borrowing or knowledge of OG, but there is no evidence of systematic revision of OG. On the other hand, we have only just begun the analysis and perhaps it is better to suspend our judgment. The picture of Th's relationship to OG should become clearer as we proceed.

II.3. Text-Critical Problems

1. 18 and 19, 21-The omission in l. 18-19 could be due to the translator's decision to omit the words as redundant. There is also the possibility that the translator omitted בָּהֵן אַלְפָּיִים אֲשֶׁר־סָמֵּלַנְתוּ by parablepsis. The vb. in l. 20 is marked with the ה, but it is followed by בַּן and l. 21 begins with דְּבָרָה as well. A third possibility is that אַרְגָּצוּנָה was inserted as an explanatory gloss to אֲשֶׁר־סָמֵּלַנְתוּ. In this case only בָּהֵן אַלְפָּיִים was deemed redundant, though the phrase is retained in 88-Syh with אַשְׁרָה. A decision here is difficult, but the last possibility is probably the one that leads to the original text. L. 21 was omitted as unnecessary by the rendering of בָּהֵן אַלְפָּיִים by אַרְגָּצוּנָה (s. Lexicology).

1. 28-S. 2:25. Charles, p. 12, is most likely correct when he argues that בָּהֵן מְלֹל has been omitted (OG reproduces בָּהֵן מְלֹל in err.) from MT. The presence of the addition in Th, which otherwise follows MT so closely, is convincing reason to emend MT rather than view the add. as a gloss from 2:25.

1. 49-S. Syntax.

47 Charles, p. 8, argues this position, and suggests there is a further addition in MT as well.

48 Also O. Plöger, Das Buch Daniel, KAT (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965), p. 36; Mont., p. 118. Collins, Daniel, p. 127, suggests all of l. 19-22 may be a later gloss.

49 Cf. the suggestion of Blud., p. 51 and Mont., p. 115.
1. 67—The vb. in MT is a later insertion. S. the discussion of Th’s relationship to OG, l. 65–67. The vb. is also omitted in the Peshitta and Vulgate.

1. 104—We have already noted that this addition is for clarification of who the other youths were (s. Syntax).

1. 107—OG omits because of the dynamic rendering given to the clause, s. Lexicology, l. 105.
III. Daniel 2:1-10

The opening 10 verses from ch. 2 were chosen for investigation because they offer the most variants in the chapter as well as some interesting translation equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>2:1</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>2:1</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>2:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1: Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>1: Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
<td>Kai en to deutero etei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200
οἱ Χαλδαῖοι
τῷ βασιλεί
Συριστί
Βασιλεὺς
eἰς τοῖς αἰῶνας ζῇβι
+§(σὺ)εἶπόν τὸ ἐνύπνιον
tοῖς ἑκαστὶ σου
καὶ τὴν ἑσύγκρισιν
ἀναγγελούμεν

2:5

ἀπεκρίθη ὁ βασιλεὺς

- -
tοῖς Χαλδαίοις
Ὁ ἡλύσιος
ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἀπέστη
ἐὰν μὴ ἑγνωρίσητε μοι

2:5

tὸ ἐνύπνιον
cαὶ τὴν ἑσύγκρισιν

eἰς ἑκάστην ἑσεσθε
καὶ οἱ ὅσκοι υἱῶν
(διαρπαγήσονται)

2:6

ἐὰν §δὲ τὸ ἐνύπνιον
cαὶ τὴν ἑσύγκρισιν

§γνωρίσητε §μοι
dόματα καὶ δορεὰς
καὶ τιμήν πολλῆν
(λίμνεσθε)

2:6

παρ' ἐμοῦ
(πλῆν)
tὸ ἐνύπνιον
καὶ τὴν ἑσύγκρισιν

λαμβάνετέ μοι

2:6

§ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέα
συριστή
Κύριε +βασιλεύ+
tὸν Χαίωνα ζῆσῃ
ἀναγγείλων τὸ ἐνύπνιον
tοῖς ὑμῖν σου
καὶ ἡμεῖς §φράσομεν

τὸν Χαίωνα ζῆσῃ

2:5

§ἀποκρίθεις §δὲ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν
tοῖς Χαλδαίοις διότι

- -

Εάν μη [Ἀπαγγείλητε]

μοι +ἐπ' ἀληθείας+
tὸ ἐνύπνιον
cαὶ τὴν τοῦτον ἑκρίσιν
§δηλώσετε

§παραδειγματισθήσεσθε
cαὶ §ἀναλημφθήσεται

§ομῶν τὰ §ὑπάρχοντα
eἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν

καὶ τὴν τοῦτον ἑκρίσιν

[Ἀπαγγείλητε]

λήψεσθαι §δόματα
cαὶ §δοξασθήσεσθε

§ὑπ' ἐμοῦ

§δηλώσατε §οὖν

tὸ ἐνύπνιον

καὶ κρίνατε
2:7
65 ἀπεκρίθησαν
dékteron kai eiπan
(Ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔιπάτω)
to enupīnon
tois paiπin autōu
kai tēn sūgykrīsin
+autōu ἄναγγελούμεν

2:8
72 kai ἀπεκρίθη
73 ὁ βασιλεὺς
74 kai eiπen

2:9
84 εἳν οὖν τὸ ἐνύπνιον
85 μη ἄναγγελήπτε μοι

(οἵδα ὅτι)

2:7
66 ἀπεκρίθησαν
dékteron λέγοντες
Basileu to ἱδραμα
eipan
oi dē paiπες sou
kρινούσιν
pros taπta

2:8
78 λαβότι
eiπετ ἁπ' ἐμοῦ
to ἱπιμα

2:9
86 εἳν μη μοι
to ἱνύπνιον

+καὶ τὴν τοῦτον
+κρινιν+ ἐπικρίσητε
+θελητε
periphe lesbēθε

89 (οἵδα ὅτι)

2:7
65 ἀπεκρίθησαν
dékteron λέγοντες
Basileu to ἱδραμα
eipan
oi dē paiπες sou
kρινούσιν
pros taπta

2:8
78 λαβότι
eiπετ ἁπ' ἐμοῦ
to ἱπιμα

2:9
86 εἳν μη μοι
to ἱνύπνιον

+καὶ τὴν τοῦτον
+κρινιν+ ἐπικρίσητε
+θελητε
periphe lesbēθε

89 (οἵδα ὅτι)

2:7
66 ἀπεκρίθησαν
dékteron λέγοντες
Basileu to ἱδραμα
eipan
oi dē paiπες sou
kρινούσιν
pros taπta

2:8
78 λαβότι
eiπετ ἁπ' ἐμοῦ
to ἱπιμα

2:9
86 εἳν μη μοι
to ἱνύπνιον

+καὶ τὴν τοῦτον
+κρινιν+ ἐπικρίσητε
+θελητε
periphe lesbēθε

89 (οἵδα ὅτι)

2:7
65 ἀπεκρίθησαν
dékteron λέγοντες
Basileu to ἱδραμα
eipan
oi dē paiπες sou
kρινούσιν
pros taπta

2:8
78 λαβότι
eiπετ ἁπ' ἐμοῦ
to ἱπιμα

2:9
86 εἳν μη μοι
to ἱνύπνιον

+καὶ τὴν τοῦτον
+κρινιν+ ἐπικρίσητε
+θελητε
periphe lesbēθε

89 (οἵδα ὅτι)

2:7
66 ἀπεκρίθησαν
dékteron λέγοντες
Basileu to ἱδραμα
eipan
oi dē paiπες sou
kρινούσιν
pros taπta

2:8
78 λαβότι
eiπετ ἁπ' ἐμοῦ
to ἱπιμα

2:9
86 εἳν μη μοι
to ἱνύπνιον

+καὶ τὴν τοῦτον
+κρινιν+ ἐπικρίσητε
+θελητε
periphe lesbēθε

89 (οἵδα ὅτι)

2:7
65 ἀπεκρίθησαν
dékteron λέγοντες
Basileu to ἱδραμα
eipan
oi dē paiπες sou
kρινούσιν
pros taπτα

2:8
78 λαβότι
eiπετ ἁπ' ἐμοῦ
to ἱπιμα

2:9
86 εἳν μη μοι
to ἱνύπνιον

+καὶ τὴν τοῦτον
+κρινιν+ ἐπικρίσητε
+θελητε
periphe lesbēθε

89 (οἵδα ὅτι)
III.1. Analysis of 2:1-10

III.1.1. Morphology

1. 5-Th has a s. for the pl. Since Th usually follows the number of the Vorlage and OG has the pl., this difference may stem from an error reading the text.

1. 11, 16, 27, 94, 113—Only in l. 16 and 27 does Th represent the 5 of the inf. cons. with an article.

1. 34—OG has the s. for the pl. here. ἐπί occurs 18x, of which 6x
there is a plural. OG retains the pl. only in 7:18(?),\textsuperscript{50} while in 4 more places it changes the pl. to the favoured sing. (2:44[2]; 3:9; 6:27[26]).\textsuperscript{51} On two occasions OG employs the adj. αἰώνιος (7:14, 27). Given OG’s preference for the s. and his omission of מִרְפָּא עַל in 2:20, it is probable that Zieg.’s reading in 7:18 is incorrect. Zieg. has OG reading with MT and Th omitting one element.\textsuperscript{52}

Th follows the number of שֵׁלֶל in MT except in 5:10 and 6:7(6). On two occasions OG and Th both read the adj. αἰώνιος, but once again this does not prove Th dependence on OG. In each instance the use of the adj. is an appropriate rendering for the adv. שֵׁלֶל; furthermore, שֵׁלֶל is employed as an adv. earlier in 3:33(100) and 4:31(34), and in both cases Th translates with the adj.

1. 35, 67-Th deals with both of these vbs. differently from OG. In 1. 35 he adds the pers. pro. for emphasis. Th correctly translates the juss. in 1. 67 (s. l. 68, Syntax).

1. 37, 47, 55, 63, 70, 103-In 1. 47, 54 Th omits the pro. against MT and OG while in 1. 71 Th adds it. These differences stem from

\textsuperscript{50} שלֶל occurs 3x in a series in 7:18, 2x in 2:20, and 2x in separate syntagms in 4:31(34).

\textsuperscript{51} S. CH 2. II. 8. for 2:44. 3x OG=0, 3:33(100); 5:10; 6:7(6) and 3x the Vorlage is substantially different in 4.31(34)bis; 6:22(21). There are differences in 6:27(26) as well. In order to account for all of the occurrences of שלֶל, note that it is found 3x in a series in 7:18, 2x in 2:20, and 2x in separate syntagms in 4:31(34).

αἰών is used 4x in the Hebrew section of MT, each time in the s. (8:11; 12:3bis, 7). In 8:11 and once in 12:3 it is an add. αἰώνιος is also found for שלֶל in 9:24; 12:2(2).

\textsuperscript{52} S. Zieg. p. 171. The apparatus reads καὶ ἐξαὶ τοῦ αἰώνιος τῶν αἰῶνων Syh Ist.] om. τῶν αἰῶνων 967; om. καὶ ἐξαὶ τοῦ αἰώνων 88: homiot. I would suggest that either 967 or 88 preserves the original reading. If 967 is original, then OG would have omitted the last of the three occurrences of שלֶל which is supported by 2:20 and the preference for the s. elsewhere. This reading would explain Syh Ist. as a variant which reflects later harmonization to MT. 88 could have omitted a portion of this text as Zieg. indicates, or represent an attempt to fix the s., or Th influence. On the other hand, we will find evidence that supports Albertz’ position that the OG translator of chs. 4-6 is different from the translator of the remainder of the book, so the change to the s. in ch. 7 may only be related to the 2x in ch. 2:44.
vocalization, but also demonstrate Th independence from OG. The meaning of the text is not affected either way. Note also the orthographical variation between Μ/Μ in MT.

1. 92-OG employs the pl. for the s., while Th follows MT.

III.1.ii. Syntax
1. 3-OG’s choice of σωθή with an acc. and inf. reflects an idiom in the Greek (s. BAG, p. 777); therefore, there is no reason to suggest an alternative Vorlage. For the addition of ἀράματα, s. Text-Critical.

1. 8-The text is corrupt in the OG (s. CH 2), but seems to have undergone revision toward MT under the influence of Th. The clause in 1. 9 was omitted as redundant, but the omission of τὸν is harder to explain given its inclusion in 1. 26. However, if the καὶ at the beginning of vs. 2 were regarded as a later insertion associated with the hexaplaric addition, then καὶ ταραχθήναι ἐν τῷ ὑπό [άφω] ἐπίταξαι would read well; and we can see how the τὸν would have been regarded as unnecessary. The meaning of OG is basically synonymous with MT.

1. 11-OG uses a different vb. (ἐπισθέω) and transforms it into a pass. in order to make the meaning of the text explicit (s. Text-Critical). The choice of the pass. may also have been influenced by the one in 1. 6.

1. 15-The gen. probably reflects an alternative Vorlage, but would make the preceding terms various classes of Chaldeans. S. Text-Critical.

1. 19-OG employs a hypotactic construction to avoid the parataxis of the Hebrew.

1. 26, 52-Wifstrand, p. 49, notes 1. 26 as one of the places where OG does not follow the Hebrew in the position of the per. pro. L. 52 should be added to his list.

1. 27-The addition, if original (s. Text-Critical), serves to make the text read more smoothly by having the king’s disturbed spirit being the cause of wanting to know the interpretation of the dream.

1. 27?, 61, 82, 98-The use of postpositive conjunctions like ὅτε, ὅπω,
and ὥσ is a sign of a dynamic translator, because employing a postpositive entails a change in the word order of the Vorlage. OG employs the conj. ὅν 9x as a free rendition of MT. Only 2x is it found outside of chs. 2-3.

Th never has this conj.

1. 31-OG's choice of the prep. is surprising since the article would do, as in l. 17.
1. 33-S. Text-Critical.

1. 39, 53, 65, 69-OG employs ἀε 52x and the distribution is significant: Ch. 1-4x; Ch. 2-17x; Ch. 3-9x; Ch. 4-6x; Ch. 5-1x; Ch. 6-9x; Ch. 7-3x; Ch. 8-1x; Ch. 12-2x. Not only is ἀε relatively infrequent in chs. 4-6, but it is almost totally absent from chs. 7-12.

Th only has ἀε 11x, and ἀε is totally absent from chs. 1, 7-12.

1. 39, 65, 72, 105-All four instances involve the semitic idiom ἀπάντησεν καὶ εἶπεν "answered and said." A literal rendering is the part./vb.(ἀποκρίθη) + finite vb. (6x, usually εἶπεν). In 3/4 cases Th translates with the formal equivalent, but it does omit ἀπάντησεν in l. 40 against both MT and OG. OG also has one omission of ἀπάντησεν in l. 72, but exhibits more variety in general. In l. 40 he has the common literal rendering while in l. 65 OG employs the even more formal equivalent participle (λέγοντες) for ἀπάντησεν. Finally, in l. 108 OG has the most idiomatic rendering when he translates ἀπάντησεν with ὅτι as an introduction to direct discourse. Thus,

53 See Aejmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," pp. 363-372. ἀε and ὥσ are discussed in more detail in later sections.
54 2:3, 5, 6, 7; 3:15, 16; 6:13, 16, 24, 26(93), 30(97); 5:6; 12:6.
55 1:17, 15, 18; 2:5, 6, 7(2), 13, 16, 24(2), 26, 27, 30, 33(2), 36, 41, 43, 44; 3:12, 15, 16, 23, 25, 46, 49, 51, 28(95); 4:16(19), 19(22), 28(31), 30(33), 34b, 34c; 5:preface; 6:5(4), 6(5), 11(10), 13(12)bis, 17(16), 23(22)bis; 7:7(2), 16; 8:4; 12:2(2).
56 2:6, 15, 24, 30, 41. 42; 3:15, 49; 4:15(18); 5:17; 6:23(22).
57 Aejmelaeus notes that Daniel's three uses (including 2:5) of ὅτι recitativum rank it among the most frequent users, even though we would expect it more often. Similar cases to l. 108 are l. 41 where it
OG displays its characteristic variety, and through its variety of renderings demonstrates four main ways that we find the idiom translated in the LXX.58

The idiom מַעֲשֵׂה is found 30x in the Aramaic section of Daniel. Generally speaking, מַעֲשֵׂה is most often represented by some form of a finite vb. (OG-16x, Th-19x, usually εἰπόν). Only 3x does OG use a participle alone (also λέγων in 2:15; 6:21), while Th has one occurrence of the part. alone in 3:16. When OG and Th choose to represent the syntagm with one equivalent it is more often the case that מַעֲשֵׂה is omitted.

It is when we compare chs. 2-3 with chs. 4-6 that there are significant differences in the TT of both Greek texts, but particularly in Th. For example, the idiom occurs 9x in ch. 2 and Th has the literal rendering of the part./vb. + finite vb. 6x.59 In 2:8, 20 one of the elements is omitted while in 2:15 the whole idiom is left out. In ch. 3:1-20 the idiom occurs 4x: 3:9-Th=omission; 3:14-vb. + vb.; 3:16-vb. + part.; 3:19-om. + vb. In the same section of chs. 2 and 3 OG almost always represents both vbs. of the construction and usually has the finite vb. as the second element. Besides the differences noted in 1. 72 and 80, OG employs the part. alone in 2:15 and in 3:19 OG translates the syntagm dynamically with ἐφανείτα.

Significant changes begin to occur where the deuterocanonical additions have been inserted into ch. 3. The idiom occurs 4x in 3:24(91)-3:26(93). In each case Th translates with a single finite vb. OG omits the syntagm once in 3:24(91) and 25(92), translates with a single finite vb. once in 3:24(91),60 and employs καλέω in 3:26(93). This cluster of differences in both OG and Th indicates either that the Vorlage is different and/or, possibly, that we are dealing with

is difficult to determine whether the OG is or and 2:25 where translates מַעֲשֵׂה. See, "OTI recitativum in Septuagintal Greek," in Studien zur Septuaginta - Robert Hanhart zu Ehren, MSU, 20, ed. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J. Wevers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 79-82.

58 See also Aejmelaeus' article, "Participium Coniunctum as a Criterion of Translation Technique," VT 32 (1982): 387.

59 Besides 2:5, 7, 10 see 26, 27, 47.

60 The idiom is attested in 1QDan. See DJD, 1, p. 151.
different translators. Similar differences are encountered in chs. 5–6.
The syntagm occurs 8x, but Th only represents both elements in
6:14(13); otherwise Th employs a single finite vb.\(^{61}\) The remaining
uses are 3:28(95); 4:16(19)\(^{bis}\), 27 where Th employs the literal
rendering and 7:2 where both Th and OG omit it. As usual OG has a
varied pattern. However, it is significant that even when we exclude
the 4x where OG=0 in 3:24–7:2,\(^{62}\) OG represents both elements 3x (5:13;
6:13[12], 17[16]) where Th only has the finite vb.

Although it is difficult to draw conclusions from the translation
of this idiom by itself, it does seem to fit a pattern in the Aramaic
section. OG generally represents both elements of the idiom through
ch. 3:19 while it does not in 3:24(91)–7:2. The same is true of Th, yet
in the majority of cases OG and Th employ different syntactical
patterns to translate the idiom. Therefore, Th is not dependent upon
OG for his renderings. If we were to examine their lexical choices, we
would discover even greater diversity.

1. 41–43–The text in 2:5 offers many difficulties. The reading of the
conj. and the omission of 1. 42–43 is somewhat odd given 1. 79–81, but
should be considered original OG (s. Lexicology and Text-Critical). As
a result, the emphasis on the finality of the decree is somewhat less
compared to MT, though this is partially compensated for by the add.
in l. 45 (if original).

1. 48, 54–It is argued below (s. Lexicology) that these additions
probably do not reflect an alternative Vorlage at all. If the OG as it
stands is original (but s. below), the creation of distinct clauses may
have been motivated by the translator’s desire to make explicit the
command to tell both the contents of the dream and its
meaning.

1. 57, 58–OG uses alternative means to render these syntagms in MT
and offers good idiomatic translations. In l. 57 OG renders one of the

\(^{61}\)5:7, 10, 13, 17: 6:13(12), 17(16), 21(20).

\(^{62}\)3:24(91), 25(92); 4:16(2); 5:7, 10.
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co-ordinate nouns with an adj. OG renders the n. and adj. in l. 58 of MT with the vb. in l. 59.

l. 68-Th translates the juss. with its formal equivalent, while OG uses the 2.s.impv. If Th were following OG closely, it would have been easy to write the voc. βασιλεῖ as in l. 33 before he arrived at the vb. and realized that μᾶλλον should be rendered with a nominative. Indeed, it could be argued that OG wrote down the voc. without looking far enough ahead to ensure that the syntax would be correct. It was only after OG came to the vb. that he realized his grammatical error, but he was able to change the syntax of the remainder of the vs. and still render the basic meaning of the passage.

l. 82-83-As they stand, l. 82-83 appear to be an add. that give emphasis to the prior decree. However, they are probably OG (s. Text-Critical), while l. 78-81 are Theodotionic.

l. 86-87-We suggest that the add. of OG be preferred (s. Text-Critical) over MT, but the basic sense of each is the same because the required interpretation of the vision is understood from the context.

l. 88-90-l. 88 is an addition containing the rare word περιπλεκτό (1-9), while 89-90 are omitted. The text echoes 2:5 and the overall sense of OG and MT is the same, though OG does emphasize the judgment against the magicians for failing to explain the dream. l. 89-90 exhibit a textual difficulty, because there is no question whether OG and Th could have translated l. 89-90 with a formal equivalent if they had so desired. Both translate μὴ elsewhere where it occurs in the Vorlage. For example, in 2:13, 15 OG has δογμαίζω and in 7:25 νομός. Th has

---

63 In 2:48 OG renders ἀνακάτεψα with δορεά, while in 5:17 OG=0. Th renders ἀνακάτες 3/3 with δομα and ἀνακάτες 2/2 with δορεά (s. 5:17).

64 See CH 3.III.3 for a discussion of ἔπρ.

65 Soisalon-Soininen ("Beobachtungen," pp. 320-321) notes that the translators were more influenced in their renderings by what they had already translated than by what was to come. They were also limited in their ability to make corrections because of the scarcity of writing material. Therefore, in cases like this, they had to make changes in the grammar.
δόγμα in 2:13 as well as in the repeated expression "the law of the Medes and Persians" in 6:9(8), 13(12), 16(15) where OG=0. Th's diversity is also shown by his dynamic rendering in 2:15 ή γνώμη ή ἀναίδης "the ruthless decree!" and 6:6(5) where he employs νόμος. This is further evidence of Th's independence, but in 7:25 Th does have νομος.

1. 91-OG employs the postpositive conj. γὰρ 19x, whereas Th only has it 4x.66 In chs. 2-6 OG employs the conj. 5x where MT=0, but in chs. 8-12 it is mainly employed for ὅτι (9/10).67

1. 93-OG omits one of the adj. while Th follows MT.
1. 98-OG transforms the syntax of the clause by the add. of τῶν, which requires the omission of καὶ in 1.102.
1.101-The plus specifies the time when the king had the vision. There is no significant difference in the meaning, though we argue below (Text-Critical) that the add. was in the OG Vorlage.
1. 120-Th does not coordinate with καὶ against MT and OG.

III.1.iii. Lexicology
1. 3-This is the only place where OG uses συγβαίνει (s. Syntax, 1. 3)


67 See previous fn. 6x MT=0 in 4:11(14), 24(27), 34a; 6:6(5), 28(27). The only place in chs. 8-12 where γὰρ is not employed for ὅτι is 12:13 where MT=0. The other main equivalent for ὅτι in both OG (14/24) and Th (18/24) is ὅτι.

Aejmelaeus ("Clause Connectors," p. 369) emphasizes that for the proper evaluation of equivalents for ὅτι as a causal conj. we need to distinguish clearly between this function and the function of ὅτι meaning "that." In 20/24x ὅτι has a causal function. Two exceptions are 12:7, 9 where OG has ὅτι in the sense of "that." In two other cases (9:18; 10:21) OG and Th have ἀλλά for ὅτι where it follows a negative clause and has the sense "but, rather" (s. Aejmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," p. 373). Therefore, OG has γὰρ translate the causal sense of ὅτι 9/20 which is almost equal to the use of ὅτι (11/20). The cases where OG has ὅτι are 9:9, 11. 14, 16, 19. 23; 10:12, 19; 11:4, 25, 37.
and does represent a rather dynamic translation. For the addition of ὀράματα, see Text-Critical discussion.

1. 4, 24-וַיְהִי as a vb. is only here in Daniel. Th employs etymologically related words to render the vb. and cog. acc., and κυνηγήσει is not found in OG. OG uses variety, though συνβαίνει is unusual.

1. 5, 18, 24, 28-OG (5/5) and Th (4/5) both employ the expected κυνηγήσει as a SE for וַיְהִי. Th omits in 1. 24, probably in error.

1. 6, 25-Both OG and Th offer good renderings of the Hebrew מָלַע (2-5, s. BDB, p. 821), though OG once again illustrates variety while Th employs the same rendition. OG uses ταφάσσει elsewhere to render different vbs. in 11:12 (לֹא), 44(ם). Th also has ταφάσσει in 11:44, though in a different person, and uses it 10x in total. OG employs κινεῖ elsewhere in 3:79; 4:16(19); 11:38, and the vb. does not appear in Th. Th uses κυνηγημα only in these two places, while OG does not employ this compound vb.

1. 10-OG always uses ταφάσσει for מָלַע in the sense "command" (s. 1:18; 2:46; 3:19, 20). Also in 3:24 where MT=σ.

1. 11-Both OG and Th use a variety of equivalents for מָלַע. The most frequent equivalent in OG is ταφάσσει 3/8 (9:18, 19; 10:1; =Th, 6x OG=σ). OG's characteristic variety is seen in the selection of

---

68 Also in 1:17.

69 Also found in Gen. 41:8; Jud. 13:25; Ps. 77:5.

70 S. also 4:2(5), 16(19); 5:6, 9(2x), 10; 7:18, 28.

71 In 11:38 κυνηγήσει is a contextual guess for מָלַע. See p. 120.

72 5:8. 12. 15, 16. 17. OG's presumed Vorlage is very different from MT for the second occurrence of מָלַע in 5:7 as well.
At first glance we might hastily conclude that Th has merely retained OG in 4:11(14); 9:18, 19; 10:1. That this is not necessarily the case can be demonstrated. Overall, Th’s TT reveals that he is marching to his own drum. Th employs two main equivalents for ΠΡ: (τείλ)καίει 6/14 and ἀναγινώσκει 5/14. In all of these instances Th has chosen an appropriate rendering for the context and is not using a mechanical approach. The sensitivity of his choices is exemplified by καίει in 5:12, because elsewhere in the ch. he chooses ἀναγινώσκει for the sense of "reading" the writing on the wall. The verbal agreement in 4:11(14) can be explained as coincidence because the rendering is a natural one. Furthermore, Th does not follow OG’s choice of Φαινει in 5:7, but employs βοάω instead. Finally, Th employs βοάω in 3:4 where one would expect him to follow the alliteration of OG. The fact that Th has already employed καίει twice before ch. 9 and that the choices are natural ones in the context also militates against borrowing in chs. 9 and 10. Th also employs perfect forms in 9:18, 19, so Th and OG only share exact verbal agreement in 10:1.

This section will examine the translation of verbs of saying. We will look at a large number of verbs in this one section, because it will illustrate the complex interplay between the vocabulary of the Vorlage and the Greek versions. There are three introductory points to make:

1. In each instance the verb in MT has the meaning "to tell, declare, make known." Other cases where verbs of saying fall outside of this

---

73 Ziegler has correctly placed καί εκάλεσε ... from 8:16 in brackets because it is obviously a doublet from Th. This is an excellent example of the early influence of the Th text on OG, because it is present in 967.

74 This is a HL in OG. The only place where it occurs in Th is 5:29.

75 2:2; 5:12; 8:16; 9:18, 19; 10:1.

76 5:7, 8, 15, 16, 17.

77 However, a more definitive statement will have to await a closer scrutiny of passages from the later chs.
semantic range are not considered. Even this categorization is quite broad.
2. 48 and 54 are underlined because they appear to be pluses in OG.
3. 1. 35, 67, 68 and 99, 100 will not be treated extensively other than to note that תָּמִין/εἰμιος is an expected equivalent. However, it should also be noted that OG and Th do use different forms of the vb. To treat all of the occurrences of תָּמִין would require great length and our discussion can proceed without that degree of detail.

In 2:1-10 we are concerned with the translation of 4 semitic verbs: רָדָה (hi. from [רָדָנה]), רָמָה, רֶםָה (ha. or hi. בְּדִי). These verbs are translated with 6 different verbs in 2:1-10 in OG and Th: ἀναγγέλλω, ἀπαγγέλλω, εἶπον, γνωρίζω, φρόνεω, δήλοω. διασαφέω 78 also appears in 1. 54 of OG (1-11, s. LEH, p. 108), seemingly as an addition.

The first vb. we meet is רָדָה (inf. cons.) in 1. 16, which is translated by the inf. of ἀναγγέλλω in both OG and Th. The verbal agreement is probably best explained, however, either as coincidence or Th influence on OG. There are two pieces of evidence that lead to the conclusion that Th has not borrowed his rendering from OG. First, apart from the not unexpected uses of תָּמִין/εἰμιος mentioned in #3 above, this is the only instance where there is exact verbal agreement in the use of these vbs. between OG and Th in this section. Second, in the three other places where רָדָה occurs, Th always has ἀναγγέλλω whereas OG renders it consistently with ἓποδεικνύο. 79

78 9x in the Maccabean literature and also in Deut. 1:5.
79 9:23, 10:21; 11:2. ἓποδεικνύο occurs 9x elsewhere in OG. In 4:15(18), 34c; 5:9 MT=O. It renders ἔβδομα in 2:17, ἑξαώτερον in 5:7, Ἕβδομον in 10:14; it also occurs in 5:12 where ἐγείρετο and [ὁδε] are found and 5:16 where ἔδησα is found once again. In these latter two instances the differences between OG and MT are rather substantial; these are the only occurrences of the verb ἔδησα in MT. One interesting use of ἓποδεικνύο is the difficult construction in 9:22 where it translates לְיָדֵהוּ. Except in 7:8 where there was evidently a misreading of the Vorlage and 1:17 where the rendering is dynamic, OG uses expected equivalents from the semantic domain of knowing for לְיָדֵהוּ elsewhere (1:4; 8:25; 9:13, 22, 25; 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10). Therefore, there is a possibility that OG read לְיָדֵהוּ for לְיָדֵהוּ or לְיָדֵהוּ for לְיָדֵהוּ in 9:22. The latter would appear more likely because it would involve the omission of ה, and the misreading of ה for ה and ה for ה. It may also have come more easily to the translator because לְיָדֵהוּ is the following word.
is found 14x in the pa. and ha., 7 of which are in vss. 2:4-11. The most frequent equivalent in OG is δηλόω, which is used 5/11. The remaining 6 uses are as follows. In 5:7 it is rendered by ὑποδεικνύω while the appearance of δηλοςις (1/4, not in Th) in 2:26 is a dynamic rendering. The other four renderings are unique and are probably explained as due to stylistic variation since they are clustered within vss. 2:4-11. Th is far more consistent in his translation of ἔρως, using ἀναγγέλλω 11/14 and γνωρίζω in the other three.

The reading of ἀναγγέλλω for ἔρως in 1. 56 of OG is interesting, because OG also has an unusual addition of διασαφήσιτε μοι in 1. 54. Although 1. 54 could be viewed as an addition against MT, it is also very possible that ἀναγγέλλω originated as a gloss to διασαφέω (1-11). This is suggested by the presence of the rare term διασαφέω, the frequent use of ἀναγγέλλω by Th, and the fact that we already have reason to question the rendering of ἔρως by ἀναγγέλλω in 1. 16. Though it might be objected that it is characteristic of OG to use variety, the amount of revision on the OG text as we have it can not be underestimated.

There is further corroboration of the possibility that 1. 56 is a later revision by the add. in 1. 48. In 1. 48 δηλόω appears to be an addition, yet δηλόω is consistently employed in the OG to render either ἔρως (5/11) or ὑνία (8/14). Therefore, ὑνία in 1. 44 is the

Since the Hebrew construction in 9:22 would have caused difficulties for the translator and we can construe a semantic path by which the OG translator rendered the text, it is unlikely that the OG Vorlage differed from MT.

802:6, 9, 11, 16, 24; 3x OG=0 3:32, 5:12, 15.

81l. 38-φράζω, (1-3, not in Th); l. 56-ἀναγγέλλω or διασαφήσιτε; l. 71-a dynamic translation with κρίνω; l. 112-εἶπον.

82S. 2:6, 10; 5:7. Elsewhere in Th γνωρίζω is a SE (17/21) for the ha. and hi. (only 8:19) of ὑνία. The exceptions are ἀναγγέλλω in 2:9, 25, 26 and δηλόω in 4:15. γνωρίζω does not occur in OG.

83Otherwise δηλόω appears for ἔρως in 2:47. The ha. and hi. of ὑνία occur 21x in Dan., but 4x OG=0 (4:3, 4, 15; 5:15). 2x the text of OG presumes a different Vorlage compared with MT (5:16, 17), though ὑποδεικνύω is a possible equivalent in 5:16. Apart from the double translation in 2:5, and the 8x with δηλόω (2:9. 23. 25. 26, 28. 29.
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natural equivalent for δηλόω. However, δηλόω looks like an add.
because ἀκ-ν-αγγέλλω" appears in l. 44 as the formal equivalent for
βηθ. As in the preceding case, it is possible that ἀκαγγέλλω is the
result of later revision of OG, though OG does employ ἀκαγγέλλω to
translate βηθ in 8:19.

The distinct ways in which OG and Th have translated the vbs. of
saying in this section, and throughout Daniel, indicate that they are
independent translations. In l. 48 and 54 OG has what appear to be
additional verbs, but in both cases these vbs. seem to be pluses
because ἀν(π)αγγέλλω, a vb. common in Th, is found in the correct word
order position as the equivalent for the semitic vb. Is it not at
least as likely that in both cases ἀν(π)αγγέλλω is a correction of OG
from Th toward MT?

1. 27-Θέλω appears 4x in OG. MT=0 in 4.17; 7:19 for ἔφη; 8:4 for ἡθ. Never in Th.

1. 29-λαλέω is a SE for ἔφη in both OG (17/19) and Th (19/19). The
only places where OG departs from this usage are 1:19 and 11:27. The
use of the relatively rare ὑμιλέω (1-9) in 1:19 has a more specific sense
of conversing than the more general term λαλέω; so it is well-suited
to a context that assumes a dialogue. In 11:27 OG employs a compound
πανδολογίσονσιν (HL in LXX!) to translate ἔρπεν ἔμκ. In the 17 other
occurrences Th and OG share many exact verbal agreements, but many

30; 7:16), σημαινε is found 3x (2:15, 23, 45), ἐποδεικνύω 1x in 2:17 and
ἀκαγγέλλω 2x in 5:8; 8:19.

The fact that δηλόω does not occur in chs. 4-6 is one of the
proofs of Albertz (p. 163) that chs. 4-6 originate from a different
translator. However, as we have seen, δηλόω is used 13(14)/15 to
render either ἔφη or ἡθ and there is little evidence that either of
these are found in the semitic Vorlage of OG in chs. 4-6. The only
places where these vbs. occur in chs. 4-6 of MT are 4:3, 4, 15; 5:7, 8,
12, 15(2), 16, 17 and the only places where OG might have had them in
its Vorlage would be 4:15; 5:7, 8, 12, 16. The most certain of these
are 5:7, 8, 16, but 5:7 certainly appears to have suffered corruption
from vs. 8, or possibly from Th, and harmonization toward MT.
Therefore, though the absence of δηλόω in 4-6 does support Albertz' thesis, it is not quite as significant as it seems at first.

"Note also that 967 reads ἀναγγέλλω.
of these agreements occur in the later chs. OG and Th also have agreement in the Aramaic section where both employ λαλέω (4/5) as a SE for מילה. We will have to see what a closer inspection of chs. 7-12 reveals, but some of the agreements could easily be coincidental while others may be due to Th influence on OG. For example, in 10:11, 15, 19 OG and Th use the τῶν + inf. (λαλήσας) to translate the inf. cons. + τώ (τ in 10:19). This is an acceptable translation, but very literal and more characteristic of Th. Furthermore, in 8:18 where the exact same construction is found Th has τῶν λαλέω, while OG uses a gen. abs! Soisalon-Soininen also notes that the frequency of OG’s use of the more literal equivalent is disproportionate to OG’s treatment of the Hebrew inf. cons. as a whole in Daniel. The fact of these agreements and their Th like character suggests that the OG text has been revised toward Th.

1. 35, 46, 53, 62, 67, 85, 99—The seven cases where OG employs ἀπαμα, including 1. 67 and 99 were discussed in CH 1. Th consistently employs ενεπινυγνον for מלך.

1. 36-παίζ. is an expected equivalent for מלח and appears in OG 11/11. However, Th employs παίζ exclusively for מלח (4/4) in chs. 1-2, whereas in chs. 3-12 he has the alternative equivalent δοῦλος 6/8.

---

85See 8:13(2x); 9:12, 20, 21, 22; 10.11(2x), 15, 16, 17, 19; 11:36.

86See 7:8, 11, 20, 25. In 6:22(21) OG presumably has a different Vorlage, and Th has εἰπε. The only other occurrences of the vb. are in 3:36=Th; 4.29(32); 4.34(37)bis where MT=0.

87See Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive, pp. 81, 206. However, there is a slight difficulty with his statistics on p. 188. Soisalon-Soininen’s table suggests that π + inf. con. is found 7x in Daniel and that in all 7 cases Th employs τῶν + inf. In fact, the Hebrew section of Daniel has 8 cases and there are another 4 in the Aramaic section. Only 6x does Th use τῶν + inf. (8:15, 17, 18; 10:11, 15; 11:34). The other instances are 2:25; 3:24(91); 4:24; 6:20(19); 8:2; 10:7. 8:2 is omitted by both OG and Th and in 10:7 they both employ dynamic translations.

88Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive, p. 189.

89The n. בֵּין is in 1:12, 13: 2:4, 7; 3:26(93), 28(95); 6:21(20): 9:6, 10, 11, 17; 10:17. OG=0 in 6:21(20).
The exceptions are 3:28(95) and 10:17 where Th again has παίς, but the basic difference in pattern in chs. 1-2 is clear.

1. 37, 47, 55, 63, 70, 103-Th employs σύνκρισις as a SE (26/31) for θεοτ. 90 OG displays greater variety. In chs. 4-6 the n. is either not in the Vorlage 91 or OG employs σύγκριμα as a SE. 92 Elsewhere the main equivalent is κτίσις 7/14, 93 while the remaining cases involve some type of dynamic rendering. In 2:24, 25 OG employs ἐκαστά, which is very similar to the use of πάντα in 2:16, and the neuter pro. in l. 37. In 2:30 the articular pass. inf. of δηλόμε "what has been revealed" is an excellent idiomatic translation. The final two translations involve l. 63 and 70, where θεοτ. is collocated with the vb. γεννᾶ (also l. 37, 55, 104). In both of these cases OG transforms the n. into the etymologically related vb. κρίνε. L. 70 "they will decide with regard to these things" is another good idiomatic translation. The cluster of uses of the same vb. within 2:1-10 means that some of these renderings are probably motivated by the concern for stylistic variation. However, it should be noted that in l. 63 and 70, as in 2:24-25, OG has maintained a similar translation equivalent when one character's words are referred to by another.

OG's restriction of σύγκριμα to chs. 4-6 is evidence that a different translator is responsible for these chs. 94

1. 42, 81, 92, 111, 113, 118-Taken by themselves the 5x that θεοτ. is found in 2:1-10 suggest that Th does not exhibit dependence upon OG. However, there is a translation pattern in both OG and Th that is best understood by looking at chs. 2-3 separately from 4-7.

---

90 The exceptions are 2:25; 4:15; 5:26=OG, 5:16 (cognate acc.) where σύγκριμα occurs; and 5:15, where it is omitted.

91 OG=0 11x. S. 4:3(6), 4:4(7), 4:6(9), 4:15(18)bis, 4:16(19), 4:21(24); 5:12, 15(2x), 16.

92 S. 5:7, 8, 16, 26. σύγκριμα is also found in 4:16(19) and 5:17, but the pattern does support Albertz' contention that chs. 4-6 originate from a different translator.

93 2:5, 6, 9, 26, 36, 45; 7:16.

94 Albertz, p. 162.
The variety of equivalents is obvious, and each of the renderings is a good translation. Note, however, that there is uncertainty over what word occurs in 2:15 (s. CH 2.111.). The translations of 2:8?, 10, 17 are particularly dynamic. Th employs βῆμα 9/11, and λόγος in 2:5, 11.

The situation is significantly different in chs. 4-7 where ἡλίσθ occurs 13x. 5x OG=0, 4:30(33); 5:10, 15, 26; 6:15(14).

λόγος-4:28(31); 6:13(12); 7:1, 11, 16, 28.

βῆμα-7:25, 28(27)!

In these chs. not only has the translation been standardized, but βῆμα appears twice. The same preference for λόγος is evident in Th who uses it 8/10. βῆμα is used only in 5:26 and 7:28. 3x Th=0, 5:10, 15; 7:1.

Both the use of βῆμα by OG in ch. 7 and the predominance of λόγος in chs. 4-6 have to be explained. This pattern supports Albertz’ thesis concerning the independence of chs. 4-6, but also raises more questions about chs. 7-12.

l. 43, 80-Th translates Μωυσεύν exactly the same in both places. There is possible verbal agreement with OG as well, and this agreement must be either a distinctive agreement or Th influence because ἀπέστη is a

95 We argue below that λόγος in 2:5 and πράγμα in 2:8 are not original. The suggestion that προστίτεχα is the dynamic rendering is based on our reconstruction of the text of 2:8 (s. Text-Critical, 1. 78-83), but it does reflect OG’s other dynamic renderings. προστασσω is also etymologically related to πρόσταγμα in 3:22 and προσταγη in 3:28(95). Munnich (“Origène,” p. 190) also lists the asterisked addition in 2:5 as a reading that conforms to MT and Th.

96 Note that πρός ταΐς of 2:23 also appears in 1. 71.
contextual guess for ἡσυχία. So, the question is, who is borrowing from whom? Prior to investigating this line of inquiry it was determined in CH 2 on the basis of the textual witnesses that 1. 42-43 were not present in OG. If the argument that OG omits 1. 42-43 is correct, then 1. 80 must exhibit later Th influence. This suggestion is supported by three further points. First, there is obvious textual corruption where 2:8-9 join. Note, for example, that 967 omits καθάπερ εἰσφάκατε διὰ ἀπέστη ἄξι' ἐμοῦ τὸ πρᾶγμα (s. also the discussion in Text-Critical, l. 78-83). Second, in 1. 49 (as well as the similar text in 3:29[96]) Th goes his own way; and here the renderings exhibit a formal correspondence typical of Th. Third, this would be one of the few places in this section that one could argue that Th has borrowed from OG in any way. If anything, the accumulating evidence suggests that Th is not dependent on OG.

1. 49-52—The reading of the OG has several difficulties and should be considered alongside the similar passage in 3:29(96) where the texts read:

Th—εἰς ἀκώλειαν ἔσονται καὶ οἱ οἶκοι αὐτῶν εἰς διαρρήγην

MT—τὴν κίνησιν ὑποβρύχιας καὶ τὴν ἁρματικὴν

OG—διαμελισθήσεται καὶ η ὦσία αὐτοῦ δημενθήσεται

McCrystall argues that there is a shift in meaning in the OG in these passages from "physical ruin" to "confiscation." In this instance McCrystall is no doubt correct about the resulting translation, but it is questionable whether this was motivated by any intentional theological Tendenz. The first factor we have to consider is the general difficulty presented by the vocabulary of MT. These are the only two passages in MT where the Persian loan-word יָדוֹ "member, limb" (s. BDB, p. 1089) is found; and יָדוֹ occurs elsewhere only in Ez. 6:11. In 3:29 the rare word הָעַשׁ "be made" (hithpa.; also the pa.

---

97 It is found only here in these two passages in MT. See Mont., pp. 148-149, for a discussion of the uncertainty of the meaning.

98 McCrystall, p. 80.

99 The meaning of this word can only be guessed at, as exemplified in the translations. S. BDB, p. 1102 and Mont., p. 148.
or peil in 5:21) occurs. Given the difficulties of the Vorlage, the most logical course of action is to consider whether the OG has misunderstood the text.

With regard to 2:5, Mont., p. 148, has already advanced the explanation that the HL παράδειγματιζε "you shall be made an example" for ἑτοίμασιν is based on reading τὸ οὖν (ἦν). The key to the final phrase is the meaning of ἐν πληρωμῇ, at which the translator could only guess from the context. The easiest explanation is that the translator read the hitpe. ἐν πληρωμῇ as a pe. (which explains the choice of ἀναληφθήσεται), and offered the best guess that he could: "and everything that you own will be expropriated into the treasury."\(^{100}\)

It may be, as McCrystal suggests, that the actual rendering reflects a Hellenistic act of procurement of property; but it would only be natural for the translator’s guess to reflect his own cultural circumstances. If we were to refer to this case as theological Tendenz, there certainly would not be any great theological consequences; nor could it be deemed as intentional changing of the text.

The translation of ἐν πληρωμῇ by καὶ η ὀφθαλμὸς αὐτοῦ διεμετέχεται in 3:29(96) is very similar to 2:5, except that the translation is probably a guess based on the earlier translation. In this case the OG did not know the meaning of ἔρημος,\(^{101}\) so the HL δημιουργοῖ "confiscate" appears to be a simplification of ἀναληφθήσεται . . . εἰς τὸ βασιλείῳ. The major difference between 2:5 and 3:29(96) is that in the latter OG seems to translate τὸ οὖν ἑτοίμασιν correctly. However, it is possible that διομελίζει should be emended to read the more common διαμερίζω, which is the reading of 967 (s. CH 2.II.7.iv.).

There is little doubt that the translation of 3:29(96) was dependent on 2:5, so one has to wonder why παράδειγματιζε was chosen in the first instance. There are four possible options: 1) the translation in 2:5 is based on an alternative reading of the semitic text; 2) the reading in 3:29(96) represents a later correction; 3) there were separate and distinct translators; 4) 3:29(96) should be amended to read διαμερίζω, which is also a contextual guess. The

\(^{100}\) S. I Esd. 6:31 for a parallel rendering.

\(^{101}\) OG=0 in 5:21.
second option always has to remain a consideration, but is unlikely because we would expect the same correction in 2:5. In favour of the first is the possibility that the ה of הדריה was omitted by haplography with the final ה in הדריה (s. Text-Critical). This assumes that the translator of both passages was the same. The fourth option accounts for the difficulties in both passages and does not presuppose any theory of multiple translators. Furthermore, if the translator of 3:29(96) did get it right with דיאופלטיקו, why is there no evidence of correction of 2:5? The third option is also possible, but it would require that the translator of 3:29(96) was later than the translator of 2:5 because he seems to rely on 2:5 for the translation of הביתו נלי הרש. Although this solution assumes a rather complicated scenario of translation, it has much to commend it. There are a number of differences in TT in 3:20–30(97) that suggest this portion of text was freely edited in order to insert the deuterocanonical material into ch. 3. The evidence does not permit any easy resolution of the textual difficulties, but either of the last two solutions are more likely.

Th’s translation in 2:5 and 3:29(96) is similar to OG only in that he guessed at the meaning of וְאָמַרְתָּם. There is, however, a possible explanation for Th’s translation of וְאָמַרְתָּם by εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἔσεθε (ἔσεθα in 3:29(96)). Th probably read וְאָמַרְתָּם as if it were a hithpe. derived from דָּאָמַר and simply omitted וְאָמַרְתָּם. The choices of the vb. διαψαθ in 2:5 and the related n. διαψαθ in 3:29(96), both HL in Daniel, again demonstrate Th independence from OG.

1. 57, 59—Although λαμβάνω is the expected equivalent, the fact that OG and Th both use παραλαμβάνει in the two other occurrences of הבּל indicates there may be Th dependence on OG in these later passages. 103

102 The evidence for this is discussed in the next section on 3:11–20, A Note on the Additions to Chapter 3. The third solution also allows for the possibility that διαψαθikw should be emended to read with 967. Regardless of the reading we choose, the translator of 3:29(96) did not depend on 2:5 for the rendering of וְאָמַרְתָּם. 101

103 S. also 6:1(5:31) and 7:18, though the only actual agreement in the former passage is the use of the vb.
bestowal of gifts more explicit.

1. 61, 99—OG and Th reflect two different interpretations of וֹלֶל.\textsuperscript{104} OG uses oov (+ vuv, 1. 99) here for וֹלֶל, while in 4:24(27) OG=0. Th's rendering with πλην in 1. 61 (HL in Daniel) understands וֹלֶל as an adversative and διά τοῦτο in 4:24(27) is an excellent rendering as well. The omission by Th in 1. 98 is difficult to explain.

1. 75—This is a common rendering for OG and Th. בַּל occurs 5x in total in Dan. OG renders with ἀκριβῆς in 2:45; 6:13(12)\textsuperscript{105} where Th uses ἀληθινός, and they share the reading of ἀκριβεία (1-4!) in 7:16. OG=0 in 3:24(91) where Th has ἀληθινός. Whether we judge Th to be dependent upon OG in 1. 75 and 7:16 depends on our overall assessment of their relationship.

1. 77—This is the only occurrence of בַּל in Dan. εὐγοράζεω is a HL in the LXX, so OG and Th have another common reading in this vs.

1. 78, 114—OG translates with καθάρπερ also in 2:41, 45. Although מַלְכָּבֶל יִר occurs 13x altogether, OG only has an equivalent elsewhere in 3:29(96)—διότι and 6:11(10)—καθάρς.\textsuperscript{106} Th's translations are very interesting. He uses καθάρς also in 3:29(96), while in the three remaining cases in ch. 2 he has δὲ τρόπον. The situation changes drastically in chs. 4-6 where δτι is employed 5x, κατενώσιον is used in 5:22, and καθάρς in 6:11(10)=OG. As in our investigation of מַלְכָּבֶל יִר above, there are indications that Th's translation of מַלְכָּבֶל יִר in chs. 4-6 is different from ch. 2. The translation of 1. 78-81 involves a textual problem, but that does not affect the evaluation of καθάρπερ.

1. 91, 93—OG employs the rare term συνείκον (1-2) for the hithpa. (Q, HL) of [ןֵלֶל]. Th employs another rare word, συνιδήμυ (1-11). Both are


\textsuperscript{105}OG employs ἀκριβῆς in 4:24(27) where MT=0. ἀκριβῆς occurs only 5x elsewhere and not in Th.

\textsuperscript{106}2:40; 4:15(18); 5:12, 22; 6:4(3), 5(4), 23(22). 2:40 is probably omitted by homoiotel.
good translations.

1. 92-Th employs διαφέρειν as a SE 6/8 for the Hebrew and Aramaic [תָּמִל]. The exceptions both occur in 6:5(4) where OG=0. The latter occurrence in 6:5(4) is within a whole clause that is omitted in Th. In the first instance Th employs παράπτωμα as an idiomatic translation. Th also employs παράπτωμα in 4:24(27) for [תָּמִל] and in 6:23(22) for מְלַבָּה, but παράπτωμα is not found in OG.

1. 94-OG employs a dynamic rendering while Th uses an expected formal rendition of מְלַבָּה.

1. 97-The translation of [מְלַבָּה] offers an interesting example of how difficult it is to determine whether there are separate translators in OG and to describe the relationship between it and Th.

[מְלַבָּה] is found 12x in chs. 2-6 and both OG and Th employ ἀλλοίω as a natural SE. OG translates with ἀλλοίω 6/7. The one difference is ὀφελέω (HL in OG) in 3:28(95), which carries the more appropriate sense of rejecting the command of the king. Th employs ἀλλοίω 10/12 and offers the unique rendering of παρέρχομαι in 1. 97 and παραλλάσσω (1-6) in 6:16(15).

In ch. 7 [מְלַבָּה] occurs 7x, but here the SE for OG is διαφέρει 5/7. The related adv. διαφόρος appears in 7:7 and ἀλλοίω in 7:25.

107 S. also 6:5(2); 8:24(2), 25; 9:26; 11:17.
108 Th's reading is based on a slightly different pointing. See p. 145.
109 2:9, 21; 3:19, 27(94); 5:6; 6:9(8). OG=0 4:13(16); 5:9, 10; 6:16(15), 18(17). ἀλλοίω does occur in 4:13(16) but the context is different. Otherwise OG employs ἀλλοίω in similar types of contexts in 4:16(19), 30a, 34(37), 34a(2) where MT=0 and we can retrovert מְלַבָּה with confidence. See also J. Barr, "Aramaic-Greek Notes on the Book of Enoch (1)," JSS 23 (1978): 187.
110 It is also in 9:7 of Th.
111 Th employs παρέρχομαι elsewhere in 4:28(31); 6:13(12); 7:14; 11:10, 40. OG overlaps only in 11:10 and has the vb. also in 11:26 and 12:1.
112 7:3, 19, 23, 24, 28.
However, the change in equivalents is not evidence of separate translators, but sensitivity to the differing semantic range of the vocabulary. In 4/5 instances where διαφέρω or the adv. διαφόρος appears the reference has something to do with the "differing" nature of the beasts or the fourth beast in particular. ἀλλοίωμα would not have been an appropriate rendering in those contexts, but it is in 7:25 where the reference is to the changing of times and the law. The only possible indication of different translators is in 7:28, where we might expect ἀλλοίωμα because it would agree with the OG choices in 3:19, 27(95); 5:6.

Th employs the expected ἀλλοίωμα in 7:25, 28; διαφέρω in 7:3, 7, 19; but ὑπερέχει "will rise above" in 7:23 and ὑπερέχει "will exceed" in 7:24 are excellent translations of the sense. Th, then, is more consistent with his use of ἀλλοίωμα in the book and has several marked usages. However, a relationship between Th and OG is indicated not so much by the change in equivalents in ch. 7, but by the fact that they both use διαφέρω, which is only found 11x elsewhere in the LXX.

1. 110-Th's choice of ξηράς (1/1) in contrast to OG's more common ἥν is another mark of independence.

1. 114-The add. of σὺ ἐρωτάς may have been motivated by OG's prior changes to the syntax when it brought forward the vb. in the συ clause to l. 111 as well as the dynamic rendering ἐ γράφεται in l. 113. The vb. in the final ἐ γράφεται clause is delayed until l. 119, which would have resulted in a more complicated sentence structure in OG if he had given a formal translation. The insertion of σὺ ἐρωτάς makes l. 115-121 into an independent clause, which explains the insertion of καί in l. 115. The creation of distinct clauses results in some loss in emphasis. MT would be translated "No one can tell the matter of the king; furthermore . . ." while OG has "No one can tell what the king saw as he asks, and no king . . ."

1. 117-Th's rendering with ἄριτταν 3/8 reflects independence (also 2:15-OG=0; 5:29). Elsewhere Th demonstrates a dynamic tendency on the four occasions (4:14, 22, 29; 5:21) where ἄριτταν occurs within the same nominal clause: ὅρσελαί ἄριτταν τούτων μειλετόν ἀνέσσα (OG=0). In each case Th
supplies a vb. The latter three are identical: ὁ κύριος τῆς βασιλείας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, while in 4:14(17) Th transforms κύριος into κύριος and adds ἔτσιν. The remaining passage where κύριος is found is 4:23(26) where Th employs ἐξουσία as another good translation of the sense of MT.

OG only has one other equivalent for κύριος (5:29) where it employs ἐξουσία, though it may also reflect κύριος in his Vorlage of 4:23(26) where ἐξουσία is found.

l. 118–The shared reading of τοῦτο in OG and Th probably indicates dependence in one direction or the other because it is a HL. Once again, if we dismiss any prejudice that Th is borrowing from OG, then it is conceivable that the reading of 88 reflects later corruption toward Th. This is supported by the fact that 967 reads τοῦτο τό. Now, the reading of 967 can not be explained as correction toward MT because τοῦτο is a better translation of the sense. On the other hand, 967 or 88 could represent an orthographical error. So, the OG witnesses are split and 88-Syh agree with Th. Although there must be a degree of caution evaluating these readings, we cannot assume that Th has borrowed from OG. Th may have the OG reading in l. 118, but it is also possible that τοῦτο τό in 967 represents the original OG reading.

III.1.iv. Summary

The investigation of 2:1-10 has revealed similar findings to our previous examination of 1:1-10. In the majority of instances OG was translating a Vorlage very similar to MT. Although OG is described as a free translation, his faithfulness to his Vorlage is manifested, as in 1:1-10, by his overall adherence to the word order of MT. On one occasion OG employed a hypotactic construction (l. 19) to avoid the parataxis of his Vorlage. On other occasions he used postpositive conjunctions (ὅτε in l. 39, 53, 65, 69; οὖν l. 27?, 61, 82, 98; γὰρ in l. 91). These characteristics are indicative of OG’s style in the early chapters of Daniel, but his freedom is most evident in the diversity of his lexical choices and occasional dynamic renditions. In one instance (l. 67-69) OG changed the syntactic structure unintentionally. There are a number of textual differences between OG’s Vorlage and MT, but,
for the most part, the differences can be explained as expected corruptions that occur in the transmission of ancient texts (s. Text-Critical).

In 2:1-10 Th exhibits the expected narrow formal correspondence to MT, though there are several omissions of words (l. 3, 24, 40, 90, 98, 120). However, formal correspondence does not mean that Th was translating mechanically. For example, there are several omissions and additions of minor morphemes (l. 11, 35, 40, 56, 94, 99). The wider investigation of vocabulary also revealed that Th demonstrates a sensitivity to the semantic range of the vocabulary of his Vorlage, and turned up occasions where Th employed excellent idiomatic translations.

III.2. The Relationship Between OG and Th

It is obvious from the few distinctive agreements and the more numerous disagreements that there is no sense in which we can refer to Th as a recension of OG in 2:1-10. There are only two certain distinctive agreements: ἐκαγόρασε in l. 77 and ἕν' ἀλήθειας in l. 75. However, these agreements do not necessarily indicate Th dependence on OG because they both occur within vs. 8. In the discussion of l. 78-81 (s. Text-Critical) we saw that the agreement there is due to a secondary add. from Th to OG, so the distinctive verbal agreement in the preceding lines must be questioned as well. The only other possible shared readings are l. 16 (coincidence?) and l. 118 (Th influence?). The distinctive nature of Th's translation is demonstrated by the occasions when Th does not follow OG such as l. 67-69, l. 89-90, and the contextual guess in l. 49-52. There are also numerous places where Th employs distinct vocabulary (eg. l. 4, 6, 24, 25, 51, 61, 97, 110).

In contrast to Th being a recension, we have uncovered more evidence indicating later corruption of the OG due to Th influence. Besides the certain Th influence on the OG in l. 79-81, which is confirmed by the hexaplaric addition in 2:5, it is also possible in l. 16, 44, 56, and 118. The same relationship between OG and Th is

---

113 For a full listing of Th omissions against MT, see Schmitt, "Stammt," pp. 19-25.

114 Another example is 2:1 (see CH 2) where 88-Syh had undergone revision toward MT through Th influence.
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apparent throughout ch. 2: there are occasional verbal agreements and infrequent large agreements (eg. 2:28). This does not exclude the possible acquaintance of Th with OG, which may have occasionally influenced the lexical choice of Th; but it does exclude the possibility that Th is a recension of the OG in chs. 1 and 2. As has already been demonstrated, some of these agreements can also be explained as Th readings that have displaced the OG. Therefore, we must seriously consider that any distinctive agreements in these chapters may reflect secondary corruption of the OG. It is when the investigation touched on chs. 7–12 that the number of agreements between Th and OG increased.

Finally, we have also uncovered evidence that not only corroborates Albertz’ thesis that chs. 4–6 originate from a translator different from the other translator(s) of OG, but there is a suggestion that Th’s relationship to MT is different in these chs. as well. As to the OG translator of 4–6 we have confirmed that the non-appearance of נַחֲלַה in 4–6 is evidence for a different translator. More importantly, we have also found that the translation of הנב לע and the idiom also support Albertz’ view. It is also quite possible that the translation of נא and the idiom נַחֲלַה יי corroborates Albertz’ thesis. Th’s translation pattern of these three elements is also different in 4–6, though only in the case of הנב is there possible influence by OG (or later revision of both?). Th also displays a different pattern of translation for נַחֲלַה יי between chs. 1–2 and 3–10.

The employment of postpositive conjunctions also tends to support the picture that is emerging. ὅσιον only occurs 2/9x in chs. 4–12; and though δὲ still appears 16/52x in chs. 4–6, it appears only 6x in chs. 7–12. γάρ is the exception because 10/19x it is used in chs. 8–12 (but 9/10 for ὅσιον). OG is definitely more dynamic in the translation of chs. 1–2, but particularly ch. 2.

III.3. Text-Critical Problems
1. 4–The addition of ὁμοία could reflect the ideology of the translator who uses ὁμοία and ἑνώσιμον as overlapping synonyms. In this case the addition would have helped to prepare for the synonymous
uses to follow. On the other hand, one of the terms may be a doublet. Given the Greek syntax it is unlikely that there was a differing Vorlage.

1. 6–9–OG frequently abbreviates MT and it is unlikely that it represents an alternative Vorlage.

1.11–Both Jahn, p. 10 and Charles, p. 27 suggest that the LXX read לַעֲבוֹר. This is possible, but the OG probably resulted from misreading the text and/or the translator’s expectation of what the text should read, particularly since the context is so similar to 1:3 where לִפְנֵיהָ does appear.

1. 15–The reading of OG is supported by 1QDan⁸: Chaldeans is used as a comprehensive term for the divisions of wise men also in 2:4, 5, 10; 3:8. However, it is only one of a list in 2:10; 4:4(7) OG=O; 5:7, 11 OG=O. It is more likely that OG and 1QDan⁸ have harmonized to the absolute uses in 2:4, 5 (see also 1:4).

1. 27–We have provisionally accepted this addition as OG. In favour of its retention is the appearance of the postpositive conj. ἀπό, which is found elsewhere in this section. If the plus represents a Vorlage, we would most likely reconstruct ἀπό τεταρτῶν. It is possible that this was omitted from MT through homoiotel. or homoioarc. with λίθῳ. However, the order of the Greek looks suspiciously like an addition. Despite the dynamic approach of the OG, for the most part OG does follows the word order of the Vorlage. In particular, in OG, as elsewhere in the Biblical corpus, the infinitive invariably follows the vb. of wishing, saying etc. to which it is connected.

---

¹¹⁵ See the earlier discussion in CH 1, pp. 29–32.


¹¹⁷ In this case the variant only existed in the translator’s mind. See TCU, pp. 228–240, where Tov emphasizes distinguishing between true variants and pseudo-variants.

¹¹⁸ Wright’s (Difference, p. 47) statistics on formal equivalence indicate that OG fails to follow the word order of MT in only 2.16% of the lines.
This would be the natural semitic order as well, so we would expect 88-Syh to have the infinitive τοιγώναι following the addition (s. l. 11, 110 for examples). Furthermore, even if the add. is accepted as OG, it appears to be an add. to smooth the syntax.

1. 33-It is highly unlikely that Κιριε originated from an alternative Vorlage given the fact that it normally renders the divine name. For the same reason it is difficult to understand why it would have been added. However, Th does use Κιριε to render Μέριμ in 4:16(19), so it is possible that OG read Μέριμ in MT would then be explained as a later correction. It is also possible the OG rendered Μέριμ with Κιριε and this would also explain the addition of βασιλεός. Either of these scenarios suggests that βασιλεός is not OG. In favour of the retention of Κιριε βασιλεός as OG is the fact that both are present in 3:9. OG does not witness to an alternative Vorlage.

1. 40, 72-The omission by Th. in l. 40 and OG in l. 72 of one element of the idiom ἡμετέρα διακόσμησις does not necessarily indicate a difference in their respective Vorlagen. Such omissions are fairly frequent.

1. 43-The omission of OG might be explained as error by homoiotel. from Ἃγιοι . . . λευκάρια, but see also l. 43, 80 in Lexicology. This omission could have been in the OG Vorlage, but the text of MT is preferable in any case. The difference between OG and MT is better explained as an omission in OG, rather than an addition in MT because we can see how the omission occurred and there are numerous places in Daniel where the words of one character are alluded to or repeated verbatim for emphasis.

1. 45-Closely linked to the previous variant is the addition of εἰς ἀληθείας. Presumably this add. would reflect μαρτύριον as in l. 75. Though it is difficult to see how this variant could have been omitted from MT, it is also difficult to read μαρτύριον at this point in the text. Here, the decision will depend upon the disposition of the textual critic, but we are not inclined to view the addition in OG as leading to a better semitic text.
1. 48, 54—We have previously argued that there is reason to believe that these verbs are not additions at all (s. Lexicology). Even if original, the additions would be attributed to the translator rather than an alternative Vorlage.

1. 49—The translation παραδείγματιζε is based on the reading ρημι ἔτοιμον (s. Lexicology), but based on the parallel to 3:29(96) MT is to be preferred. It cannot be known whether OG’s reading accurately reflects its Vorlage and haplography had occurred in MT, or whether his translation stems from a reading error. It could also be that there was a different translator in 3:29(96).

1. 56—The add. of the per. pro. in Th, which is supported by l. 54 in OG, suggests that the pro. suf. was read. The Peshitta reads the pro. suf. as well. The strength of this combination suggests that the pro. suf. should be added to the vb. in MT.

1. 78–83—The text in these lines is very difficult and is obviously corrupt. We will begin by printing the texts of MT, Zieg. (=88–Syh), and 967.

MT

καθάπερ ἐοράκατε δι᾽ ἀπόστη ἀπ᾽ ἑμῶν τὸ πράγμα· καθάπερ οὖν προστέταχα οὕτως εσται

967—

καθάπερ οὖν προστέταχα

It will be noticed that while the first portion of 88–Syh reads with MT, καθάπερ οὖν προστέταχα οὕτως εσται appears to be an addition, and it is duly marked with the obelus in both 88 and Syh. However, 967 omits the portion that agrees with MT and has an abbreviated version of the addition. The text that Hamm (I–II, pp. 163, 165) chooses to read is 88–Syh without οὕτως εσται. He argues that the first portion agrees with OG’s vocabulary usage elsewhere, and it is lacking in 967 by homoioarc. Hamm reads the καθάπερ οὖν προστέταχα as a striking translation for the ἂν at the beginning of vs. 9 and οὕτως εσται as a later addition. This reconstruction has much to commend it and,
initially, the present writer was inclined to agree. However, there is another and, perhaps, better way to view the text. Hamm’s reconstruction assumes that ‘Ο λόγος ἀπέστη ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ in 1. 42-43 is OG, but as we have previously noted (s. CH 2 and Lexicology 1. 42-43), 1. 42-43 are most probably not original to OG. They are asterisked in 88-Syh, omitted in 967, and exhibit the formal correspondence characteristic of Th. Therefore, if we begin with the presupposition that 1. 42-43 are the result of later Th influence, our analysis of 1. 78-83 changes drastically. Not only is ἀπέστη ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ in 1. 80 corrupt because it agrees with Th, but the whole section that agrees with MT becomes suspect (i.e. καθάπερ ἐφοράκατε δὲ ἀπέστη ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ πράγμα). If we omit the section that agrees with MT as a secondary addition, then Hamm is correct that καθάπερ is the correct equivalent to ἐπὶ τῆς κυρίας, but it is the καθάπερ followed by οὖν προστεταχα and not καθάπερ ἐφοράκατε... πράγμα. This view has additional support in that προστεταχα also fits well with OG’s pattern of dynamic renderings for θηλ (s. Lexicology, l. 42, 81, 91, 111, 113, 118).

In other words, 88-Syh preserves the OG, but a more literal translation of MT was added in as a correction and displaced the OG. Without the secondary addition, καθάπερ οὖν προστεταχα οὕτως ἔσται reads as a dynamic contextual guess for MT. Ultimately, it is impossible to be sure of the reading of OG, but our approach takes the best account for the texts that we have. For these reasons, we believe that OG rendered MT with a dynamic equivalent and does not reflect a plus or an alternative Vorlage; at least, one cannot be reconstructed with any confidence.

1. 86-87-The add. καὶ τὴν τοῦτον κρισιν would be retroverted as ἔτσι as in 1. 47 and 54. The use of the demonstrative adj. is a trait of OG (also 2:45) that indicates ἔτσι was in his Vorlage. OG might also be preferred to MT in this case, because when the king speaks of his dream and interpretation in 2:5-6 they occur together as ἔτσι ἀνάλογο; whereas when the magicians speak in 2:4 and 7 the terms are employed in separate clauses. OG’s reading in 1. 86-87 would reflect MT’s pattern in 2:5-6.

1. 88-90-It is difficult to judge whether OG reflects an alternative
Vorlage because of the number of problems in 2:8-9 and how the text echoes 2:5. For example, 1. 88 could be a secondary add. based on 1. 49, and 1. 89-90 might reflect a textual difficulty because the reading of Th also differs from MT. Th borrows from 1. 76 for his rendering in 1. 89-90, and the similarities between the two are such that Th could accurately reflect a Vorlage in 1. 89-90 that had been influenced by 1. 76. The add. in 1. 88 of OG also follows his habit of adding for clarification. 119 Both OG and Th read more smoothly than MT, and for that reason MT could be original. In the final analysis it is impossible to determine a retroversion for OG that can account for the differences between the two, so MT should be retained.

1. 101-We have discussed this plus and how it reflects the TT of the OG in a preliminary fashion already in CH 1 (s. p. 31). The plus δ εὐθῶν τὴν νῦν αὐτὰ would be retroverted as ἡ λέξις ὑπαρχεῖσα (ἐν)λειλίως and, as in 1. 86-87, it reflects expressions as they are found elsewhere in Daniel (s. 2:26). ἡ λέξις ὑπαρχεῖσα (ἐν)λειλίως may also have been omitted from MT through parablepsis with either the preceding μαθωμάτων or the following ἡ λέξις. For these reasons, it is probable that the OG addition should be regarded as reflecting a better semitic text.

1. 114-The add. was most likely to simplify the syntax in the Greek and is not based on an alternative Vorlage.

1. 116-Whether בָּל was omitted in OG's Vorlage or he chose to leave it untranslated is difficult to decide. It is possible that OG regarded it as redundant. In any case, MT should be retained.

119 So also Collins, Daniel, p. 149.
IV. Daniel 3:11-20

The most interesting aspect of this passage is 3:17-18, but we will find that OG is much closer to MT and Th here than in 1:1-10 and 2:1-10.

3:11 Th 3:11 MT 3:11 OG
1 ἵνα — — μη
2 πεσάνων
3 προσκυνήσῃ
4 τῷ εἰκόνι τῇ χρυσῇ
5 ἐμβληθῆσεται
6 εἰς τὴν κάμινον
7 του πυρός
8 τὴν καιομένην

3:12
9 ἐστίν ἄνδρες
10 ἱοδαίοι
11 σὺς κατέστησας
12 ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα
13 τὴς χώρας
14 ἩΒαβυλῶνος
15 σεδραχ Μίσαχ
16 — Ἀβδεναγω
17 σοι ( — — )
18 σὺν συνήκουσαν
19 βασιλέων
20 τῷ (δόγματι) σου
21 τοῖς θεοῖς σου
22 οὕτω λατρεύονσιν
23 καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι
24 τῇ χρυσῇ
25 ἡ ἐστήσασας
26 οὕτω προσκυνοῦσιν

3:13
27 ὁτότε Ναβουχοδ.
28 ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ὑπῆρξεν
29 εἰσεν ἄγαγεῖν
τὸν σεδραν Μισαχ
- Ἀβδεναγω
καὶ ῞(καὶ)
καὶ ᾧ
καὶ ἤχησαν
ἐνώπιον τοῦ
βασιλέως

3:14
καὶ ῾απεκρίθη
Ναβουχοδονοσορ
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
Εἰ ᾧ ἀληθῶς
Σεδραν Μισαχ
Ἀβδεναγω
toῖς θεοὶς μου
οὐ — —

καὶ ἄτρεύετε
cαὶ τῇ εἰκόνι
τῇ χρυσῇ
tῇ ἔστησα
οὐ "προσκυνεῖτε"

3:15
καὶ νῦν ὅσιοι
ἐξεῖτε ἐποίμος


καὶ παντὸς γένους
μοναστικῶν
65 πεσόντες
66 προσκυνήστε
67 τῇ εἰκώνι
68 ἡ ἐκώνσα
69 εἰάν δὲ
70 μὴ προσκυνήστε
71 λατρεύσετε
72 έμβαλθήσατε
eiς ὑπὲρ τῆς κάμινον
73 εἰς τὸν πυρὸς
tὴν καιομένην
cαι τίς ἐστὶν θεός
dε έξελείται υἱὰς
74 εἰς ὑπὲρ τῶν "χειρῶν"
75 τοῦ πυρὸς
tὴν καιομένην
cαι ἡ ποίος θεός
76 έξελείται υἱὰς
eκ τῶν "χειρῶν μου"
77 3:16
78 3:16
79 3:16
80 καὶ ἀποκρίθησαν
81 σέβασθαι Μισαχ
82 -Αβδεναγὼ
83 λέγοντες
84 τῷ βασιλεί
85 Ναβουχοδόνοσσορ
86 +Βασιλεί
87 οὐ έρειαν ἐχομεν
88 ήμεῖς "κερί"
89 τοῦ "ρήματος τούτου"
90 έκανεν κερί
91 έκανεν κερί
92 "γάρ θεός"
93 +οὸ ἐν οὐρανοῖς
94 ψ "κύριος ἡμῶν"
95 ἀκούσθησα αὐθεντικῶς
96 έξελεύσθαι ήμᾶς
eκ τῆς καμίνον
tοῦ πυρὸς
tῆς καιομένης
97 3:17
98 3:17
99 3:17
καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν σου
βασιλεὺς

καὶ ἐξελείται ἡμᾶς

καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι

καὶ ἐξελείται ἡμᾶς

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι

καὶ ἑκάτερον μὴ
gνωστὸν ἢστω σοι
IV.1. Analysis of 3:11-20

IV.1.i. Morphology

1. 22, 26, 46, 50—Either the present or the aorist can be reasonable equivalents for the perfect of ἡ, and both are abundantly represented in 3:11-20. However, it is interesting to compare 1. 22 and 26 to 1. 46 and 50. Regardless of the fact that the present probably represents a better choice in 1. 22, 26 (as in 1. 46, 50), Th’s choice of the present in 1. 22, 26 where OG reads the aorist is somewhat significant. DA, pp. 63-65, identifies the elimination of the historic present as a characteristic of ὑμεῖς. While these examples are not historical presents, they are more appropriate in the context, and do not exhibit the same formal correspondence to ἔτη as OG.

1. 29–OG avoids the simple coordination of the terms in MT by transforming one n. into the aor.pass.part. ὑμεῖς. 1. 29, 90, 131, 134—in none of these cases does Th (or OG) represent the ἔ prefixed to an inf.

1. 55, 66–OG employs infinitives for the imp. forms of MT in 1. 55, 66 in an attempt to preserve the sense of the syntax. S. Syntax, 1. 51-66.

1. 71–OG employs the gen. abs. rather than the finite vb. because of changes introduced to the syntax. S. Syntax, 1. 69-71.

1. 79, 100–OG prefers to employ the pl. for ὑμεῖς (s. CH 2.11.8.1.a.), while Th normally follows the number of MT. In fact, only in 1. 100 does Th not follow the number in MT for ὑμεῖς. The change in 1. 100 is probably due to harmonization to the earlier use in 1. 79.120

IV. 1.ii. Syntax

1. 1-4—Th’s omission of the clause ἐπὶ χθενὸς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἡμέρα in 3:10 is

120 Note that BHS wants us to read the earlier number in the light of the later.
a rather lengthy minus against both MT and OG, and reflects a tendency of Th, particularly noticeable in chs. 4–6, to omit repeated phrases. Th changes the syntax of MT in 3:10-11 from "Anyone who hears ... should fall and worship ... but whoever does not fall and worship ..." to "Whoever hears ... and does not fall and worship ... ." The change in syntax explains the add. in l. 4 as necessary to provide the object of worship. The basic meaning of the Vorlage is retained, though the elimination of the repeated phrase lessens some of the rhetorical effect.

l. 2-OG's omission of the part. alters the rhetorical effect, but the basic sense is the same.

l. 6, 74, 97, 135-MT has the full expression ΜΑΤΡΙ ΑΚΩΝ ΤΡΑΧ also in 3:6, 21, 23, 26. A formally equivalent translation τὴν καμινον τοῦ πυρὸς τῆν καταμένην is given by OG and Th in l. 6, 74, 135; 3:6. OG omits τὴν καταμένην in l. 99 and 3:21; and has differences in 3:23, 26(96). In 3:23 OG has ἔξελθοντας ἢ πλοῦς ἐκ τῆς καμινον; and 3:26(96) has τῆς καμινον ἕπι καταμένης, but both may reflect a different approach to translating compared to the earlier portion of ch. 3.

Th only omits τοῦ πυρὸς in 3:23.

l. 11-This is the only occurrence of the independent obj. pro. ἦν in BA. The relative pro. οὖς is a literal and idiomatic equivalent for the ἦν + obj. pro.

l. 17-OG=MT while Th omits "these men" and employs a relative clause instead.

121 Indeed, both OG and Th employ the individual Greek words as SE for the corresponding Aramaic. The majority of omissions and/or different readings from the three terms are in 3:21-26(93). For example, Πυ only occurs 8x; all in the phrase currently being discussed. ΤΡΑΧ is found in 2 additional passages (3:19, 22), and in each case OG and Th translate with καμινος. ἦν is also found in 3:22, 24(91), 25(92), 26(93)bis, 27(94)bis, 7:9(2), 10. Both OG and Th translate with τὸν, except where it is omitted. OG omits in 3:21, 22, 24(91), 26(93); 7:9. Th omits ἦν in 3:22, 23, where the context is different due to the inclusion of the deutero-canonical material.

122 Asterisked add. in 88-Syh.
1. 18-Both OG and Th translate the semitic idiom סָמַךְ סָמֵךְ "pay regard to" (+ הָלַע pers.; s. BDB, p. 1113) literally by providing an object for the vb. The idiom also occurs in 6:14(13). There OG=0 and Th employs בשורשככ. It is also possible that Th has read בָּשָׂר in both cases.

1. 23, 109-The add. of סָמַךְ may be the result of OG making explicit what is implicit in MT, i.e. the image is in the likeness of the king (cf. 2:32, 37),[12] but OG does not add the first per.pro. in 1. 47. Regardless of the appearance of the image, to worship it was to acknowledge Nebuchadnezzar's god/idol.

1. 37-40-OG employs a relative phrase to avoid the excessive parataxis in MT. The part. in OG does serve to make the sequence of events explicit ("they were brought . . . when he saw them . . . he said"), but there is no significant difference in meaning. OG's syntax also requires the non-translation of 1 in 1. 40.

1. 37, 80, 121-For the variation in the translation of the idiom יָסְמֵךְ, s. Syntax, 2:1-10.

1. 51-66-Here MT leaves the apodosis unstated.[124] OG employs infinitives in 1. 55 and 66, which effectively follow the syntax of MT. יָסְמֶךְ + dat. + inf. in 1. 54-55="Together with the hearing . . ." Th has 2 subj. in 1. 55 and 66, which introduce a slight change, "Now, therefore, if you are prepared: When you hear . . . you should worship."

1. 51-OG employs the idiomatic µέν/δέ[125] 8x, but the distribution is significant. It occurs in 1:7; 2:24, 33, 41; 3:15, 23, 46; 12:2. The total absence of this construction from chs. 4-11 in the original text of OG is unlikely. Th only has µέν/δέ in 2:41, 42.

---


[124] GBA, §86.

1. 58–62, 119—In 1. 119 (s. l. 132) OG substitutes a shorter expression for the repeated list of names for stylistic variation. The same motivation accounts for the omission of the instruments in 1. 58–62.\(^{126}\) The list of instruments is also shortened in 3:7, 10; as well as the list of officials in 3:3.

1. 69–71—OG adds 1. 70 to emphasize the ominous consequences of not worshipping ("But if not, know for certain/it is a certainty").\(^{127}\) The introduction of 1. 70 also caused 3 changes in the syntax. First, \(\mu \eta\) was added to 1. 69; second, OG’s introduction of \(\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega\) required an obj. clause in order to retain the elements in MT; third, OG transforms the finite vb. \(\pi \rho \sigma \kappa \nu \gamma \nu \epsilon \omicron\) into a gen. abs! OG’s dynamic translation is faithful to the intention of MT, but slightly more dramatic. At the same time, even though OG added a few elements to create this emphasis, the vocabulary of MT is represented.

1. 86, 105—In the former the voc. \(\mu \lambda \epsilon \nu \) is added, while in the latter the voc. is omitted. Neither makes any significant difference (s. Text-Critical).

1. 88, 90—Both OG and Th construe \(\mu \tau \nu \rho \mu \nu\) with \(\mu \tau \nu \rho \mu \nu\) incorrectly.\(^{128}\) MT="There is no need for us to make an apology about this."

1. 91, 103—The theological implications of the conditional clauses in 3:17–18 of MT are interesting, but it is not incumbent on us to determine whether it is God’s existence or his ability to save that is in question.\(^{129}\) What is significant for our purposes is that there

\(^{126}\) In both instances 88–Syh have an asterisked add.

\(^{127}\) For \(\gamma \epsilon\), see Smyth, §2821–2829.

\(^{128}\) Noted by Mont., p. 208; but note that the Peshitta has an addition (\(\lambda \tau \nu \lambda \mu \nu\)) which makes this connection as well.

\(^{129}\) The linguistic difficulty in 3:17 is the separation of the particle \(\tau \rho \iota \) from the vb. \(\lambda \omicron \lambda \). There are two options for translation. The first is offered by Torrey ("Notes," p. 263) and presupposes that the \(\tau \rho \iota\) contains the whole protasis. Thus, he translates, "If it be so. (i.e., if the sentence of the king is executed), our God whom we
is an ambiguity in the text, and both OG and Th, in company with the other versions, resolve it. OG and Th affirm the existence of God (OG adds 1. 92-93, s. below) and His ability to save. They confirm God's existence by employing ὥς for ὅς, but the unified approach could be based on an exegetical tradition rather than Th borrowing from OG.

The translation of the second conditional clause in 3:18 (l. 103) reveals significant differences between OG and Th, which supports the view that there is no dependence of Th on OG in the earlier clause. Th translates l. 103 with formal equivalents "And if not," (i.e., if God does not save us), and the juss. in l. 104 with an impv. "let it be known to you." According to Th, then, the three do not intend to worship the gods whether their God acts or not. Conversely, OG has καὶ τοῦτο ἐαν εἴη ὅτι ἐστι "And then it will be clear to you," which presupposes that they will be delivered. The explicit belief that they will be delivered is in complete accord with the confession in 1. 92-93.

1. 92-93—OG's add. imparts a monotheistic emphasis that strengthens the syntactic change in 1. 91. A similar statement on monotheism is found in OG 4:34c. The similarity of the theological statements suggests that the same translator is responsible for both 3:17 and 4:34c.

serve, is able to deliver us." The second option is to translate ἢνικα as a copula (Mont., p. 206). Thus, "If our God whom we serve is able ..." For an excellent discussion of the issues, see P. W. Coxon, "Daniel III: 17: A Linguistic and Theological Problem," VT 26 (1976): 400-409. Ashley, pp. 358-368, notes that medieval rabbinic exegetes debated vigorously over the meaning of this clause and argues that we should seriously consider that the clause questions the existence of God for rhetorical effect.


See also Blud., p. 45.

The lines are marked with the obelus in 88-Syh.
1. 125-126-OG employs παρα + acc. for a comparative\textsuperscript{133} "seven times more than it was (literally: he had seen it) heated." Th reads ἥν for ἦν and employs εἰς τέλος adverbially.\textsuperscript{134} See Lexicology, 1. 126.

1. 132-967 reads τοίς περί τὸν 'Αζαριαν, which agrees with OG's translation in 3:23. However, it is argued below that a later translator has edited 3:20-30(97) in order to insert the additions to ch. 3. It is the reading of 967 in 3:20 that suggests this editing began in 3:20.

IV.1.iii. Lexicology

1. 3, 22, 26, 46, 50, 66, 71, 94, 108, 112—The cultic terms ἁπέῳ and ὅλμο are both rendered by SE in OG and Th. OG employs προσκυνέω 12/12 for ἁπέῳ,\textsuperscript{135} and λατρεύω for ὅλμο 7/9.\textsuperscript{136} The choice of equivalents reflects a semantic difference. In the remainder of the LXX λατρεύω is the SE for Ἀξιού where it refers to cultic service. προσκυνέω is the SE for ἡσυχασμός in BH and has a more predominant sense of worship. Both OG and Th recognize and maintain that distinction.

OG employs φοβέω in l. 94 as an unusual equivalent for ἅπεῳ. The motivation for this rendering was to supply a parallel with 3:12 (s. Syntax). According to OG, the three do not fear the king's decree because they do fear/revere God\textsuperscript{137} ἄμοιάςσαμος is a good dynamic translation by OG in 7:27, and only appears elsewhere in OG as a plus to 11:37.

Though Th's choice of δούλειω in 7:14, 27 is acceptable, there is no semantic difference that would explain why he would not employ the established equivalent λατρεύω. It would support the suggestion that

\textsuperscript{131}Smyth, §1073.

\textsuperscript{132}So Mont., p. 211.

\textsuperscript{133}2.46; 3:5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 28. Th omits in 3:10, s. Syntax.

\textsuperscript{134}3:12, 14, 18, 28(95); 6:17(16), 21(20); 7:14. In 3:17 OG has φοβέω (Th has λατρεύω) and in 7:14 Th has δούλειω. In 7:27 OG has ἄμοιάςσαμος where Th has δούλειω again.

\textsuperscript{135}It is surprising that Meadowcroft, pp. 159-160, fails to note the obvious literary connection.
at least ch. 7 originates from a different translator, or that ch. 7 has undergone some revision.

l. 5, 73, 134-In ch. 3 OG always employs ἐμβάλλω for ἐμπορία 5/5, but in ch. 6 OG has ἐπιτελέω 4/4. Th employs ἐμβάλλω (9/10), except in 3:24(91) where he has the simple form of the vb. The only other occurrence of ἐμπορία is in 7:9 where it has a different sense, and both OG and Th have ἔνθεμα. Once more OG's vocabulary reveals differences within chs. 4-6.

l. 6, 74-OG omits ἑλώ all 10x it appears in Daniel, whereas Th only omits in l. 6, 74 and 3:6. Elsewhere Th has μέσος.

l. 9, 45, 52, 91, 107-Both OG and Th treat ἔνθεμα as a copula. OG has ἐπιεύ (ἐπιευ in 1. 8) 6/12 and omits it in 2:26; 3:14, 18. In three cases OG offers free renditions. OG employs the f. part. ὑπάπαν in 2:30 and ἐπιευ in 1. 50. In both these cases Th has the same reading and they would have to be classed as distinctive agreements. In 3:25(92) OG has οὔσια ἐγένηθα. Besides the agreements with OG in 2:30 and 3:15, Th also omits ἔνθεμα in 1. 43, 96 and 2:26, but in these cases the particle is made redundant by the presence of a finite vb. Otherwise, Th has 3 person forms of ἐμί 9/14.

l. 9, 17, 33, 34, 127-OG employs ἀνάφορος (7x) and ἀνέρ (7x)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{138} & \text{3:6, 11, 15, 20, 21. OG}=0 \text{ 3:24(91).} \\
\text{139} & \text{6. 8(7), 13(12), 17(16), 25(24). See 6:18(17) for an equivalent to 17(16).} \\
\text{140} & \text{See also Albertz, p. 162.} \\
\text{141} & \text{Also in 3:21, 23, 24(91), 25(92), 26(93); 4:7(10); 7:15. 7:15 has the difficult ἡρώη ἐλάβε, which Th seems to have attempted to render with a contextual guess ἔδει.} \\
\text{142} & \text{GBA. §95. Muraoka (Emphatic, p. 81) states that ἔνθεμα retains an asseverative force in 2:26 and 3:17, while elsewhere in Daniel it is weakening to a copula.} \\
\text{143} & \text{2:11(2), 28; 3:12, 17, 29(96). OG}=0 \text{ in 4:32(35); 5:11.}
\end{align*}\]
indiscriminately as equivalents for καινοί (19x).\textsuperscript{144} In contrast, Th never employs ἀνθρωποί. However, Th also omits translating καινοί more often than OG and in one case makes it explicit who the men are (οἱ τακτικοί in 6:6[5]). The omission in 3:12 is due to Th changing the syntax; and Th also omits καινοί once in 3:20. Th has a large minus compared to MT in 3:22, while the omissions in 3:13, 23 have no apparent motivation.

1. 11-The same equivalence is shared by OG and Th in 2:24, 49, though Th employs it earlier in 1:11.\textsuperscript{145}

1. 12, 13–καθότι is also collocated with μαρτυρία in 2:49 in its only other usage in Daniel, and MT reads exactly the same as 1. 11–12. Th has the same equivalent in 2:49, while OG has επί τῶν πραγμάτων ἡς βασίλ. Presumably, OG has omitted καθότι in both cases as unnecessary. Th also employs the collective ἔργα for the Hebrew equivalent הָמָלְכָּה (HL in Daniel) in 8:27.\textsuperscript{146}

Th employs χώρα (9/9) as a SE for μαρτυρία,\textsuperscript{147} while OG is more varied in his approach. OG employs χώρα 4x, but also has πόλιν in 11:24 and πράγμα in 2:48, 49 (3:3, 30[97] OG=0). The fact that OG has χώρας in 3:12 suggests that OG employed the dynamic translation πράγμα in 2:49 because of his earlier choice in vs. 48.\textsuperscript{148}

1. 20-OG employs a variety of equivalents for ובש: γνῶσις 2:14; κρίνω 3:10, 29(96); ἐντολή 3:12.\textsuperscript{149} Th favours δόγμα 6/9, but not to the

\textsuperscript{144} καινοί=ἀνθρωπος in 2:25; 3:12, 13, 27(94); 5:11?; 6:25(24); 8:15.
καινοί=ἀνθρω in 3:8, 12, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25(92). OG (and Th) omits the second καινοί as redundant in 3:20 and also omits in 6:6(5) and 6:12(11). In 2:24(91); 6:16(15) OG=0.

\textsuperscript{145} S. the discussion of the relationship between Th and OG in 1:1–10, 1. 48, 94.

\textsuperscript{146} ἔργα is also found in 3:27, 57 in both OG and Th, and in an OG + in 4:19(22). OG has the sing. in 11:17 for מלך(?)

\textsuperscript{147} 2:48, 49; 3:1, 2, 3, 12, 30[97]; 8:2; 11:24.

\textsuperscript{148} Mont., p. 184, suggests that 2:48 was motivated by 2:49.

\textsuperscript{149} OG=0 4:3(6); 5:2; 6:3(2), 6:14(13), 6:27(26).
point of misconstruing the meaning of the text. ἀποκόπη renders the
sense of "good judgement" in 2:14, while in 5:2 ἀντίστασις has the sense
"taste," which Th translates with ἁγνός. Th employs λόγος in 6:3(2) in
a vain attempt to render the meaning of the difficult Aramaic.

Though Th and OG share a much closer relationship in the
current passage, the translation of ἀντίστασις does exhibit significant
differences in approach. It should also be noted that OG only employs
δόγμα in a plus (6:12a), whereas Th's use of δόγμα mainly for ἀποκόπη
μνήμη (s. Syntax, 2:1-10) represents incomplete lexical levelling.

1. 21, 44, 106-OG's specifies the nature of the gods (εἰδωλον) in 1. 21 and
106,150 whereas in 1. 44 it has a literal equivalent to MT. Actually,
OG's ideology preserves a nice distinction. To the king the statue
represents the "gods" θεῶς (l. 44), but to the three it is merely an
"idol" εἰδωλον.151 This distinction explains why OG does not employ
εἰδωλον in 1. 44.

1. 25, 48, 111-Forms of ἱερημος were ideal to render ἐπὶ because of the
broad semantic range it afforded, as well as its use as both a
transitive or an intransitive vb. Of the 35x ἐπὶ appears in Daniel
the majority are in the Aramaic section and 10 are in ch. 3:1-18.152
MT has a plus against OG and Th in 3:3, but it is probably a case of
dittography in MT.153 The remaining 8 cases in 3:1-18 all have to do
with the setting up of the statue (5 in 3 s.ha.pf.; 3 in 2 s.ha.pf.), so it
is not surprising to find identical forms in Th and OG.

For the most part, OG and Th employ formal equivalents for the
translation of ἐπὶ. The only dynamic equivalent in OG is 7:17
(ἀπολογοῦνται). There are several Th renderings that require comment.

150 S. the discussion of these equivalents in CH 3.III.2.i.

151 It is possible that OG's choice of the s. in 3:12, 18 reflects
the Q in MT, but given the change in translation equivalents it is
difficult to answer this question with any degree of certainty.

152 2:21, 31, 39, 44(2); 3:1, 2, 3(3), 5, 7, 12, 14, 18, 24(91); 4:14;
5:11, 21, 6:2(1), 4(3), 8(7), 9(8), 16(15), 20(19); 7:4, 5(2), 10, 16, 17,
24(2); 8:27; 9:12. OG=0 in 3:3(2); 4:14(17); 5:11, 21. 6:20(19)?

153 OG omits the entire final clause, while Th omits the redundant
"which Neb. set up."
Th employs ἐκατοστήμι in 3:24(91), which is unique. It is the only occurrence in Th, even though it is a regular equivalent for נְשָׁם in the LXX. In 6:4(3) Th renders נְשָׁם נָשֹׁמָה with a simple finite form of καθίστημι, whereas OG employs ἐποιεῖται καταστάσας. Th has probably omitted translating the HL נָשֹׁם.

Finally, we must consider the question of Th’s relationship to OG. The ratio of agreements between Th and OG for the translation of נְשָׁם in the remainder of Daniel is not quite as extensive as it is in ch. 3. However, rather than investigating each equivalent we will focus on those instances where OG and Th have the vb. καθίστημι. OG and Th share a common reading of the vb. in 2:21; 6:2(1), 4(3), so it might be concluded that Th has merely retained OG. On the other hand, Th also employs καθίστημι in 5:11 (OG=0) and in each of these instances Th accurately translates the sense "to appoint." For example, in 5:11 Th has ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ πόρος . . . κατέ. σῶν = ἡμέρα . . . βραδύς = "your father appointed him head . . ." Th’s translations in these instances accord well with his renderings of נְשָׁם in 1:11; 2:24, 49; 3:12 that were discussed earlier (s. 1:1-10, Lexicology). Furthermore, Th employs καθίστημι elsewhere only in 2:38 and 2:48 for the two places where the ha. of נְשָׁם appears. Therefore, when we consider the faithfulness, consistency and distinctiveness of Th’s translation, it is unlikely that Th has borrowed from OG. Most of the common readings are exactly that, common. On the other hand, the shared reading of παρεισṭηκείναι 7:10 is most likely a distinctive agreement.

1. 27, 32, 113-MT employs יִירָמָה(ב) 46x in Daniel. There is little point in presenting a comprehensive analysis because τότε is the normal and expected equivalent for יִירָמָה(ב), and καὶ is a reasonable and frequent choice as well. However, there are several noteworthy points. First, except for the omission in 3:3 OG has τότε for יִירָמָה(ב) 13/13 in

154 ἐκατοστήμι appears in 5:6 in OG where MT=0.
155 OG has καθίστημι in 2:48, but in 2:38 it employs κυριεύει!
156 2:14, 15, 17, 19(2), 25, 35, 46, 48; 3:3, 13(2), 19, 21, 24(91), 26(93)ביס, 30(97); 4:4(7), 16(19); 5:3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17, 24, 29; 6:4(3), 5(4), 6(5), 7(6), 12(11), 13(12), 14(13), 15(14), 16(15), 17(16), 19(18), 20(19), 22(21), 24(23), 26(25); 7:1, 11, 19.
ch. 2-3:21. Th, on the other hand, has δε in 2:15! and καί in 2:17, 19, 48; 3:3. Second, the frequent use of καί in Th means that the καί in 1.32 may be the equivalent for ἐντολή, rather than for a hypothetical τ ( mégale τιμία is omitted in 1.33). Third, OG employs the dynamic equivalents οὕτως οὖν only in 3:26(93) and 3:30(97). Fourth, contrary to the stereotyped usage in ch. 2-3:21, OG only employs τότε about 12/23 in 3:24(91)-7:19 and the alternative equivalents (also καί in 3:26[93]; 5:3, 6, 8; 6:12[11], 14[13], 15[14], 20[19] and δε in 4:16[19]) only occur in chs. 4-6.157

It is not possible to formulate any definite conclusions, but the pattern of translation is similar to what we have found elsewhere. Not only are there unique equivalents in OG around the inclusion of the deuterocanonical additions at the end of ch. 3, but there is also a different approach to translating the term in chs. 4-6.

1.28, 115-MT has two terms for anger/wrath collocated in 1.28 ( qualifiers is a HL in Daniel). Although OG transforms the first to a participle, Th has the same order of equivalents: θυμός (θυμών OG) then ὀργή. The nature of this agreement is underscored in 1.115 where both OG and Th employ θυμός for Ἀδα μ in 1.115 instead of ὀργή as in 1.28. The same type of agreement occurs with the cognate Hebrew term נבוש. In 11:44 OG and Th both render נבוש with θυμός, but in 9:16 they both have ὃ θυμός σου καὶ ἢ ὀργή σου where MT reads νεφελὶ βοής. The order θυμός, then ὀργή is not a fixed collocation in the LXX either, so 3:13 and 9:16 are probably distinctive agreements.158

The specifics of OG and Th’s agreement are, however, difficult to discern. For example, in the only other occurrence of נבוש in 8:6, OG has the expected θυμός; but, Th has ὀργή (1-10)! If we broaden the investigation, we find that OG and Th employ ὀργή to render the substantive νεφελ in 8:19 and 11:36. However, when νεφελ occurs as a vb. 157 3:24(91)?; 5:9, 13, 17?, 29; 6:7(6), 13(12), 19(18), 26(25); 7:1, 11, 19. OG=0 5:24; 6:4(3), 5(4), 6(5), 16(15), 17(16), 22(21), 24(23). Th’s ratio of 15/31 in 3:24(91)-7:19 (Th=0 in 5:24?) is about the same as 2-3:21.

158 In fact, ὀργή more often precedes θυμός (50x) in the LXX than the other way around (38x). See also Muraoka, 12 Prophets, pp. 111, 173 where Muraoka notes that θυμός and ὀργή are employed as overlapping synonyms in the LXX.
in 11:30 OG employs ὄργη and Th has θυμώ. Nor does Th share OG's reading of ὄργη in the addition (doublet?) to 9:26, or OG's error in 11:18. In the other occurrence of ὄργη in the sense of anger in 11:20 (cf. 9:16) OG employs ὄργη, whereas Th renders literally with πρόσεπον. Finally, we should note that OG employs both θυμώ (8:7) and ὄργη (11:11) to translate ἔρμ in the hithpalpal (ἴμναϊα) "to be embittered," but Th has 2 HL in the LXX: εξαιρεσύνε and ἀγριάνε!!

1. 29, 34-OG and Th have common readings for τάε throughout Daniel (12x), but the significance is minimal because the equivalents are expected. In 3:26(93) OG simplifies τάε πτε to ἐξέλθητε while Th has a good dynamic translation ἐξέλθητε καὶ δέιτε "Come out and come here!"160

1. 37-This is the only occurrence of συνοράω for the translated books of the Hebrew Bible, though it does occur 9x in the Maccabean literature.

1. 41-OG renders the sense of MT, but it is uncertain whether he actually knew the meaning of the inf. ἁρπαζ. Th offers a literal equivalent.

1. 51-The adv. πρὸς appears 7x in MT, though OG only seems to have it in his Vorlage in 3:15 and 2:23. Th reflects a difference in his approach. In the 5x that the adv. stands alone, including 3:15, OG translates with νῶν οὖν. However, in 5:15 where the conj. ἀ is attached, Th translates with καὶ νῶν. According to Ziegler, the νῶν is not part of Th’s text in 2:23, but there is some support for its inclusion.

159τάε is 12x in Daniel. 3:2, 13(2), 26(93); 5:2, 3, 13, 23; 6:17(16), 18(17); 7:13, 22. OG=0 5:13; 6:17(16).


1623:15; 4:34(37); 5:12, 16; 6:9.
l. 52—The equivalent ἐπίθεμας (1–4) for ἱστορίας (HL in Dan.) in OG and Th is a common reading in l. 50.

l. 54—also occurs in 3:5 where OG has ἀναν and Th employs ἅ ἀν ἀργ. Th's rendering is more dynamic in 3:15. S. Syntax, l. 49–64.

l. 57—There are five or six musical instruments listed in 3:5, 7, 10, 15. 3 of the names of the instruments are certainly Greek loan words (κιθάρις, ψαλτήριον, συμφωνία), and two (udiantes, ערב) are semitic. OG only gives a complete list in the first instance and prefers to abbreviate in vss. 7, 10, 15. The main point of interest in the list is the word συμφωνία. Bevan identified συμφωνία as a type of bagpipe and Grelot has argued that it was a double flute. It was believed that συμφωνία is specifically mentioned as a favourite individual instrument in connection with Antiochus Epiphanes, but Coxon has argued that it should be understood in the sense of a group of musicians. The sense of the term is uncertain, but Th and OG seem to understand it as orchestral music. Th omits συμφωνία all 4x in which it appears. This suggests that he understood it in terms of a band or orchestra; therefore, he omitted it as redundant because of the following "and all kinds of music." The reading of OG depends on the text we choose as original. 88–Syh and 967 translate all six terms in 3:5, but 88–Syh lists them in a way that suggests συμφωνία refers to an individual instrument. 967 reads "and a symphony of all kinds of music," which should probably be accepted as OG. In the later vss. (7, 10, 15) OG omits συμφωνία as redundant.

l. 68—OG may employ ἵστατον for ἱστορίας because he expected to read ἱστορίας due to the previous collocation of ἱστορίας in 3:2, 3, 5, 7,


165 Bevan, p. 41, includes the quote from Polybius; see Coxon, "Greek Loan-Words," p. 32.

166 συμφωνία could be the result of later harmonization to MT (s. CH 2. III.).
12, 14, though he also has שֵׂעִירַת in 7:21. The expected equivalent for the verb כָּבָּד in both OG (3/7) and Th (10/12) is θοῖον.\textsuperscript{167}

1. 72-71 only appears 5x in Daniel: 4x in the temporal expression מִשְׁתִּפּוּ (3:6, 15; 4:30[33]; 5:5) and once prefixed with כ (4:16). OG has various equivalents. אֲבָדֵי (1-2) in 3:15 appears to be a neologism (LEH, p. 70), while in 3:6 OG omits translating it. אָכָל כָּבָּד may be an equivalent in 4:30(33), though like 4:16(19) the Vorlage is uncertain. Other than the neologism in 3:15, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἥρως in 5:5 is the most significant equivalent for מִשְׁתִּפּוּ because it almost certainly stems from Th! In the other three cases where מִשְׁתִּפּוּ appears, Th always has αὐτῷ τῷ ἥρως. The only difference in 5:5 is the add. of ἐν, but the literalness of the reading and the consistency with which it is found in Th leads to the conclusion that the reading ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἥρως of OG in 5:5 is Theodotionic.

1. 78, 96, 102-The main equivalent for בְּרֵי (shaphel, see BDB, p. 1115) in both OG (5/8) and Th (7/9) is ἐξεσάρακ.\textsuperscript{168} The other equivalent for OG is σαλέο in 3:28(95); 6:21(20), 28(27).\textsuperscript{169} Th has θυμάμαι in 3:17 and ἐξαπλαμπάω! (HL in Daniel) in 6:28(27). It is possible that Th has followed OG’s equivalent for בְּרֵי, but it is also possible that Th made the same equivalence. The 2x that Th changes equivalents can be explained as stylistic variation, and it is noteworthy that Th changes equivalents in 3:17 while OG does not.\textsuperscript{170} Analysis of related vocabulary sharing the sense of deliverance reveals similar findings. For example, other than 3:88 Th only has σαλέο in 11:41 and 12:1 where the Hebrew equivalent is מָלַל (ni.). These are the only appearances of מָלַל in Daniel and the reading is shared with OG in 12:1. However, in

\textsuperscript{167} 2:5; 3:1, 15, 29(96), 32(99); 4:32(35)bis; 5:1; 6:11(10), 23(22), 28(27); 7:21. OG=0 in 3:32(99); 4:32(35)bis; 6:23(22)?, 28(27). Neither OG or Th understand MT in 2:5 and 3:29(96).

\textsuperscript{168} בְּרֵי is in 3:15, 17(2), 28(95); 6:15(14), 17(16), 21(20), 28(27)bis. OG=0 once in 6:28(27) where בְּרֵי appears twice and OG reads quite differently.

\textsuperscript{169} OG has σαλέο also in 3:88; 11:42; 12:1.

\textsuperscript{170} S. the discussion of OG and Th’s relationship.
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11:41 OG=O, so we cannot assume Th dependence on OG in 12:1.

Another Semitic term for deliverance, לֵוָה (ha. in BA), occurs 5x in Daniel. OG has יָדֶּלֶה in 3:29(96); 6:16(15)=15(14) and הָדָא in 8:4, 7. Th overlaps in 6:15(14), whereas in 3:29(96); 6:28(OG=O) he has הָדָא and in 8:4, 7 יָדֶּלֶה.

1. 87-OG and Th employ the common reading χρείαν εξομεν for ἔπος (HL in MT; BDB, p. 1093). This reading also shares the same feature as the common reading in 1. 52, i.e. both employ εμεν.

1. 88, 90-OG and Th have ἀμοιρίω for ἀρν. Th has the same equivalence where ἀρν has the sense of "answer" in 2:14. There OG has εἰςεν. Elsewhere ἀρν has the sense of return in 4:31(34), 33(36)bis, and in each case Th renders with ἐπιστρέφει (OG=O).

1. 88, 90-MT also has ὡς in 4:14(17) where OG=O and Th has λόγος.

1. 95-OG and Th only have διωτός elsewhere in 11:3 for ἔπος (HL in Daniel). The reading in 1. 95 is a distinctive agreement, but there is no way to prove the direction of borrowing. However, it is noteworthy that OG and Th have extensive agreement with one another and formal agreement with MT in 1. 95-101.

1. 115-OG and Th have a common reading, which in all probability stems from OG. παρελθμ is nowhere else in Th while OG has it again in 12:4.

1. 116-εικόν is the SE for ἴκα for both OG (14/17) and Th (16/17),

[171] Elsewhere ἴκα has the sense of return in 4:31(34), 33(36)bis, and in each case Th renders with ἐπιστρέφει (OG=O).

[172] יְבַדְּרָו=διωτός is a common equivalent in the LXX.

[173] לֶוָה appears 4x in MT: 2:35 OG=παραπαρός, Th=πληρό; 9:2 OG=ἀναπληρος, Th=συμπληρος; 10:3 OG=συνελε, Th=πληρος. OG's rendering in 2:35 is based on his reading מִלֶּה for מִלָּה. מִלָּה is found earlier in the vs. as well as in 2:34.

[174] לֶוָה is found elsewhere in 2:31(2), 32, 34, 35; 3:1, 2, 3(2), 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18. OG omits in 2:32 and once in 3:3. Th omits in 3:10, but has it as a plus in 3:11 (s. Syntax, 1. 1-4).
but would not have been appropriate to describe the "appearance" of the king's face. The choice of equivalents in 3:19 is interesting because μορφή is a HL in OG, whereas Th has it 5x for ἄπως. Th is an equivalent for ἀπομόρφωμαι in 1:4 of Th, whereas OG has it for ἀπομόρφωμαι in 1:13, 15 (Th=ἰδέα).

1. 118—The translation of ἀπομόρφωμαι was discussed in the previous section on 2:1-10. 4x elsewhere MT has ἄπως collocated with ἀπομόρφωμαι "his appearance was changed" and in each case Th employs ἀλλοϊκός.

1. 122, 126—OG employs the simple καίω for ἀπομόρφωμαι while Th has the compound ἐκκαίωσις. The only other occurrence of ἀπομόρφωμαι is in 3:22 (pe.pf.) where both read ἐπικαίωσις. OG exhibits lexical levelling by employing καίω for both ἀπομόρφωμαι and ἐπιτελείον (3:6, 11, 15, 20, 23), whereas Th makes a distinction through employing the compound. Therefore, it is very possible that the compound in 3:22 of OG reflects Th influence.

1. 126—Th has the dynamic rendering of εἴς τέλος for ἀπομόρφωμαι. Th translated it adverbially (i.e. "utterly"), but it is unlikely that his text differed from MT. This is a good example of Th's independence from OG.

1. 128-129—MT piles up the superlatives in depicting the "men, mighty men of strength who were in his service" who were to throw the three into the fire. OG renders מנהיגים מmightily with a superlative, and a formally equivalent rendition of מנהיגים מ. Th simplifies to ἑξευθυλοῦσα ἑξορθοῦν "strong in strength." Th's more dynamic rendering should be regarded as another clearly independent translation.

175 4:33(36); 5:6, 9, 10; 7:28. OG=0 in all cases except in 5:6 where it has ἀπομόρφωμαι.

176 5:6, 9, 10; 7:28. OG has ἀλλοϊκός in 5:6; OG=0 in 5:9, 10; ἑξευθυλοῦσα in 7:28.

177 Mont., p. 211, suggests that Th read מנהיגים מ as if it were from the root of ἀπομόρφωμαι.
1. 131–OG has συνποδιζω (3/3) for κοιμω, whereas Th has πεταω 4/4.\(^\text{178}\)
Both words are employed in the LXX (s. HR), but Th’s choice suggests independence.

IV.1.iv. Summary

As in 1:1–10 and 2:1–10, OG was no doubt translating a Vorlage virtually identical with MT. However, OG’s relationship to MT has a different character in 3:11–20 when compared to the previous sections we have examined. As in the previous sections OG adheres quite closely to MT, but here OG does not exhibit the same variety in his choice of lexical equivalents and the close formal correspondence to MT (note the number of articles!) is unusual. This may be partly explained by the high degree of repetition in the vocabulary. However, it is also striking that in 3:11–20 OG always has qualifying adjectives and participles with articles in the attributive position (eg. τη εικόνι τη χρυση) rather than employing a shorter form. There are omissions against MT, but these primarily involve words that occur frequently in ch. 3. Though OG demonstrates a closer formal correspondence to MT in this passage, there are still some interesting free translations. For example, OG changes the conditional clauses in 3:17–18 in order to remove any ambiguity about the existence of God or His ability to save. The addition emphasizing monotheism in 1. 92–93 of 3:17 ensures that we are in no doubt about OG’s theological views. The addition in 1. 70 is different from 1. 92–93 because it does not introduce any fundamental differences in meaning, though it did require OG to make changes in the syntax. OG also has a few dynamic equivalents (1. 37–συνιδων; 1. 72–αυθαπι; 1. 94–φοβοσιμηθα) and displays some freedom in word order by employing postpositive conjunctions (δι in 1. 9, 69, 80; γιν in 1. 91).

In 3:11–20 Th demonstrates an expected formal correspondence to MT, but not to the point of mechanical literalness. Once again, Th has occasional omissions against MT and even changes the syntax at the beginning of vs. 11. Th also employs some variety in equivalents (1. 102, 116, 126, 131) that distinguish him from OG. Th’s expression of the superlative in 1. 128–129 is also dynamic.

\(^{178}\)3:20, 21, 23, 24(91). OG=O in 3:24(91) but has an extra appearance of συνποδιζω in 3:22. OG has πεταω in 4:30a.
The investigation of 3:11-20 has also found further evidence to confirm Albertz' thesis. First, we have confirmed that OG's use of \textit{piste} for \textit{noe} in chs. 4-6 is distinct from the choice \textit{embaal} elsewhere. Second, OG employs \textit{tote} as a SE for \textit{yarmo} in ch. 2-3:21, which is distinct from 3:24(91)-7:19. Third, the idiomatic \textit{mev/be} only occurs once outside of chs. 1-3, but this finding has been anticipated by the results of our investigation of 2:1-10.

There is also a significant piece of evidence linking chs. 4-6 with the rest of OG, or, at least ch. 3. The emphasis on monotheism in 3:17 is very similar to 4:34c. Albertz argues that one of the reasons why the later translator of chs. 1-3, 7-12 adopted the earlier "popular" edition of chs. 4-6 into his edition was because the earlier translator of chs. 4-6 shared the same theological concerns. Albertz offers the parallel between 3:17 and 4:34c as a prime example of this shared theology.\textsuperscript{179} However, if that were the case, we might expect to find additional emphasis on monotheism elsewhere in chs. 1-3 or 7-12. So, although it can be maintained that OG chs. 4-6 stem from a different translator when compared with chs. 1-3; 7-12, the correspondence between 3:17 and 4:34c exemplifies the problem of reconstructing OG and its compositional history.

IV.2. A Note on the Additions to Chapter Three

A further complication in reconstructing the compositional history of OG is the inclusion of the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men in ch. 3. Whether the additions stem from a semitic \textit{Vorlage} is beyond the limits of this investigation, nor is it strictly within our purview to decide whether the additions were part of the OG text. However, what we have found suggests that the additions have been inserted into the OG. There are differences in content between MT, Th and OG in the verses immediately prior to and following the insertion in 3:21-30(97), but the primary difference is in 3:24(91). MT does not provide a reason why the king was alarmed and rose to his feet, but presumably he can see the four from where he sits. In OG and Th the king rises to his feet in amazement because he hears them singing, and then he declares to his friends (nobles in Th)

\textsuperscript{179}Albertz. p. 164.
that there are four beings in the fire. Despite the differences in content, the narrative sequence, apart from the inclusion of the deuto-canonical material in the Greek texts, is basically the same in MT and the Greek versions. Therefore, we can be reasonably certain that the Vorlage for OG and Th was very similar to that preserved in MT. Even though the Vorlagen for MT and OG were very similar, there are several translation equivalents that OG employs that are unique to 3:20-30(97). These are summarized below:

1. OG has ἐξελθοῦσα ἡ φλόξ ἀπὸ τῆς καμινοῦ in 3:23 and τῆς καμινοῦ ἐκ κατομένης in 3:26(96) where MT has καταφέροντες οἱ διηνότηται (cf. 3:6, 11, etc.).
2. OG has οἰδεμία ἐγενήθη in 3:25(92) for λέγεται.
3. OG employs οὔτως οὖν only in 3:26(93) and 3:30(97) for καί ἔργον.
4. OG renders ἄνωθεν with ἀνειθέω (HL in OG) in 3:28(95) instead of the SE ἀνασώκοντο (6/7).
5. A strong piece of evidence that the deuto-canonical material has been inserted into the text is the translation of ἐν κακοῖς ὁμίλων and ὁμίλων ἐν τῇ ἡδωρίᾳ in 3:29(96)=2:5. For the latter OG has καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ δημιουργήθηκεν "his belongings will be confiscated" in 3:29(96), which seems to be a simplification of καὶ ἀναληφθήσεται ὑμῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐις τὸ βασιλείαν in 2:5. Yet, the same translator, who depends on 2:5 for the translation of one difficult text, ignores 2:5 for the translation of ἐν κακοῖς ὁμίλων. Instead of an equivalent similar to παραδειγματοθέτησαν in 2:5, the translator has διαμελὶς(π)ίξω. The best way to explain the differences between how the same Vorlage is rendered in 2:5 and 3:29(96) is to posit a later translator (redactor) of 3:29(96). The later redactor simplified the translation given by the translator of 2:5 for ἔνοχος ἔλεος because he did not know the meaning either. On the other hand, the redactor employed his own equivalent for ἐν κακοῖς ὁμίλων rather than follow the earlier translator's lead because in that case he knew the meaning of MT.180
6. The translation τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀζαριαν for ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀζαριαν in 3:23 (s. 3:20 of 967) prepares for the insertion of the Prayer of Azariah.
7. It was also noted that the translation of τοῦ Ἰάκωβ (s. 2:1-

---

180 S. the discussion of Lexicology, 1. 49-52, in 2:1-10.
10) changes after 3:19, but, in this case, it is not possible to distinguish 3:20-30(97) from chs. 4-6.

The differences in TT by OG in 3:20-30(97) are consistent with the position that a later translator/redactor has freely edited this section in order to accommodate the insertion of the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men.\

IV.3. The Relationship Between OG and Th

We can be fairly certain that the choice of lexical equivalents in 1. 28 and 115 are distinctive agreements in which Th is dependent upon OG. The readings in 1. 52, 87 and 95 are also distinctive, but there are no means to determine the direction of dependence. The conj. γόρ is a common reading in 1. 91, but it is not necessarily distinctive because it may stem from an exegetical tradition. Likewise, the omissions of ἡμι in 1. 6 and 74 (also 3:6) are common readings, but it is difficult to judge their value because Th does translate ἡμι 7x elsewhere while OG always omits it. The evidence for Th's independence from OG in this passage is more limited than in the two previous sections. We noted above the lexical equivalents (1. 20, 102, 116, 126, 131) and syntactical features (1. 1-4, 128-129) that distinguish Th from OG, and they do indicate independence in approach. However, the extent of the verbal agreement accompanied by several distinctive agreements indicates that there is a closer textual relationship between OG and Th.

It is not possible, however, to conclude that Th has revised the OG text. There are two reasons for this position. First, many of the lexical equivalents are expected (ἦν=ἰστήμη; ὑπερ=πόρ; ἡπὲ=καίω; ὄλος=εἰκόν; ἄρα=χρυσός) and are, therefore, insignificant. For the equivalents ἔρχομαι in 3:28(95)=6:21(20), 28(27) is one link between the editor of the insertion and chs. 4-6.
decidedly unlike the OG that we have witnessed previously. Where are the prepositive genitives? Why is the part. in the attributive position? And why is OG so monotonous? Unfortunately, the paucity of textual witnesses for OG suggests that Th and OG are closer in this passage than they may have been originally. Given the decidedly formal—Theodotion like—correspondence between OG and MT and the accumulating evidence that Th has infiltrated OG, it is a reasonable hypothesis that some of these verbal agreements are the result of secondary influence of Th on OG. For example, the formal correspondence to MT in 1. 95-101, which includes the distinctive agreement of διωματω in 1. 95, is likely the result of textual corruption.

A closer examination of the statistics also reveals that OG influence on Th is minimal. Although there are numerous ways by which we could attempt to "count" the frequency with which Th retains OG in 3:11-20, if we count the number of individual lexemes in OG, including some of the omissions (which Th followed), then we get 264. If we count every lexeme in Th that reads with OG, no matter how insignificant, we get 174 or 66%. However, articles, pers. pro., prep., conj., and negatives account for 75 agreements and proper names number 27. That only leaves 72 agreements. As we have already noted, most of the these remaining agreements are themselves insignificant. The insignificance of common vocabulary for the determination of whether Th is a revision of OG will be demonstrated in the following section on 8:1-10.

IV.4. Textual Criticism

The omissions and additions against MT have been commented on already during the course of the analysis of TT. In summary, it may be that one or another minus or plus is based on a minus or plus in the respective Vorlagen of OG or Th, but there are no convincing grounds to emend MT. A few cases are noted below.

182 We have uncovered only two places where Th influence on OG is possible and neither is in 3:11-20. We can be reasonably certain that ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀνὴρ in 5:5 stems from Th. It is also possible that the compound vb. ἔξεκατεν in 3:22 stems from Th.
1. 6, 74—The omission of מִן by Th (also 3:6) in these places is difficult to explain except as OG influence (s. Lexicology).

1. 33—OG and Th both omit דָּלָם, but this is not so significant because Th also omits it in 1. 17 where OG has it and Th has occasional omissions.

1. 67—The addition of פָּרַשְׂנָה in OG could be based on an alternative Vorlage reading סַכַּנְת, but it also looks like harmonization with previous uses (omitted in Th, Peshitta and Vulgate). There are no grounds to emend MT.

1. 70, 92—These additions almost certainly reflect the ideology of the translator. The former only involves a slight emphasis on the consequences of not worshipping the image. The latter is a definite example of theological Tendenz because the translator adds a confession of monotheism where the meaning of MT is ambiguous.

1. 86, 105—It is possible that OG’s βασιλεύ in 1. 86 is based on מלך in his Vorlage, which was omitted in MT (or added in OG’s Vorlage) due to the preceding מלך. On the other hand, OG may have inserted βασιλεύ as a means to introduce this important section of direct address. In a similar fashion, OG omitted מלך in 1. 105 because he had retained it in 1. 102 and it would have been redundant to translate it again in 1. 105. There are no convincing grounds to emend MT in either case.

1. 99—OG has a definite tendency to shorten and omit elements, especially those that are frequently repeated. The omission of אָדָם in OG (cf. 1. 8, 76) falls into this category.

1. 119—The substitution of τῇ αὐτοῦ for the list of names is more likely another example of OG abbreviating the monotonous repetition of

---

183 It is marked with the obelus in 88-Syh.

184 Collins, Daniel, p. 177, emends based on OG (967).
MT in ch. 3 and is not based on a Vorlage with וְלַיִלָּה.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁵ For the dramatic irony conveyed by the repetition of the lists in MT, see Meadowcroft, pp. 141-145. Collins, Daniel, p. 177 emends MT.
V. Chapter 8:1-10

Sharon Pace Jeansonne made extensive notes on this portion of text in her investigation of the OG of Daniel.\textsuperscript{186} For that reason, in this section our sole concern will be to evaluate her conclusion that Th is a recension of the OG. As in the previous sections, we will begin with an alignment of the texts and then follow that with a discussion of Th’s relationship to the OG. In order to facilitate the discussion the readings will be divided exactly as Jeansonne did. The readings in Th that Jeansonne judged to retain OG will be underlined while those she judged to be dependent upon OG will be double-underlined.

\textsuperscript{186} Jeans., pp. 32-57.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:1 Th</th>
<th>8:1 MT</th>
<th>8:1 OG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ἐν ἑτεὶ τρίτῳ</td>
<td>ἐν τῇ ἐθνικῇ</td>
<td>Ἰσότος τρίτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ</td>
<td>βασιλεύσσει τῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Βαλτασάρ</td>
<td>Βαλτασάρ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 δρασίς</td>
<td>δρασίς</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ἔφθασεν πρὸς μέ</td>
<td>ἔφθασεν πρὸς μέ</td>
<td>ἤν εἶδον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 εγὼ</td>
<td>εγὼ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Δανιήλ</td>
<td>Δανιήλ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 μετὰ</td>
<td>μετὰ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 τὴν (ἀφθείσαν)</td>
<td>τὴν (ἀφθείσαν)</td>
<td>τὸ ἱδεῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 μοι</td>
<td>μοι</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 τὴν (ἀρχὴν)</td>
<td>τὴν (ἀρχὴν)</td>
<td>τὴν πρῶτην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>8:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>καὶ εἶδον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ὁράματι</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 )</td>
<td>τοῦ ἐνυπνίου μου</td>
<td>τοῦ ἐνυπνίου μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 καὶ ἤμην</td>
<td>ἔμοι ὄντος</td>
<td>ἔμοι ὄντος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 ἐν σοφίᾳ</td>
<td>ἐν σοφίᾳ</td>
<td>τῇ πόλει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 τῇ βάρει</td>
<td>τῇ πόλει</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 ἦ</td>
<td>ἦ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ἔστιν ἐν χώρᾳ</td>
<td>ἔστιν ἐν χώρᾳ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 Αιλαμ
---
22 και
23 ἐπι
24 τοῦ Ουβαλ
25 και εἴδον
26 και ἡρα
27 τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μου
28 και εἴδον
29 και ἡρα
30 και εἴδον
31 και ἡρα
32 κρίος
33 εἷς
34 ἐστιν κόσμος
35 πρό
36 τοῦ Ουβαλ
37 και στό
38 κέρατα
39 και τὸ ἄνθος
40 υψηλά
41 και τὸ ἐν
42 υψηλότερον
43 και τὸ ἐν
44 και τὸ ἕμπνεον
45 ἀνέβαινεν
46 και τὰ ἐσχάτων
47 εἴδον
48 τὸν κρίον
49 κερατίζοντα
50 κατὰ θάλασσαν
51 και βορράν
52 και νότον
53 και πάντα
54 καὶ θερία
55 τὰ θερία

8:3
8:4

εἴδον τὸν κρίον κερατίζοντα πρὸς ἀναπτολάς καὶ πρὸς βορρᾶν καὶ μεσομήριαν καὶ πάντα τὰ θερία
ούτε
στήσανται
ἐνόπλον αὐτοῦ
καὶ οὐκ ἦν
ὁ (ἐξαιρούμενος)
ἐν χειρός αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐποίησε
τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐμεγαλώθη

καὶ ἐγὼ
ὁμην
(συνίσχον)
καὶ ἰδοὺ
τράγος
αἰγὼν
ὁριζέτο
ἀπὸ
(λείβος)
ἐπὶ
πρόσωπον
πάσης
τῆς γῆς
καὶ οὐκ ἦν
ἀπόκεμον
τῆς γῆς
καὶ τὸ τράγῳ
κέρας
ἐπὶ
ἀνὰ μέσον
τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν
καὶ ἠλθεν
ἐκ
τοῦ κριοῦ
90 τοῦ τὰ κέρατα
ἐχόντος
91 ὃ
92 εἶδον
93 ἐστώτας
94 ἐνώπιον
95 τοῦ Ὀσβαλ
96 καὶ ἐδραμε
97 πρὸς αὐτὸν
98 ἐν (ἀφῆς)
99 τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ
100 καὶ εἶδον αὐτὸν
101 (φθάνοντα)
102 ἔσχατος
103 τοῦ κριοῦ
104 καὶ (ἐξηγηριάνθη)
105 πρὸς αὐτόν
106 καὶ (ἐπαίσχεσ)
107 τοῦ κριοῦ
108 καὶ συνέτριψεν
109 —
110 (ἀμφότερα)
111 τὰ κέρατα αὐτοῦ
112 καὶ σῦκ
113 ἤν
114 ἵσχες
115 ἐν τῷ κριῷ
116 τοῦ στῆναι
117 ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ
118 καὶ ἔρριψεν αὐτὸν
119 ἐκ τῆς γῆς
120 καὶ (συνεπάτησεν)
121 καὶ σῦκ
122 ἦν
123 ὁ ἑξαιρούμενος
124 τὸν κριόν
125 ἐκ
126 χειρὸς αὐτοῦ
8:8
127 καὶ ὁ τράγος
128 τῶν αἰγῶν
129 (ἐμεγαλύνθη)
130 ἐκς
131 σφόδρα
132 καὶ ἐν
133 (τῷ ἰσχύσαι αὐτῶν)
134 συνετρίβη
135 τὸ κέρας
136 τὸ μέγα
137 καὶ ἄνέβη
138 — —
139 κέρατα τέσσαρα
140 ἵπποκάτω αὐτοῦ
141 εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρας
142 ἄνεμους
143 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
8:9
144 καὶ ἐκ
145 τοῦ
146 ἐνὸς
147 αὐτῶν
148 ἐξῆλθε
149 κέρας
150 ἐν
151 ἰσχυρὸν
152 καὶ (ἐμεγαλύνθη)
153 (περισσῶς)
154 πρὸς
155 τὸν νότον
156 — —
V.1. The Relationship Between OG and Th

Jeansonne states that she has divided the text into 171 readings ("judgeable units"). According to her findings, in 69 readings (40%) Th has retained OG, and in an additional 30 (18%), Th is dependent upon OG. On this basis she concludes, this sampling of readings confirms that θ' [Th] is indeed a recension of the OG since a total of 58% of the readings show the OG influence on θ'. In 72, or 42%, the θ' readings are distinct, revised in the interest of already well-known principles, that is, grammatical fidelity to M and standardization of word equivalences.

There are two discrepancies between Jeansonne's statistics and the text above. First, it is not always clear from her notes and discussion what Th readings she considers to be dependent upon OG. Thus, there are only 28 readings that have been double underlined, and many of these are my guesses of what Jeansonne intends to represent Th dependence. Second, Jeansonne has omitted του ουρανου from 1. 168 of Th.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁷ Jeans., p. 57.

¹⁸⁸ Another misprint is ἐναγμα for ἐναγμα in 1. 30 (8:3).
As to Jeansonne’s analysis of the relationship between Th and OG, many points can be disputed. In the following we will look at each verse individually and consider the following aspects of relationship: 1) Cases where Jeansonne asserts Th retains OG; 2) Cases where Jeansonne suggests that Th is dependent upon OG; 3) Evidence of Th independence. We will find that in many cases OG and Th exhibit verbal agreement, but the Greek translation equivalent is the SE for the whole LXX. We assume that the reader is knowledgeable of the really obvious agreements (e.g. ὀψεῖ = ἀνάθεσις, εἰς = ἔλθει) in order to avoid generating endless (and rather pointless) statistics.

Vs. 1
Th retains OG (4x)—The equivalents in 1. 6, 7, 8 are obvious equivalents and are of no significance in determining whether Th is a revision. Jeansonne, p. 49, suggests that Th’s retention of the spelling βαλτασαρ in 1. 3 is good evidence that Th is a recension, because we would expect a more precise transliteration for ἱλιάνναιες. Although Jeansonne’s argument has some merit, one cannot build a case on the translation of proper names, especially when they would be so prone to harmonization during the course of transmission.189 This can not be classified as a distinctive agreement.

Th dependent upon OG (5x)—In all 5 cases (l. 1, 2, 4, 5, 10) Jeansonne marks these lines with a "b" to indicate that Th "alters the grammatical forms and style of the OG to mirror more closely its Vorlage."190 If Jeansonne does intend to suggest that Th is dependent upon OG in these 5 cases, it is a surprising claim indeed. Th does exhibit a formal equivalence to MT, but that hardly requires that Th revised OG. Why should Th be dependent upon OG for such obvious equivalents as ἐπί, ἂν ἂν, ἡμέρᾳ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐπίκοτα, ἐπίκοτα, ἐπίκοτα, βασιλείας, ἔξω/ἐξω, etc.?

Independent Th readings (2x)—None of Th’s translation in vs. 1, apart from the possible exception of βαλτασαρ, requires that Th had any

---

189 The same spelling is found in 1:7, s. 1:1-10.

190 Jeans., p. 33.
knowledge of OG. Th's independence is suggested by the reading in 1. 9 where he renders the difficult Hebrew with a part.\footnote{For the use of the article to introduce a relative clause, see GKC §138k.} and by the choice of ἀπεκτύω in 1. 11, but neither of these is particularly distinctive.\footnote{ἀπεκτύω occurs elsewhere in 9:21, 23 where both OG and Th employ ἀπεκτύω. Jeans., p. 49, states that Th "standardizes ἀπεκτύω 'first' for ἰωράειν," but she does not note that OG has the same reading in the other two places.}

Vs. 2

Th retains OG (2x)—Th shares the OG reading in 1. 17 and 20. The first is for the city, Susa, and is therefore expected and insignificant. The second is more important because OG and Th not only have a verbal agreement (ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας), but also follow the same word order against MT "which is in the province of Elumaidi/Ailam."\footnote{The double underline under Αιλαμ is intended, albeit inadequately, to indicate that Jeans. suggests that Th is dependent on the OG word order.} However, as we saw in the last section, Th employs θύρα as a SE for ἰωράειν (9/9).\footnote{2:48, 49; 3:1, 2, 3, 12, 30(97); 11:24.} It is possible that Th is dependent upon OG's word order, but, with the exception of 8:2, ἰωράειν always appears as a construct when designating an area (2:48, 49; 3:1, 12, 30(97)). In those cases Th has θύρα-X and this is the natural order of the Greek, so it would have been quite natural for Th to employ the reading that we have. The immediate differences between OG and Th in 1. 18, 19, 21 also militate against Th dependence.

Th dependent upon OG (3x)—The fact that Th has the same word order as OG in 1. 20–21 was discussed above. It is difficult to be certain, but Jeansonne appears to suggest that Th is dependent upon OG for 1. 16 and 24.\footnote{Jeans., p. 50, #14.} Once again, the conclusion is hardly warranted. Th, like OG, translates the Vorlage, and in the first instance he had to
provide a tense appropriate to the context.

**Independent Th readings (1x)**—The transliterations in 1. 21 and 26, and the correct translations in 1. 18, 19, 23, and 25 only demonstrate that Th was more than capable of translating independently. However, any minus in Th against OG, especially one as large as 1. 12-15, has to be regarded as a distinctive disagreement. If Th were merely revising OG, then virtually every translation equivalent in OG that can be positively linked to MT should be represented in some way in Th.

Vs. 3

**Th retains OG (8x)**—There is definitely no significance for the SE ὄψις in 1. 30, κρίσις-τις (8/8) in 1. 32, and κίνος in 1. 38. The verbal agreement of ἔθνος-τοί in 1. 40, 42, 44 is more significant not only because these are the only places where ἔθνος appears in Daniel, but also because of the forms in 1. 42 and 44. ἔθνος does not appear elsewhere in Th, but OG has it in 4:7(10) (misreading of ἱλίον?) and 9:15. This might suggest that since OG employs ἔθνος elsewhere, then Th has borrowed from OG in 8:3. However, as a survey of HR reveals, although the adj. ἔθνος is translated sporadically by various equivalents in the LXX, the main equivalent is ἔθνος. Therefore, we should not be surprised that Th employs ἔθνος in 8:3.

Likewise, if we consider the specific forms employed by OG and Th in 1. 42 and 44, there is nothing we would not expect to find if Th

---

196 7/8 occurrences of ἦμερα are in 8:1-10, 8:3, 4, 6, 7(4), 20.

197 7/8 occurrences of ἦμερα are in 8:1-10, 8:3, 4, 6, 7(4), 20.

198 For example, the adj. ἄλλος is rendered by the singular equivalents ζής in I Sam. 16:7; μετέχομεν in Is. 5:15; ἄπεργωνος in Ps. 101(100):5; ἄπεργη in I Sam. 2:3. Otherwise the adj. ἄλλος is rendered 27x by ἔθνος outside of Daniel from Genesis (eg. 7:17) to Ezek. (eg. 40:2).
were translating independently. The comparative form in 1. 42 is expected for the comparative ἤ. The substantive in 1. 44 is linked to the verbal agreement in the vbs. in 1. 45 as well as to the agreement of the substantives in 1. 41. The vb. ἐλήλυ ἐν 1. 45 only occurs outside of 8:3 in 8:8 and 11:23. In all cases Th reads ἀναβαίνει because it is the SE throughout the LXX.\(^{199}\) The substantive in 1. 41 (καὶ τὸ ἐν for ἡμῖν), like that in 1. 44, is a formal equivalent for MT. All of the vocabulary agreements shared by OG and Th are the SE that are found throughout the LXX, and in every case the texts exhibit formal equivalence to MT. It is unlikely that OG and Th could have such extensive agreement in 1. 40-45 independently, but Th dependence on OG cannot be assumed either.

*Th dependent upon OG (3x)*—If Jeansonne intended to identify 1. 33, 34, 37 as dependent upon OG, we must question the basis for such a judgment.\(^{200}\) There is nothing about OG’s reading that is presupposed by Th, unless one has already prejudged that Th is revising.

*Independent Th readings (0x)*—Throughout the verse Th merely exhibits formal equivalence to MT, and there is no Th reading that is a distinctive disagreement against OG. For example, Th employs various but appropriate equivalents for מוש.\(^{201}\)

*Vs. 4*

*Th retains OG (9x)*—7 of the 9 agreements are well established formal SE and do not require comment. The part. in 1. 49 from καρατίζω (1-11) is a common reading, but καρατίζω is the SE (9/11) for מַעַשֶׂ in the

---

\(^{199}\) In 11:23 OG has evidently read the prep. לְךָ because it translates with לְךָ.

\(^{200}\) We should note that 4QDan\(^{a}\) and 4QDan\(^{b}\) read לְךָ with 967, but that is not evidence that Th is revising OG. It only demonstrates that their Vorlagen were different.

\(^{201}\) Also 1:16; 2:35; 10:5; 11:12, 14. Only in 1:16 (ἀναφέρει) and 11:12 (λαμβάνει) do OG and Th have verbal agreement.
Therefore, the lexical equivalence is of no consequence. It may be significant that both OG and Th employ a part., but it does correspond to MT. The other reading of possible significance is in l. 59. However, as in l. 80 below, Th always renders the particle of negation with οὐχ + a 3p. form of ἔγραψε. Th is dependent upon OG (4x)—In all 4 cases Th provides the expected formal equivalence to MT. For example, πᾶρείσχυλος occurs 4x in MT and Th employs θέλημα 4/4. Th even has a future for the imperfect vb. in MT in l. 57 where the aorist (s. OG) would have been appropriate.

Independent Th readings (1x)—Once again Th's translation exhibits formal correspondence to MT in this verse. The equivalence μεγαλίνω= ἀριστεόρειτός (hi., also l. 129, 152, 161) might be regarded as a distinctive disagreement because Th employs it as a SE (7/8), whereas OG never makes this equivalence. In fact, OG only employs μεγαλίνω once in 2:48 for ἀριστεόρειτός.

Vs. 5
Th retains OG (13x)—Each of these verbal agreements is the expected SE
employed throughout the LXX. \(^{206}\) θηλ=άνά μεσον requires some comment, because O'Connell and Bodine suggest it is a kaige characteristic. \(^{207}\) θηλ appears 4x in MT and in each case OG and Th employ άνά μεσον. This "characteristic" is nothing more than an expected Greek equivalent. \(^{208}\)

**Th is dependent upon OG (3x)**—The equivalents in 1.79 and 82 were discussed previously under vss. 3 and 4 respectively. The part. of δηλω is a formal equivalent for MT, and δηλω is the SE for δηλω throughout the LXX. See the discussion of 1.101 under Independent Th readings in vs. 7.

**Independent Th readings (2x)**—In the discussion of wisdom vocabulary in 1:1-10 we saw that Th was following his own pattern of equivalents. That conclusion is supported by the OG and Th renderings for the vb. θηλ (usually hi.) in 1.68. Th employs σωμιμα as a SE (16/22), while OG prefers διανοεμαι (11/22). \(^{209}\) In 1.74 Th employs λψ (HL in Daniel) for δηλω (HL in Daniel), whereas OG exhibits lexical levelling by choosing the same equivalent (δοσμη) that he did in vs. 4 for δηλω. \(^{210}\)

---

\(^{206}\) The only exception to this statement is τραγος=δηλω "he-goat," because τραγος is not employed for the only other occurrences of δηλω in II Chr. 29:21; Ezra 8:5. However, τραγος is the exact equivalent and the choice is also determined by the fact that δηλω is collocated with ηθ whose SE is αξε.

\(^{207}\) 8:5, 6, 21; 11:45.

\(^{208}\) See also Greenspoon, *Joshua*, pp. 301-302; Gentry, p. 407.

\(^{209}\) 1:4, 17; 8:5, 16, 17, 23, 27; 9:2, 22, 23(2); 10:1, 11, 12, 14; 11:30, 33, 37(2); 12:8, 10(2). Th has δωνεε in 8:16; 9:22; 10:14, ηννεοε once in 9:23 (s. OG in 11:33) as a stylistic variant and his use of διανοεμαι is in 1:4. In 10:1 Th omits by homoioarc. OG has σωμας in 1:17, προναω 11:37(2), υποδεικνω in 10:14, σωμιμα in 11:14 (with Th!), προστεω in 12:10, and σοφις in 1:4. In three cases OG has textual differences: omission in 8:16 and 9:23; προσθετεν (reading Κατα) in 9:22.

\(^{210}\) OG also has δοσμη in 6:15(14) where MT=0.
Vs. 6

Th retains OG (4x)—The readings in 1. 87, 92, 96, 97 are expected equivalents. For example, מְרֵא in 1. 96 is a HL in Daniel, but the SE (57/64) throughout the LXX is ἐπέκρισεν (the common aor. forms are from δικάσεως).

Th dependent upon OG (3x)—The equivalence in 1. 89 is obvious and has been discussed above. Similarly, the lexical equivalence in 1. 93 and the pf. part. is expected.211

The reading in 1. 90 appears to be a distinctive agreement because of the use of the part. from ἔχει. Th employs ἔχει 8x and in 5 cases he shares a reading with OG.212 There are two similar readings to 1. 90 in 8:17, 20. In 8:17a there is exact verbal agreement between OG and Th, but the use of ἔχει for καταθέτει is a fairly common practice in the LXX.213 MT also has καταθέτει in 8:20, which OG renders with the same equivalent as 1. 90; whereas Th has ὅ ἔχειν καταθέτει. Mont., p. 332 notes that the syntagm διὸ τότε ἀνθέουσα appears in Ecc. 10:20 and Rahlf’s text reads ὅ ἔχειν τάς περιβαλλόντας as the translation. The fact that Th follows Ecc. 10:20 (s. also the apparatus for 7:13[12]) in 8:20 is evidence that he has independent knowledge of how to translate καταθέτει. Therefore, Th’s agreement with OG in 1. 90 is surprising. It may be that Th has borrowed from OG in 1. 90, but the independent translation in 8:20 suggests that the agreement is due to textual corruption.

Independent Th readings (1x)—It was noted in the discussion of 3:11-20 that ὅμα (1-11) for ἐνθαὶ in Th l. 98 is distinctive.214 It is an excellent idiomatic rendering "in mighty fury."

211 Th employs the pf. part. of ἱστήμη 7x in Daniel and only on one occasion do OG and Th have a common form, 12:1. The other passages are 2:31; 7:16; 8:3; 10:16; 11:16.

212 Th has ἔχει 3:15, 16; 4:8; 8:6, 17, 20; 10:4, 16. Recall from the previous section that these is no way to determine the direction of dependence in 3:15, 16.

213 See, for example, Neh. 2:6, 3:23; Mic. 1:11; Ezek. 1:15. 19.

214 S. also Ezek. 3:14 for the same equivalence.
Vs. 7

_Th retains OG (11x)_—The equivalents in l. 100, 109, 111, 113-115, 119, 121, 122, and 124 exhibit formal correspondence to MT using the standard equivalents employed in the LXX. The equivalence ἔστοιχαστίς is also the SE for the LXX. Th has it 8/8 whereas OG employs it 5/8. 215

_Th dependent upon OG (2x)_—Both l. 103 and 116 are expected equivalents.

_Independent Th readings (5x)_—The normal SE for ὅνα is ἄπτω, but Th has ἄπτα in l. 101. Th makes the same equivalence in 12:12, and these must be regarded as distinctive because OG does not employ ἄπτα at all. 216 In the discussion of vocabulary for wrath/anger in 3:11-20 we noted that ἐξηγημαίνει in l. 104 is a HL in the LXX, and this also must be regarded as a distinctive disagreement. The reading in l. 106 should also be considered a distinctive disagreement. This is the only occurrence of ἱλομ in MT and the equivalents chosen by OG (παθώσασθαι) and Th (παθῶ, HL) are both employed as SE in the LXX. However, παθῶ is found only 26x compared with παθώσασθαι, which appears about 400x. If Th were revising OG we would expect him to have retained παθώσασθαι. The fourth distinctive Th reading is in l. 110 where Th renders ἢσθι more dynamically with ἀμφότερα, as opposed to OG, which has the formal equivalent δύο. The same difference in equivalents is found in 11:27 (OG never has ἀμφότερος). Finally, Th’s choice of συμποιεῖτε (6-11, never in OG) for ἐμεῖν "trample" 2/2 in l. 120 and l. 171 should also be considered distinctive because Th has obviously

215 8:7, 8, 22, 25; 11:4, 20, 22, 26. OG has the dynamic rendering ἀποδίδομι in 8:25; a textual problem in 11:22; and ἀποστρέφει (reading ἦλθεις 3s.impf. + 3m.s.pro.suf. from ἦλθε) in 11:26.

216 ὅνα appears in 8:5, 7, 18; 9:21; 10:10, 16, 18; 12:12. OG has προσαγω in 8:7; 9:21 and συνάπτεται (συνάγεω?) in 12:12. Other than the mentioned differences both OG and Th have ἄπτω.

Th also employs ἄπτα as a SE (8/8) for ἴνα. S. 4:8(11), 17(20), 19(22), 21(24), 25(28); 6:25(24); 7:13, 22.
employed his own vocabulary.\textsuperscript{217}

Vs. 8

\textit{Th retains OG (9x)}—All 9 equivalents correspond to MT and usual usage in the LXX, and most have already been discussed previously. Two of the equivalents that have not been mentioned are in l. 131 and 136. \textit{τReactDOM} appears only in l. 131 and 11:25, and in both cases OG and Th read \textit{sφoδρα (ς. ΘΡ)}. \textit{לירדנ} appears 15x and Th renders with \textit{μέγας (13/15)}\textsuperscript{218}. In two instances he employs \textit{πολίς (11:28, 44)}, which is reserved primarily for \textit{חיים} in chs. 2-7 (11/12)\textsuperscript{219} and \textit{תים} in the Hebrew sections.

\textit{Th dependent upon OG (2x)}—The reading in l. 135 is expected. Both OG and Th read a plus, \textit{κράτας} in l. 139. It is most likely that OG and Th had \textit{סנין} in their \textit{Vorlage}.\textsuperscript{220}

\textit{Independent Th readings (2x)}—It is possible that we should consider the reading in l. 133 as distinctive. This is suggested not so much by this particular reading, as Th merely gives a formal equivalent, but by Th’s translation of \textit{אַשַּׁדַּד} in Daniel. In 8:24 Th has \textit{κραταίος} where OG employs a dynamic equivalent, and in 11:23 Th employs

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{κραταίος} in 11:25, 44; \textit{μεγας} elsewhere.
\item \textit{κραταίος} in 11:13, 25, 28.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{217} The equivalence \textit{συμπαττω=.Dense} is made earlier in 2 Kings 7:17, 20; 9:33; 14:9; Nah. 3:14. Th also has \textit{συμπαττω} in 7:7, 19 (\textit{שד}; 7:23 (\textit{שד}; 8:13 (\textit{שד}).

\textsuperscript{218} 8:8, 21; 9:4, 12; 10:1, 4, 7, 8; 11:2, 13, 25(2), 28, 44; 12:1. OG has \textit{ἰσθμός} in 10:1, 7; 11:25, 44; \textit{πολίς} in 11:13, 25, 28; \textit{μέγας} elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{219} 2:6, 12, 48; 4:7(10), 9(12), 18(21); 5:9; 6:15(14), 24(23); 7:5, 28. Both OG and Th omit in 2:31.

\textsuperscript{220} Cf. Jeans., p. 54, who states that either "horn" was in the \textit{Vorlage} or it "could represent an expansion in the OG retained inadvertently by Θ'." This statement is typical of Jeansonne's analysis in that she has assumed that Th is a recension without subjecting the agreements to careful examination.
where OG has ἱσχύος. The reading in l. 129 is also a possible distinctive disagreement (s. the discussion in 8:4). καὶ ἔν
in l. 132 is not mentioned as a distinctive reading because Th has probably read ἐν for ἔν. Therefore, Th was just producing a formal equivalent for what he read in the Vorlage.

Vs. 9

Th retains OG (5x)—Th exhibits the expected formal correspondence to MT in all 5 cases (l. 144, 146, 147, 149, 158).

Th dependent upon OG (2x)—The reading ἔν for ἔν is expected. However, as Jeansonne (p. 55) points out, OG and Th appear to be translating a form of ἀρμονία "mighty" in l. 151 for ἀρμονία "strong." This reading is probably a distinctive agreement, though it is possible that OG and Th reflect a textual variant. The reading of the Greek versions does make sense in the context. If it is a distinctive agreement, there is no way to determine the direction of dependence.

Independent Th readings (3x)—OG provides a dynamic equivalent for ἔν in l. 153. Th's use of the adv. correctly interprets the adv. use of MT. περισσός in Th should also be considered distinctive. Th has περισσός 4—7 in the LXX, and it is not found in OG. The meaning of MT in l. 160 appears to be "beautiful land." The text (יִבְשָׂם) presented problems for both OG and Th. OG reads בָּרוּם as if MT had

Also 7:7(2), 19.

S. Mont., p. 339 for discussion.
The reading may have been unintentional, but OG was probably puzzled by MT and assumed a scribal error had been committed. For this reason, he seems to have guessed that another direction was intended. Th reads מְבִא מִמָּוֶת (s. 1. 163), but it should be considered a distinctive reading because he has also omitted 1. 156-157. If Th were following OG, there would not have been so great a divergence. The reading in 1. 152 is possibly distinctive (s. 8:4).

Vs. 10
Th dependent upon OG (5x)—All five readings are expected equivalents for MT (1. 162, 164, 166, 167, 169).

Independent Th readings (3x)—Th’s choice of συμπαθέω in 1. 171 has already been discussed in vs. 7. OG identifies מְבִא מִמָּוֶת with the "heavenly host" in 1. 163, 168, whereas Th renders with δίωμαι. Although OG and Th have a shared reading in 8:11 (ἀρχιστράτηγος=מְבִא מִמָּוֶת), OG seems to offer guesses also in 8:13 and 10:1 (ἔρημος, πλῆθος confusion from Aramaic מְבִא מִמָּוֶת). Except for 8:11 Th translates consistently with δίωμαι. The reading in 1. 161 is possibly distinctive as well (s. 8:4). The addition of τοῦ ὀφρανοῦ in 1. 168 is probably based on an alternative Vorlage, so it would not count as a distinctive disagreement.

V.2. Summary
An analysis of the texts of OG and Th in 8:1-10 reveals how important it is to be precise in the choice of terminology. Jeansonne asserts that there are 69 readings where Th retains OG and 30 readings where Th is dependent upon OG. Neither of these statistics can be considered accurate. The fact that OG and Th have 69 common readings does not oblige us to conclude that Th has "retained" OG. Such an assessment requires that a significant number of distinctive agreements exist between the two texts and that there is evidence to

---

224 That Th is translating independently is supported by the other three occurrences of מְבִא מִמָּוֶת in MT. Th transliterates in 11:16, 41, 45 whereas OG omits in 11:41 and has θέλησις in 11:16, 45.

225 OG and Th omit in 8:12.
prove the direction of borrowing. Such evidence is wanting in 8:1-10. There are only three probable distinctive agreements (ἐχθρος = Ἴδος 1. 151; 1. 39-44; τοῦ τὰ κείμενα ἐχθρος 1. 90) in the reconstructed texts of 8:1-10. As to the 30 dependent readings, it is hard to know what 30 Jeansonne believes are dependent upon OG, because dependence assumes that Th somehow had to rely upon OG for his choice of equivalents. In order to hold such a view we would have to assume that Th was incompetent to translate without reference to OG. As we have seen throughout this passage, indeed in all the passages we have examined, Th was more than competent as a translator. Th adopted a method of formal equivalence in his translation and was quite consistent in his choice of equivalents. Where available, Th normally chose those equivalents that were employed as SE in the other books of the LXX. Therefore, without strong distinctive agreements and proof of the direction of borrowing, there is no statistical significance when OG and Th agree in the translation of common vocabulary. Besides the three agreements mentioned above, there are only three other possible distinctive agreements in 8:1-10 (βαλτασαρ 1. 3; ἐπειν ἐν χωρα 1. 20; καὶ οὐκ ἤν 1. 59). We have already seen that these three are all exceedingly weak as evidence that Th has borrowed from OG.

Let us examine the first three agreements again. The best evidence for Th dependence on OG is ἐχθρος = Ἴδος in 1. 151. As Jeansonne states, it is possible that OG and Th had ὄνομα in their Vorlage, but her other suggestion that "it is possible that the concern of θ' with word order in this case caused the translator not to notice the sense" is gratuitous. Th does not follow OG when OG does not know MT. This has been evident throughout our investigation and is demonstrated by the omission of ἔστω in 1. 84, 138; the transliterations in 1. 21, 95; and the attempt to translate ὅβερ in 1. 160. If ἔστω was not in their Vorlagen, then it is more probable that one text is corrupt. There also seems to be a relationship between OG and Th in 1. 40-45 and 1. 90, but in neither case is it certain. Regarding 1. 90 we have seen that Th follows the form of Ecc. 10:20 in 8:20. Therefore, the fact that Th agrees with OG in 1. 90 could indicate that Th has been corrected toward OG. Finally, there is

---

126 Jeans., p. 55.
extensive agreement in 1. 40-45, but it is agreement that exhibits formal correspondence to MT. In conclusion, there are three distinctive agreements between OG and Th, but in no case is it certain that Th actually borrows from OG.

On the other hand, the evidence that Th is translating independently is strong. Not only does Th offer a literal translation of MT, but we have found 11 cases of distinctive disagreements in Th (1. 12-15, 68, 74, 98, 101, 104, 106, 110, 120/171, 153, 160, 163/168) along with another 4 possible distinctive readings (1. 9, 11, 65/129/152/161, 133). These distinctive readings are not merely cases where Th does not agree with OG. They underscore instances where Th employs translations that have no connection with OG. At the same time, these distinctive readings are part of Th's well-established pattern of formal correspondence to MT.

In conclusion, there is only one possible conclusion. There is no sense in which we can refer to Th as a revision of OG in this passage. In fact, there is virtually no evidence in 8:1-10 that Th had knowledge of OG at the time of translation. Given the paucity of textual witnesses to OG it is possible (probable?) that in some of the cases where OG and Th have verbal agreement Th readings have actually displaced the OG. However, we do not have evidence to prove this last suggestion.
The OG text of ch. 12 is unlike the sections that we have considered previously because it has more textual differences, particularly additions, when compared to MT. These textual differences will be discussed initially under the rubric of Syntax.

12:1 Th 12:1 MT 12:1 OG

1 καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡκαίρῳ .BorderStyle=wave

2 ἐκεῖνῷ .BorderStyle=wave

3 ἀναστήσεται Μιχαὴλ .BorderStyle=wave

4 οὗ ἄρχοι, οὗ μέγας .BorderStyle=wave

5 οὗ ἐστικῶς .BorderStyle=wave

6 ἐπὶ τοὺς νῦν .BorderStyle=wave

7 τὸ λαὸς σου .BorderStyle=wave

8 καὶ ἔσται .BorderStyle=wave

9 ἡκαίρῳ βλίστευσας .BorderStyle=wave

10 οἷα σὺ γέγονεν .BorderStyle=wave

11 αὕτη σὺ γεγένηται .BorderStyle=wave

12 ἐθνὸς .BorderStyle=wave

13 ἔος .BorderStyle=wave

14 τοῦ ἡκαίρῳ ἐκεῖνῳ .BorderStyle=wave

15 καὶ ἐν τῷ .BorderStyle=wave

16 ἡκαίρῳ ἐκεῖνῷ .BorderStyle=wave

17 ἄναστήσεται (BorderStyle=wave)

18 τὸ λαὸς σου .BorderStyle=wave

19 νὰς τοῦ ἁο — .BorderStyle=wave

20 γεγραμμένος .BorderStyle=wave

21 ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ .BorderStyle=wave

12:2 12:2

22 καὶ πολλοὶ .BorderStyle=wave

23 τῶν ἡκαθενδόντων .BorderStyle=wave

24 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ ἡμέρᾳ .BorderStyle=wave

25 ἔξεγερθῆσονται .BorderStyle=wave

26 οὗτοι εἰς ζωὴν .BorderStyle=wave

27 αἰώνιον .BorderStyle=wave

28 καὶ οὗτοι .BorderStyle=wave

29 εἰς ὑνειδίσιμον .BorderStyle=wave
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καὶ εἰς αἰσχύνην

αἰάνιον

12:3

καὶ οἱ συνιέντες

(ἐκλάμψοισιν)

φῶς ἢ λαμπρότης)

tοῦ στερεόματος

καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δικαίων

tῶν πολλῶν

καὶ οἱ ἄστερες

eἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

cαι ἡ (ἐτι)

12:4

καὶ σὺ Δανιὴλ

ἐμφαξον

tοῖς λόγοις

cαι σφάγισον

tο βιβλίον

ἐρασὶς

cαι συντελείας

ἐρασὶς (διδαχθῶσιν)

tολοί

cαι κληθὺνθη

ἡ γνώσις

12:5

καὶ εἰδὸν ἐγὼ Δανιὴλ

cαι ιδοὺ

dιὸ έτεροι

cαι εἰσὶς (ἐντείθεν)

tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

καὶ εἰς ἐνθέν
tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

12:6
καὶ εἶπεν τῷ ἁνδρὶ
τῷ ἑνδέδυμένῳ
tά L(βαδδίν)
§δς ἦν ἐπάνω
tοῦ ὀδατοῦ
tοῦ ποταμοῦ
'tως πότε τῷ πέρας
+§ἐν εἰρήκας
tῶν L(θαυμασίων)

12:7
καὶ ἤκουσα
tοῦ ἁνδρὸς
tοῦ ἑνδέδυμένου
tά L(βαδδίν)
§δς ἦν ἐπάνω
tοῦ ὀδατοῦ
tοῦ ποταμοῦ
καὶ Lἄγωσεν
tὴν δεξιάν αὐτοῦ
cαὶ τὴν ἀριστεράν
αὐτοῦ
eἰς τὸν οἱρανὸν
cαὶ ἄμοσεν
eν τῷ ζῶντι
tὸν αἰῶνα
ὁ
εἰς καιρὸν καιρὸν
καὶ ἦμισσιν +§καιροῦ
§ἐν τῷ συντελεσθήσῃ
dιασκορπισμὸν
(γνώσονται
- -)
pάντα ταῦτα

12:8
καὶ Νείπα §τῷ ενι
tῷ κεριβεβλημένῳ
tά Lβόσσινα
§τῷ ἐπάνω
§ _
§ _
§Πότε οὖν Lσυντελεία
+§ἐν εἰρήκας μοι
tῶν Lθαυμασίων
+§καὶ ὁ καθαρισμός
tούτον
12:7
καὶ ἤκουσα
§τοῦ Lκεριβεβλημένου
tά Lβόσσινα
§δς ἦν ἐπάνω
tοῦ ὀδατοῦ
tοῦ ποταμοῦ
+§Εἰς καιρὸν συντελείας
cαὶ Lἀγωσε
τὴν δεξιάν
καὶ τὴν ἀριστεράν
εἰς τῶν οἱρανῶν
καὶ Lἄμοσε
τὸν ζῶντα
eἰς τὸν αἰῶνα +§θεὸν
ὅτι
εἰς καιρὸν καιρὸν
καὶ ἦμισσιν +§καιροῦ
§ἡ συντελεία χειρῶν
ἀφέσεως
λαοῦ ἀγίου
cαὶ συντελεσθήσεται
pάντα tαῦtα

12:8
καὶ ἐγὼ ἥκουσα καὶ ἐγὼ ἥκουσα
καὶ οὐ ἔσωνήκα καὶ οὐ ἔδεινοθῆν
cαι εἶπα Κόριε και εἶπα Κόριε
tί τὰ ἔσχατα τίς η ἔλες
τοῦ λόγου τοῦτον τοῦ λόγου τοῦτον
καὶ τί καὶ τί
cαὶ παραβολαὶ αὕται]
cαὶ εἶπεν καὶ εἶπεν ὧμοι
καὶ ἁπέφυγαν καὶ ἁπέφυγαν
καὶ ἡ ἄνωκανθὼσιν καὶ ἡ ἄνωκανθὼσιν
καὶ ἡ παρωθὼσιν καὶ ἡ γιασθὼσιν
πολλοὶ πολλοὶ
cαὶ ἡ ἀνομήσωσιν καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτολοὶ
cαὶ οὐ ἔσων ἔσωσιν καὶ οὐ μὴ διανοθέσιν
καὶ οἱ νόμοις καὶ οἱ διανοοῦμενοι
καὶ οἱ συνήσωσιν καὶ οἱ συνήσωσιν
καὶ ἀπὸ καίροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ ἀν
καὶ ἐπηθήσαται καὶ ἐπηθήσαται
καὶ βδέλυγμα καὶ τὸ βδέλυγμα
cαὶ ἔρμωσες τῆς ἔρμωσες
καὶ ἡμέραι χιλιαί καὶ ἡμέρας χιλιαί
καὶ διακόσιαι ἐνενήκοντα καὶ διακόσια ἐνενήκοντα
VI.1. Analysis of 12:1-13

VI.1.i. Morphology

1. 11–OG has a 3.pl. vb., which could mean that he understood עון (1.12) as a reference to gentile nations, not Israel. Thus we would translate, "that time of affliction unlike any other (lit. such has not been) since they (i.e. the nations) came into existence."

Alternatively, OG may have intended the pl. sub. as an implicit comparison with previous periods of affliction in Israel's past. In this case we would translate "that time of affliction unlike any other since they (i.e. our times of affliction) began." The latter option is the plainest reading of the OG. It is also possible that the translator was working along on the text and assumed that the comparison was intended in MT; therefore, OG may have employed the pl. form before he realized that the grammatical sub. was ἡμήρα.

In any case, OG's change of subject required the omission of ἡμήρα.

---

227 We encountered a similar situation in 2:7.
1. 18, 83, 84-OG omits translating the pro. suf. as unnecessary (cf. 1. 106).

1. 36-Th reads the מ as the prep. (מִן) rather than a hi. part.

1. 37, 106-OG occasionally adds per. pro. against MT and Th.

1. 63-OG employs the first person "I said" from vs. 5 for "one said" in MT. Th has a formal equivalent to MT.

1. 113, 114, 115, 117-Mont., p. 478, states that Th has retained the subj. mood in these vbs. from OG. If this is the case, it would be the only sign of dependence in this verse. Furthermore, the impv. in 1. 107 followed by the causal מ in 1. 108 (s. Syntax) makes a purpose clause, hence the subj. mood, perfectly explicable.

1. 124-Th transforms the vb. into a noun. He may have read נַכְרָשִׁים Неּכְרָשִׁים (gen. cons. from נִכְרָשְׁין).

1. 127-Th employs a finite vb. rather than an infinitive. OG employs the pass.inf. in order to accommodate the change he has made in the syntax (s. Syntax, 1. 126).

VI.1.ii. Syntax

1. 8-It seems OG has read נֶעְשָׁה נַכְרָשִׁים for נֶעְשָׁה נַכְרָשִׁים. The demonstrative adj. creates an asyndetic clause where MT has parataxis.

1. 10-11-OG and Th follow MT quite closely and translate the sense of the syntax, but the common reading of the adj. מלק "such as" makes it appear that one is dependent on the other. However, OG and Th also employ שם for שְם in 9:12 to give a good idiomatic rendering, and there is little reason to suspect dependence in that verse.

1. 18-19-OG transposes פֶּס before אֲבָד "the whole people." In order to ensure that the statement "the whole people will be raised" is not mistaken for universalism, OG clarifies with the rendering פֶּס אֲנִיָּה יִפְּעוּפָה "whomever is found" for מְצַוְּבָה.

1. 26-30-OG renders the repetition of מַלּוֹכָה in 1. 26, 28 idiomatically with the art. + μείν/conciliation/бе while Th corresponds to MT. OG's add. of the second ב makes three groups to be raised whereas MT has two. It is
possible that מְלַלָה מְלַלָה was an early explanatory gloss on מְלַלָה מְלַלָה, but the versions support its inclusion. Th adds καὶ in 1. 30 to smooth the syntax.

1. 36-37—According to Mont., p. 473, OG has translated מְלַלָה מְלַלָה as if it were מְלַלָה מְלַלָה. This judgment is based on accepting the reading of 88-Syh and 967 (κατισχόντες) as OG. Zieg. reads the part. from κατισχε instead, and the cj. does make sense. To read "those who keep my words" is more in keeping with the context than "those who overpower my words." The problem with the cj. is that there is no equivalent that can be retroverted from κατισχόντες that is similar to מְלַלָה מְלַלָה. OG has to represent some type of dynamic equivalent or a contextual guess for a text that gave OG problems. For example, OG could be a dynamic equivalent for a text that he read as הָרִים מְרָבָּם "the righteous of the many."

1. 39—OG adds l. 39 in harmonization with l. 35, though it could be a scribal add.

1. 57—OG and Th employ equivalent expressions for the idiom "one on this side of the river and one on that side of the river." These are the only occurrences of οὖν οὖν in Daniel. The fact that Th employs a different adv. from OG suggests Th is an independent translation because there would be no reason for Th to switch equivalents deliberately. OG abbreviates the translation of l. 57-62, but the same sense is transmitted (s. Text-Critical).

1. 63, 75—In both cases OG has a more idiomatic rendering than Th who employs a formal equivalent συνέργασις + part. OG omits שָׁמַע as redundant in l. 75.

1. 66, 78—Th employs the same formal rendering for the relative clause בְּעַמָּיו. The agreement between OG and Th in l. 78 is either insignificant or the OG has been corrupted by Th (s. Text-Critical, l. 67-68).

1. 67-68-OG may have omitted לְפָּנֶ֑י הָיוֹת, or omitted the information as unnecessary, because it was sufficient to designate which of the two figures was being referred to in 12:5 by simply stating that it was the one on the upper side.

1. 69-OG renders more to the sense of the compound interrogative "When, therefore, is the end," and ὁς alters the word order. Th employs a formal rendering. ἀναφέρεσθαι also appears in 8:13 where Th employs the same equivalent and OG has Ἕκκαλος.

1. 70-OG and Th have a common add. δὲ εἰρηκατας (OG + μοι), and this add. makes it explicit that the "end" referred to is the one spoken of by Michael, the great angel, in vs. 4 (s. Text-Critical). MT does not explicitly identify either of the two figures in vs. 5, and this identification is clearly wrong when compared to 10:5, 13 (Gabriel?, s. 9:21). The add. is a distinctive agreement.

1. 72-73-OG's add. is based on 11:35 where OG twice reads the vb. καθαρίσθη (for ἡράξ, q.inf. cons.; ἃλος, hi.inf. cons.). The purification of the wise ones in 11:35 is connected with the time of the end, and, in the following verse, there is a reference to the boastings of Antiochus. OG interpreted the ἀμαθής "wondrous events" in 1. 70 as an allusion to the ἀμαθητεύοντας "boasting of wonderful things" by Antiochus in 11:36 (s. Lexicology, 1. 71). Therefore, OG added 1. 72-73 in order to clarify that there will not only be an end to the boastings of Antiochus, but also "the purification of these ones" (i.e. "the wise ones" in 1. 32; 11:35).

1. 81-The add. in OG has the one clothed in linen on the upper side of the river "until the time of the end."

---

229καὶ ὁ καθαρισμός is marked with the obelus in 88-Syh.

230Both of the translations in 11:35 are unique in the LXX, and though there is some change in meaning the OG equivalents do impart the basic sense of the Vorlage. OG only has καθαρισθῇ elsewhere in 8:14 where it is once more a singular equivalent for ἁμαθής (ni.pf.; a distinctive agreement with Th!).
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1. 89–OG makes explicit who it is that lives forever by the add. of \( \text{ὁ ὄν} \) in apposition to the preceding substantive, though \( \text{ὁ ὄν} \) could have originated as a marginal note that was later incorporated into the text.

1. 92–OG and Th share a common add. of \( \text{καὶ ποιεῖ} \), which is implicit in MT, though the agreement might be because \( \text{τὰ ἀπὸ ὑπαίθριο} \) was in their Vorlage (s. Text-Critical).

1. 93–96–Both OG and Th had difficulties with this text. Evidently OG transposed \( \text{τὰ} \) after \( \text{νῦν καὶ ποιεῖται} \), which would explain 1. 93 (s. Text-Critical). However, the translation of \( \text{ἀφεστάκη} \) for \( \text{τὸ} \) is unique. McCrystall argues that OG engaged in deliberate theological Tendenz by reading \( \text{ἀφεστάκη} \) (which can express "deliverance") for \( \text{τὸ} \).\(^{231}\) However, is this an example of intentional theological Tendenz, or was it motivated by a misunderstanding of the Vorlage? This is not to say that OG's theology did not play any role in this rendering, but the type of programmatic theological manipulation of MT by OG envisaged by McCrystall is extreme.\(^{232}\)

In the first place, the translator may have been uncertain about the exact meaning of the phrase, and McCrystall has shown a possible semantic path by which OG arrived at the rendering. Second, the translation bears similar characteristics to the add. in 1. 72–73. It has been suggested that the add. in 1. 72–73 was motivated by the translator drawing a parallel in 12:6 with the connection between the boastings of Antiochus and the purification of the wise ones at the time of the end in 11:35–36. OG may have understood the same referents in 12:7. The context is the time of the

---

\(^{231}\) McCrystall, p. 84.

\(^{232}\) McCrystall argues that the rendering in 12:7 is theologically motivated based on the OG interest in following the chronological system of the MT, which is based on the Jubilees' calendar (p. 234). To a great extent McCrystall's view of 12:7 depends on his ability to prove that MT used the Jubilees calendrical system and that OG knew this and inserted slight modifications. This view rests on his interpretation of three texts: 7:25, 9:24–27, and 12:7. It has not been our concern to establish whether MT does in fact reveal that it used the Jubilees' calendrical system, but in the course of this thesis we have given considerable reason to doubt McCrystall's view that the OG translator actually intentionally introduced significant changes to MT for theological purposes.
end, which brings the end of the powers (i.e. those who are boasting), and the release of the holy people (i.e. the wise ones). Finally, the resulting translation by OG is in keeping with the context, because there is an emphasis on the time of the end bringing purification, blessing, and reward in vss. 10(9)-12.

Ultimately, the explanation offered here for 12:7 has much in common with McCrystall's. The difference is that McCrystall presumes that OG correctly understood MT and then deliberately introduced changes, whereas the suggestion here is that the process is probably more subliminal. It would be more appropriate to say that OG, in company with every reader, interpreted a difficult text according to his own understanding. If anything, there was more intentional Tendenz in the add. of l. 72-73 than in the translation of l. 94.

Th had his own problems with l. 94-96. He translates יְהַּנְּנָא correctly with דּוֹמָאָרְפִּיםָא, but γνώσιμα in l. 93 suggests that he read יְהַּנְּנָא(1) (3.pl.pf.cons.[?] from דּוֹי) for יְהִינָא and he or his Vorlage omitted קַרְדְּרַנְדִּיִּים הַכְּלִוָּנַיִים. The significant point for our purposes is that OG is obviously closer to MT than Th, and Th's translation is clearly distinct from OG.

1. 100-OG adds this line to make explicit what is implicit in MT.

1. 104-105-Zieg. encloses these lines in square brackets to indicate that their originality is doubtful. The preceding lines exhibit traits of dynamic equivalence and correspondence to MT, which would indicate that they are original and not later correction toward MT (s. Lexicology). However, παράβολος could be based on μυστήρια "riddles" (s. 5:12), which would grant these lines a strong claim to originality. So, we have a double reading in which there are no easy means to determine which lines translate the Vorlage (s. Text-Critical). Although 1. 104-105 could have been added later, they also could be an additional comment of the original translator, similar to other pluses in OG. In that case, OG makes explicit the uncertainty regarding the time of the coming of the end. Such a comment would be appropriate given the fact that Antiochus had come and gone between the period of the final redaction of MT and the translation by OG.
1. 108-OG and Th both use ὅτι when γὰρ would have been a more appropriate rendering of τό. Other shared examples of this Hebraism are 9:16, 19, 23; 11:4, 37, while OG employs γὰρ properly against Th's ὅτι in 9:18; 10:11, 14; 11:27, 35.

1. 111-112-The omission by OG results in a redivision of the sentence and cuts across the verse division.

1. 123-OG renders τὸ in 1. 123 with the relative ὅ and omits the coordinate conj., which makes 1. 123-125 subordinate to the predicate in 1. 122. The OG of 1. 121-125 might be translated, "But the wise will pay attention from [the time] when the perpetual sacrifice is taken away."

1. 126-The addition in OG retains the connection between the removal of the daily sacrifice and the "abomination of desolation," but also makes it explicit that there is a sequence involved: the sacrifice is taken away, "and the abomination of desolation is prepared to be given."

1. 128-129-The same terms are collocated in 9:27 and 11:31. In 9:27 the expression is pl., and OG and Th have the common reading βεβληγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεως. In 11:31 OG again has βεβληγμα ἐρημώσεως, while Th has βεβληγμα ἡθανασίμενον. Th has the cognate n. ἀθανασίμος in 9:18, 26 (not in OG), so the agreement of ἐρημώσεις in 9:27 and 12:11 is

---

233 S. Aejmelaeus, "OTI," pp. 118-126. Aejmelaeus notes that the usage of ὅτι for γὰρ in such instances is particularly Septuagintal and "frequently occur[s] in connection with commands or prohibitions," (p. 118, s. 1. 107).

234 The complete listing for the occurrences of τό (24x) in Daniel is 8:17, 19, 26; 9:9, 11, 14, 16, 18(2), 19, 23; 10:11, 12, 14, 19, 21; 11:4, 25, 27, 35, 36, 37; 12:7, 9.

235 Cf. Jeans., p. 18, who states in error, "When Θ' revised Θ' the expression [βεβληγμα ἐρημώσεως] was retained in all three occurrences (Dan 9:27, 11:31, 12:11)."

βεβληγμα=τό is a SE in the LXX, so it is only ἐρημώσεως that could be used as evidence that Th has borrowed from OG.
distinctive. However, the verbal agreement is not surprising when we consider the popular currency of the phrase (s. I Macc. 1:54), particularly in the later Christian tradition (Matt. 15:14! Mk. 13:14). So the agreement in 9:27 and 12:11 could be because Th employed a known phrase. At the same time, the distinct reading in 11:31 suggests that the agreements in 9:27 and 12:11 are probably due to later scribal corruption. Either way, the agreements cannot be considered as evidence that Th is a revision of OG.

l. 138-142—The lines in OG are generally regarded as a large addition to MT and this may well be the case. On the other hand, we have to consider the possibility that these lines are actually OG and l. 143-147 are a later correction toward MT. In favour of this possibility is that the conclusion of the verse has a high degree of verbal agreement with Th and it corresponds to MT. The main difference is in l. 145 where OG has ἀοικον for καλλον, but this could based on a corrector reading ἡμείς for ἡμείς; or it may just be a dynamic rendering.

The suggestion that l. 138-142 is OG faces two objections. The first is based on the preconception that Th is a revision of OG; therefore, the reason why l. 143-147 are so close in Th and OG is that Th has retained OG’s reading. By now it should be obvious that we have every reason to dispense with that presupposition. On the one hand, Th’s translation of l. 143-147 provides the expected formal equivalence to MT and does not require knowledge of OG. On the other hand, the OG looks a great deal like a doublet and we have proved Th influence on OG elsewhere.

The more significant objection against reading l. 138-142 as OG and 143-147 as a later doublet is that l. 138-140 are not equivalent in meaning to MT. In l. 143-147 MT has "and rest and you will rise to

---

236 Mont., p. 478; Collins, Daniel, p. 370; Lacoque, p. 247. Plöger, p. 170, argues that l. 138-142 are an equivalent for ἡμείς. The add. is marked with the obelus in 88-Syh.

237 Mont., p. 478.
your lot at the end of the days." L. 138-142 in OG have, "Go away," for there are yet days and hours until the fulfilment of the end." Some of the discrepancy in OG's reading might be accounted for by textual differences. For example, OG may have read יְהִי נָבָע for יְהִי נָבָע and possibly לָעָב for לָעָב, but it is unlikely that we could (or should even attempt to) reconstruct a whole catalogue of textual corruptions to account for OG's reading in 1. 138-142. One of the main reasons for the creation of doublets in the LXX—and Th is in one sense a rather large doublet—was that there was a perceived inadequacy in the original translation. Therefore, it could be argued that there would not have been a need to add the correction from Th, if the OG had been closer to MT in the first place.

There is one final consideration that may support the position that 1. 143-147 is a later addition to OG. It is generally agreed that the epilogue in 12:5-13 consists of a later addition to MT. Therefore, it is possible that OG was translating a slightly different Vorlage, which did not contain the specific promise of personal resurrection for Daniel in 1. 138-140. However, this suggestion is less plausible because the OG is generally close to MT in the previous verses.

Although we can do no more than raise the possibility that 1. 143-147 are a later addition to OG, it is necessary to do so because it brings into focus two questions: 1) How faithfully has the OG text been preserved? 2) How great was Th influence on the OG witnesses that have survived? We will consider these questions in more detail in the summary at the conclusion of this chapter. Suffice it for now to say that the answer to these two questions makes it plausible that 1. 143-147 are a later addition to OG.

VI.1.iii. Lexicology

238 967's reading of ἀποθεόου has been accepted in CH 2 as OG against ἀνασκαινάω in 88-Syh, which has been influenced by Th and/or the reading in 1. 143.

239 Collins, Daniel, p. 371, and Mont., p. 474 regard the epilogue as later but integrated with the remainder of the book, while Hartman and Di Lella, p. 277, regard it as a gloss. Charles, p. 392 and Lacoque, p. 249 regard vss. 11-13 as later glosses.
1. 1, 9, 14, 16, 47, 111, 123-Th employs καϕός as a SE for ἡμέρα (15/16), while OG displays more variety using ὁρα 5x, καϕός 4x, and ἡμέρα 3x. The dynamic equivalent is ἡμέρα, which appears 3x in 12:1. In keeping with the eschatological outlook of the context OG equates ἡμέρα in 1. 9 with ἡμέρα ἡμί, which is found 20x in the Hebrew Bible. ἡμέρα is usually translated ἡμέρα θλίψεως (eg. Gen. 35:3; II Ki. 19:3; Is. 37:3; Obad. 1:12, 14; Nah. 1:7; Hab. 3:16). OG retains ἡμέρα to render ἡμέρα in 1. 14, 16, because the antecedent is still that day of affliction.

1.3-OG employs a dynamic equivalent, but given the problems OG had in reading the text and the textual differences, he very well could have read the 3.s.impf. of ἦλθεν.

1. 4-The translation of ἦσθα might be regarded as a distinctive reading in Th. Apart from its uses in compounds (6x) Th renders ἦσθα with ἀρχέων 9/11. Once again OG demonstrates variety by employing στρατηγός (10:13, 20[2], 21), δυνάμεις (9:6, 8; 11:5), and ἀγγελός (1. 4). OG shares a reading with Th in 10:13 εἰς τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν πρῶτων, and we have to suspect Th influence on OG. OG employs ἀρχέων only 4x elsewhere, and only in 2:48 is there an equivalent in MT (Ἡ, but even there it may be a doublet translation with ηγοήμενον).

1. 17-Zieg.'s text reads συνήθεσαν for OG (with Th) against the reading

240 S. 8:17; 9:21, 25; 11:6, 13, 14, 24, 35, 40; 12:1(4), 4, 9, 11. Th follows OG with ἀγείρον ὑπόκειται ἐκείνης in 9:21 which is evidence for borrowing or a corrupt text. OG=0 in 9:25; 12:9 and there are textual difficulties in 11:24; 12:11 (s. Syntax, 1. 123). The fact that Th employs καϕός reveals that it is a perfectly legitimate rendering, but it is possible that OG's reading in 11:14 (also in 11:13; 35; 12:4) is actually Th because καὶ ἐν τοῖς καϕόις ἐκεὶνοίς is a formal equivalent to MT and we might have expected OG to employ his more favoured ὁρα.

241 8:25(2); 9:6, 8; 10:13(2), 20(2), 21; 11:5; 12:1. OG and Th share a common difference in the reading of ἔσθα ἦσθα in 8:25. OG has ἀπολείπον着他, Th ἀπολείπον着他. Mont., p. 354, is surely correct when he states that they read ἐσθα / ἕσθα ἦσθα. The difference in the OG and Th readings suggests that there is no dependence, but the similarities reflect an alternative Vorlage.

242 MT=0 in 3:38; 97(30)?; 4:15(18).
of 88-Syh, which is accepted here. 243 שֶם only appears elsewhere in 11:41 where OG=о and Th has the expected סְפָרָה. Th's reading is an obvious equivalent in 1. 17, but there is no reason to expect that Th is witnessing to the OG. There are also no obvious inner Greek grounds to explain 88-Syh as a corruption. The emphasis on resurrection in this passage is unparalleled in the Hebrew Bible, and given the context ἀνωθησότατα "will be raised/exalted" renders the sense rather well. ἀνωθησότατα should be accepted as OG.

1. 19-Th omits κατά against OG as redundant.
1. 23-OG and Th share a HL καθέεισθαι for the HL יָרֵא. It is possible that this is a distinctive agreement, but the euphemism of sleep for death may have been arrived at independently.

1. 24-OG employs πλάτος (also in 9:27, not in Th) "breadth" as a dynamic equivalent for the construct פָּרָשָׁה, while Th's rendering with χώμα (1-15) might be considered distinctive.

1. 25-Th employs the compound ἀνωθησότατον elsewhere in 7:4 and 11:25. Although either OG or Th's rendering is appropriate for the HL יָרֵא (hi.) and Th's choice is not particularly distinctive, it does demonstrate his independence from OG.

1. 29-ἀνωθισμὸς is the expected SE for פָּרָשָׁה (4/4) in OG and Th, though it may have originated as a gloss to פָּרָשָׁה (s. Syntax, Text-Critical).

1. 30–31-OG renders פָּרָשָׁה (1-2, Is. 66:24) "abhorrence" with a

---

243 967 has a lacuna for this portion of text. Mont., p. 473 simply refers to 88-Syh's reading as an error.

244 See Collins, Daniel, pp. 394-398.

245 The euphemism was well known and used. See T. H. McAlpine, Sleep, Divine and Human in the Old Testament, JSOTS, 38 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987).

246 Talmon suggests that פָּרָשָׁה is a double reading of synonyms, but there is good evidence to retain both. See "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," Textus 1 (1960): 167-68.

contextual guess διασκόπα, while αἰσχύνη is a later gloss from Th.\textsuperscript{248}

1. 32, 99, 119, 121, 122-OG and Th's vocabulary for ἴδω was discussed previously in 8:1-10 (though it should be noted that OG's προσέγξε "give attention to" in 1. 122 is a good dynamic rendering). ἴδω was discussed in 1:1-10, and Th's translation of ἴδω was treated in CH 4.III.1.iii. Neither OG or Th's translation indicates that they discerned any special significance in the ἴδω.

The previous investigations of vocabulary concerned with the domain of knowing indicated that Th was working to his own agenda. Recall, for example, that Th employed σωτηρίς in 11:33 and νοημον (1-10) in 12:10, because in both cases ἴδω is collocated with ἴδω.\textsuperscript{249} The fact that Th clearly favoured σωτηρίς for ἴδω and that his two exceptions in 11:33 and 12:10 can be explained does raise questions, however, about the verbal agreement with OG in 1. 32. OG has ἐπιστήμην in 1:4; ἐννοεῖ in 11:33; διανοεῖ in 12:10; but σωτηρίς in 11:35 (gen.pl.m.part.=Th) and 12:3 (nom. pl.m.part.=Th)!\textsuperscript{250} Given OG's other choices for ἴδω and the fact that σωτηρίς is clearly a favoured Th equivalent, we are more than justified to question the authenticity of OG's participles in 11:35 and 12:3. σωτηρίς is not collocated with any other term for knowing in 12:3, so it is particularly doubtful that we have OG in 1. 32.

1. 33-34, 117-118-Phonological motivation is evident in the choices of OG and Th for the translation of ἴδω in 1. 33-34. OG employs the rare φωστήρ (1-6) with φαίνε, which retains at least some of the consonance in MT. Th's choices ἐκλάμπε and λαμπρότης are even closer in sound (λάμπε). ἐκλάμπε (1-8) and λαμπρότης (1-6) are also rare in the LXX; therefore, they are excellent examples of Th's distinctive vocabulary.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{248}So also Zieg., p. 17.
  \item \textsuperscript{249}The particular choice of νοημον in 12:10 may also be explained by phonological motivation. In the preceding lines, Th employs Ἰννοεῖ 3x (1. 117, 118, 120) to render Ἰννοεῖ.
  \item \textsuperscript{250}σωτηρίς only appears one other time in OG (11:33) where OG again agrees with Th (σωτηρίς).
\end{itemize}
The same phonological processes were at work in 1. 117-118 where OG and Th again employ different equivalents. In this instance, OG's choices were guided by the fact that ἀμαρτάλος is the main SE for ἴπτω in the LXX. Although Th's ἄνομος is also employed for ἴπτω, it is not used as frequently or as consistently as ἀμαρτάλος.

1. 34–OG exhibits lexical levelling by employing σφαγός for κύριος (unique in LXX) and στερέαμα is the expected equivalent.

1. 41–Th has read ἱππότα for ἵπτω. Such an error can also be regarded as a distinctive disagreement, because, if Th were following OG, he would not have made such an obvious mistake.

1. 44, 110–The translation of ἵπτω offers further evidence of the distinctive nature of Th's translation. If we discount the 3 occurrences in ch. 1, OG employs πρόσταγμα as a SE 14/18.²⁵¹ The only exceptions are 10:6, 9 where λαλία "speaking" is a better idiomatic rendering,²⁵² and 10:12(2) where OG has ῥήμα. Th's SE for chs. 9–12 is λόγος (17/18; Th=0 in 10:1 by homoiot.).

1. 43, 45 and 108, 109–MT has the same verbs collocated (ἤπιον ἡπότα pass. part.) in 12:9. The SE for ἱππότα in the LXX is σφαγίζω so it is not surprising to find agreement in OG and Th.²⁵³ However, there are differences in the rendering of ἱππότα. There are only two points worthy of note. First, κατακαλήψατο by OG in 1. 107 is a HL in Daniel. Second, ἱππότα also occurs in 8:26. In 8:26 Th employs σφαγίζω as the common term meaning "to seal," while OG has φάσσα (1–8). The

²⁵¹ 1:5, 14, 20; 9:2, 12, 23(2), 25; 10:1(3), 6, 9(2), 11, 12(2), 15; 12:4, 9. OG and Th both omit the second ἴπτω in 10:9 which is probably an addition. The vocabulary we have examined has not been comprehensive enough to determine the nature of the link between the translator of chs. 1–2(3) and 7–12 in OG. However, OG has πρόκος for ἵπτω in 1:14 and λόγος in 1:20, both of which are unique equivalents for OG (1:5 is an idiom).

²⁵² 4QDan c has a singular (พนัน(683,755),(718,770)) in 10:6 (lacuna for 10:9), but OG's equivalent implies the pl. of MT.

²⁵³ See also 6:18(17); 9:24(2). OG has σφανίζω and συντείλω in 9:24.
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differing vocabulary indicates independent translations.

1. 47, 69, 111, 141, 146-As in the previous two paragraphs, ἢ δείκτης is found in both 12:4 and 12:9. The Th reading in 12:4 is most likely OG. ἢ δείκτης appears with a preceding prep. 5x and in every case except 12:4 Th renders ἢ δείκτης with πέρας (s. 8:17; 11:35, 40). Th also employs πέρας to render ἢ δείκτης by itself in 8:17; 11:27 and 12:6, while 12:4 and 13 are the only instances where Th employs συντέλεια. Besides 12:4, OG renders ἢ δείκτης with συντέλεια 9/15. Since the shared reading in 12:4 is the only one, and Th demonstrates a significantly different pattern of translation throughout Daniel; the agreement is more likely due to textual corruption than to Th borrowing from OG.

1. 49-The readings of OG (ἀπομαίνομαι "to rage violently" HL in LXX) and Th (διδάσκω "to teach") for the HL ἀνύφακτον "to rove about" (BDB, p. 1002) reveal that both had difficulties with the text. OG has read a homonym ἀνύφακτον "treat with contempt." Charles, p. 332, suggests that Th's reading is a corruption from διαχρόνιον, but διαχρόνιον is more likely a contextual guess based on the following clause "until many have been taught and knowledge is multiplied." Th's guess is clearly independent from OG, but both versions alter the intention of MT significantly.

1. 51-OG and Th employ different but appropriate equivalents. παράτησις only appears elsewhere in the Hebrew portion of Daniel in 11:39 where both OG and Th have πληθύνω.

1. 52-Th provides an equivalent for MT. OG is reading παράτησις and has added ἡ γῆ to produce, "the earth be filled with iniquity" (s. Text-
1. 56-ὶστημι is the expected equivalent for ἔστη, as in 1. 3, 5, 144 of Th (s. OG in 1. 3, 140), but the common reading of the 3.pl.plupf.a.i. is probably a distinctive agreement. However, there is no way to determine the direction of agreement, though it may be noted that Th employs ἢστημι and its compounds consistently for ἔστη; whereas OG uses variety (eg. 1. 3; 1:4, 19).

1. 64, 75, 76-OG uses a variety of equivalents for ἀπό (στολή 5:7, 16; ἐνδο 5:29; 10:5; περιβόλλος 12:6, 7), while Th employs ἐνδοω as a SE (6/6).

1. 65, 77-The same equivalents are found in the other occurrence of ἀπό "linen" in 10:5. Th transliterates.

1. 71-OG and Th employ different and adequate renderings for κέρας. The same root is employed as a ni.part. in 8:24 (OG-θαυμαστῶς, 1-4; Th-θαυμαστῶς) and 11:36 (OG=0; Th-ὑπερόγκος, 1-7, s. OG 5:12) to refer to the boastings of Antiochus. Therefore, the "end" being referred to in 12:6 is not solely the resurrection and judgment, but includes the conclusion of the events in ch. 11. 256

Th's renderings are distinct.

1. 82-The vb. ὅρω appears 8x in Daniel and ὅρω is the expected equivalent. OG has ὅρω 3/4 and Th 6/8. 257

1. 87-ὑπῆρξ is a HL in Daniel. OG and Th both employ δύναμι, which is the SE for ὑπῆρξ in the LXX.

1. 102-OG employs λίθος (1-3) as a dynamic equivalent for θυσία while Th has the expected SE ἐγχυσία. 258

256 Also Charles, p. 334; Collins, Daniel, p. 399.

257 S. also 4:34(37); 5:19, 20, 23; 8:11; 11:12, 36. OG=0 in 5:19, 20, 23 and in 4:34(37) the texts are vastly different, though ὅρω does occur. In 8:11 OG and Th have the common reading ἐροτήθη. Th also has ὑπερόγκος in 4:34(37).

258 S. also 8:19, 23; 10:14; 11:4. OG has ἀληθ in 11:4, which may be an adjustment according to the sense of the context or based on an alternative Vorlage (BHS, ἀληθ, Collins, Daniel, p. 363, θυσία).
1. 103-OG adds λόγος "matter," which is implicit in MT.

1. 107, 137-OG employs ἀντέχω (HL in Daniel) in 1. 107 and a common SE (βαδίζω) for הָלַל in 1. 137. Th's renderings with δεδομένο are unique in the prophetic corpus of the LXX and must be considered distinctive. 259

1. 113-McCrystall argues that the omission of וַהֲנָה in 12:10(9) is probably due to the translator's desire to reserve וַהֲנָה in 11:35 for an elite group within the maskilim. 260 Though McCrystall admits that the omission in 12:10(9) could be due to the fact that the verb is translated by πράττω (in which case ἡμείς was omitted) or that the three verbs were rendered by two in the Greek, he clearly favours his hypothesis. It is the use of the passive infinitive of ἔλθειν for ולָכַָד in 11:35 that constitutes his proof that וַהֲנָה was reserved for the elite group within the maskilim. He believes that there is a contrast in that verse between the voluntary decision of some of the wise to purify themselves and be elect according to OG, against the statement in MT that their affliction has the purpose of purifying. 261

To be fair, McCrystall does note with Mont., p. 460, that OG apparently reads כִּשְׁלֶל for כִּשָּׁל in 11:35, but he does not consider the ramifications of this reading on the translator's approach to the rest of the verse. Once the translator mistook the initial verb כִּשְׁלֶל "to consider/have in mind" for כִּשָּׁל "to stumble" he still had to make sense of the verse. It would have been a fairly easy step to translate the following infinitives as passives, and the remainder of the OG follows the Hebrew. This passage reflects what Tov refers to as a "pseudo-variant." 262 It does not reflect a variant Vorlage, neither does it reflect Tendenz. Furthermore, we have already seen that OG

259 On the use of δεδομένο, s. Eynikel and Lust, pp. 59-62. Other occurrences of מַלִים are 3:25(92); 4:26(29), 34(37)-OG=0; 9:10. OG and Th share the reading περισσεύειν in the first two instances and OG has κατάκολονθείν in 9:10. Th employs πορεύομαι in 4:34(37) and 9:10, where the reference is to God's goings.

260 McCrystall, pp. 85-86; 228-231.

261 Ibid., p. 229.

262 TCU, pp. 236-240.
and Th betray no special significance in the vocabulary employed for translating מָסָכַלֵי (s. Lexicology, 1. 32, 99, 119, 121, 122). The variant in 11:35 resulted from a simple metathesis in the verb כָּלַב.

McCrystall’s argument for an elite group within the maskilim is based on the intended restriction of the term דָּבֶּר to 11:35 and an intentional change in the meaning of the verse in OG, but there is no basis to McCrystall’s premise. As for the omission of דָּבֶּר from 12:10(9) McCrystall fails to consider still another possibility: one of the first two verbs may have been omitted due to homoioarcs (וּתְבֵּדַי הָיוֹלְכֵנָּה), and the omission is part of a larger one beginning in 1. 111.

1. 114-OG’s choice renders the sense of MT, while Th’s is a closer formal equivalent. However, ἐκλεξακαίνω is also a HL in the LXX! Th’s distinctiveness is also demonstrated by the translation of לְכוֹן in its other occurrence in 11:35. OG has καθαρίζω, while Th might have ἀπολεξακαίνω (HL in LXX).

1. 115-The only other occurrence of כָּלָב in Daniel is in 11:35 where OG has καθαρίζω and Th again has πνεόμε. 263

1. 120-Th’s omission of לְכוֹן appears to be an example of one of his occasional omissions, because it is rendered by OG. 264

1. 124-OG employs ἄφισσημι as a SE 4/4 for רָאוֹס. In this case Th shows variety and complete independence from OG. Th employs ἐκλινώ (not in OG) in 9:5, 11; μεθίσσημι in 11:31; παράλλαξις (1-2, s. Morphology) in 12:11.

1. 125-MT has דָּבֶּר collocated with כָּלָב in 11:31. OG and Th employ the same equivalents there. 264 Th’s use of ἐνδεξείσμως "daily sacrifice" (2-11) in 1. 125 indicates his independence. Zieg., p. 17, regards

---

263 Zieg. reads ἀποκαλυφθήναι in 11:35, but Mont., p. 460 suggests that Th’s text is a corruption from ἀπολεξακαβήναι. ἀποκαλύπτει cannot easily be explained as a variant reading of the Vorlage, yet it does make sense in the context. Therefore, a later scribe might have written the graphically similar ἀποκαλυφθήναι for the rare ἀπολεξακαβήναι. Th’s reading is still distinct from OG.

264 Otherwise דָּבֶּר appears in 8:11, 12, 13, and both OG and Th employ θυσία. As previously mentioned, 8:11-13 has similar textual difficulties to 9:24-27.
"dia pantos" in OG as a doublet and elsewhere OG does employ "kata" alone. However, as Jeans., p. 92, points out, the meaning of OG is the same with the add. "the eternal sacrifice" and Lev. 6:13(20) does employ "kata" for "pantos".

1. 132—OG and Th employ appropriate equivalents for "hab" (HL in Daniel), though Th's "proemne" is more common.

1. 133—The SE for "hab" in the LXX is "kata" so both OG and Th employ unique renderings. 265

1. 143—"anastasi" is a common equivalent for "hab" (HL in Daniel) in the LXX.

1. 145—OG has the dynamic rendering "sogos" for "hab", though it could be based on reading "hab" (s. Syntax, 1. 138-142). Th has "kliros" (HL), a SE in the LXX.

VI.1.iv. Summary

As in the other sections that we have examined, OG offers a faithful rendering of MT where it is present. For the most part, OG follows the word order of MT. Other than textual differences, OG only interrupts the word order of MT with the postpositive conj. "et" in 1. 28 (in 1. 30 "et" is an add.) and "oiv" in 1. 69. On two occasions OG altered the syntax (1. 10-11, 122-124), which did not affect the meaning of the text significantly; whereas in one one case it did (1. 30, three groups at the resurrection). As elsewhere OG omits pro.suf. in some cases (1. 18, 83, 84), but has added a per.pro. 2x (1. 37, 106). As usual, OG offers several dynamic translations (1. 17 against Zieg.'s cj.; 1. 107, 102, 122, 138-142?, 145), though several others were occasioned by OG's difficulty in understanding MT or a textual problem (1. 30, 36, 49, 94, 105?, 145?). Several translations were also influenced to varying degrees by phonological considerations (1. 33-34, 117-118, 119).

There were a number of textual differences between OG and MT that are significant for our understanding of OG. The minuses were mainly due to the omission of redundant elements (1. 58, 61-62, 67-68)

265 S. the discussion of vs. 7 in 8:1-10 above. Th's use of "eave" is distinctive not only because of the equivalence he makes, but also because OG does not use the vb. at all.
or textual problems (1. 111-113, 137). These omissions are characteristic of what we have found throughout this investigation and are not greatly important. Some of the additions are not that important either. For example, 1. 39, 81 are probably due to harmonization and 1. 89 was probably a scribal addition. However, the pluses in 1. 70, 100, 126, though similar in nature to other places where OG makes an addition in order to make MT explicit, are significant. The significance of these pluses lies in their length and that there are three of them in close proximity. In particular, 1. 70 and 100 read as explanatory additions. Of course, these additions would not be all that remarkable without the pluses in 1. 72-73, 104-105, 138-142. (There is good reason to question whether we should regard 1. 138-142 as an addition, but that is besides the point.) The presence of additions/translations like these should make us pause to consider how likely it is that other such additions/translations have not survived the transmission of OG.

In 12:1-13 Th provides a formally equivalent translation to MT. He is generally consistent in his choice of equivalents, but, at the same time, Th is sensitive to context and does not violate Greek grammar. There are two omissions against MT and OG (1. 19, 120), which is not unusual for Th, and one omission due to a textual problem (1. 95-96). Phonological considerations played a role in some of Th's translations (1. 33-34, 117-118, 120, 121), and he had some good dynamic renderings as well (1. 107, 124, 137).

VI.2. The Relationship Between OG and Th

OG and Th share one distinctive agreement in 12:1-13, which is the add. in 1. 70. We can also be fairly certain that Th has the OG reading in 1. 47-48 and 129, but both readings are probably due to textual corruption. There are four other possible distinctive agreements where it might be argued that Th has borrowed from OG. The best candidate is 1. 10-11, which would be cited as a classic example of Th's revision of OG toward MT. The difficulty is that Th does in fact correspond to MT, and the argument that Th is revising OG only has weight if accompanied by significant supporting evidence. The reading of the pluperfect in 1. 56 could be due to borrowing, but such an agreement could easily have occurred through corruption/
harmonization to a familiar form. The agreement in 1. 23 may be coincidental and the add. in 1. 92 is probably based on an alternative Vorlage.

There are, then, 7 instances in ch. 12 where Th may show evidence of direct borrowing from OG and a number of other expected verbal agreements in common vocabulary. On the other hand, there is substantial evidence to indicate Th's independence from OG as well as some evidence that Th readings have infiltrated OG. For example, the verbal agreement in 1. 32 (also 11:35), and the add. of ἀληθέων in 1. 31 are almost certainly due to OG corruption by Th. It is less certain whether OG has been corrupted in 1. 78, but the reading is definitely Th. Finally, it has also been suggested that 1. 143-147 could be a later correction of OG in the light of Th. Besides the 4 agreements that indicate Th readings in OG, there are a number of distinctive readings in Th. There are 9 instances where Th employs distinct vocabulary from OG, some of which is rare in the LXX (1. 24, 33-34, 107, 114, 121, 124, 125, 133, 137). In two cases Th had trouble understanding MT and clearly employed his own renderings of MT (1. 49, 95-96). In addition there are 5x that Th transliterated MT, or exhibited minor textual differences against MT and OG (1. 19, 41, 65, 77, 120), which indicate he was not following OG. Finally, there are 5 less impressive cases where Th's vocabulary is distinct from OG (1. 4, 57, 60, 71, 117-118).

The evidence of Th's independence from OG is overwhelming, and vindicates the original evaluation of the 7 readings that might have indicated Th borrowing from OG. The agreements in 1. 47-48, 56, 129 are probably due to textual corruption. The same explanation or alternative Vorlagen accounts for 1. 70 and 92. L. 10-11 and 23 are inconsequential.

VI.3. Text-Critical
1. 12-OG omits, s. Morphology, 1. 12.
1. 39-S. Syntax, 1. 39.
1. 52-OG is reading πᾶσα and has added η γῆ to produce, "the earth be filled with iniquity," (s. 1 Macc. 1:9 for a possible allusion). The difference is the interchange of θ/η. As Charles, p. 333, writes,
"the only certainty is the uncertainty of the text," but it seems more likely in the context of the book that wickedness rather than knowledge will multiply before the time of the end. MT should be emended.\(^{266}\)

1. 58, 61–62—Both OG and Peshitta omit these lines, but the fact that the Peshitta also omits 1. 58 suggests dependence of Peshitta on OG rather than an independent witness to an omission. Although 1. 61–62 could be a later harmonization in MT, such repetition is certainly characteristic of Daniel and Hebrew narrative in general.\(^{267}\) The fact that OG also omits 1. 58 suggests that he has omitted for the purposes of Greek style, just as we have witnessed elsewhere.

1. 67–68—Collins, *Daniel*, p. 369, reconstructs OG without τὸ ἔκάνει in 1. 66 from 88–Syh and regards 1. 66–68 as a later add. in MT to harmonize with 1. 78–80. Collins' reconstruction is possible, but would we not expect a complete description of the one to whom Daniel was speaking in the first instance? Once the figure is clearly identified, then the figure might be referred to in an abbreviated form. Furthermore, it could well be argued that the verbal agreement of OG with Th in 1. 78–80 is due to corruption of the OG by Th (s. *Syntax*, 1. 66, 78), and we do not know what OG read! Perhaps OG omitted 1. 78–80. It is also possible that the omission of 1. 67–68 was simply a scribal error due to parablepsis (s. *Syntax*, 1. 67–68). For these reasons, the text of 88–Syh is accepted as OG in 1. 66, and MT is not to be emended.

1. 70—The attestation by both OG and Th is strong evidence that they read יְהוָֽה בֹּדֶר in their Vorlagen, but the resulting Hebrew syntax would be awkward and the Greek looks like an addition by one of the translators (probably OG). In any case, the identification of the one clothed in linen with Michael is wrong when compared with 10:5, 13 (s.

\(^{266}\) So also Charles, p. 333; Collins, p. 369; Bevan, p. 203; Hartman and DiLella, p. 274.

\(^{267}\) Collins, p. 369, wants to omit 1. 61–62 and merely states that MT and Th "repeat 'on the bank of the river.'" Surprisingly, Charles does not even comment on the omission.
Syntax). The common reading in OG and Th is probably due to textual corruption.

1. 72-73—The add. of καὶ ὁ καθαρισμός τοῦτον in OG is to clarify that the end will also bring the purification of the wise. The link is based on the two appearances of the vb. καθαρίζω in 11:35 (s. Syntax, l. 72-73 above); therefore, it is unlikely that it represents an alternative Vorlage.

1. 81—The add. in l. 81 would be retroverted into ἔτη δισ., but it probably resulted from harmonization.

1. 92—We would not expect both OG and Th to have the add. of καρπός if it were not based on their Vorlagen, but the shorter reading of MT is to be preferred.

1. 100—This is a large add. in OG against MT, but it is similar to other add. in that it makes explicit what is implicit in MT. So OG can omit elements which are redundant or unnecessary (eg. l. 58, 61-62, 67-68), but also adds elements to make MT explicit.

1. 104-105—These lines originated as an additional comment by the translator or by a later hand (s. Syntax.) It is highly unlikely that such a plus existed in an alternative Vorlage, but even if it did, MT is to be preferred.

1. 126—The add. in OG is not based on a semitic Vorlage (s. Syntax).

1. 137—Only OG and Th omit ἔτη, but commentators are agreed in reading this as a doublet.\[268\]

\[268\]Mont., p. 478; Collins, Daniel, p. 370; cf. Plöger, p. 170 who regards the add. in OG as an expansion of ἔτη.
VII. Summary

The investigation of OG and Th in the book of Daniel was concentrated on five sections: 1:1-10, 2:1-10, 3:11-20, 8:1-10, and 12:1-13, though significant portions of the remainder of the book were also examined. As a summary we will review the three main areas of our investigation: TT, textual criticism of MT, and the relationship between OG and Th.

For the most part, OG provided a faithful rendition of a Vorlage, which was very similar to, and, in most cases, basically identical with MT. We also found that OG's translation was not only faithful to the semantic content of his parent text, but also exhibited a relatively high degree of formal equivalence to MT. However, OG is generally regarded as a "free" translation, and there were particular features about his TT that were identified as characteristic of his dynamic approach. The most consistent characteristic of OG's dynamic approach was variety in the choice of lexical equivalents. OG also employed various methods to avoid excessive parataxis. The main way he did so was to employ postpositive conjunctions, but the majority of these are confined to chs. 1-3, particularly ch. 2. Occasionally OG employed hypotactic constructions with a subordinate participle, and in a few instances the genitive absolute. Another fairly consistent feature was that OG would omit repeated elements in his Vorlage. On the other hand, OG often made small additions or introduced slight changes in the syntax in order to make something explicit that was implicit. Most of these changes should be regarded as attempts to remain faithful to the content and intention of the Vorlage. However, there were occasions, sometimes due to misunderstanding the parent text, that OG's theology was more evident in his translation (eg. 3:17).

The evidence from our research also supports two conclusions regarding the TT in the OG. First, it strengthens Albertz' conclusion that chs. 4-6 originate from a separate and distinct translator. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that a semitic equivalent of OG with

---

269 There is not enough shared vocabulary in chs. 1-2 and 7-12 to determine whether chs. 1-2, like 4-6, originate from a separate translator. However, the dearth of the postpositive conjunctions δὲ and ὅπως in the later chs. requires some explanation.
an alternative structure in chs. 4-6 ever existed as a complete book.\textsuperscript{270} Second, the TT in 3:20-30(97) is different in character from both the preceding and following chs., which suggests that a later editor inserted the deutero-canonical material into ch. 3 of OG.

Generally speaking, Th prefers to follow a consistent pattern of formal equivalence, but he deviates from that pattern when required. Th's formal equivalence is subordinated to his concern for clarity and the demands of the target language. For example, Th usually does not represent the $\bar{\nu}$ of the infinitive construct with an article and Th often omits a preposition that would be redundant in Greek (eg. partitive $\partial$). Th tends to employ SE, but not when the semantic range of the SE does not overlap with the use of a word in a particular context. Th's sensitivity to the meaning of the parent text is also exemplified by his occasional dynamic equivalents.\textsuperscript{271} A rather curious feature of Th's translation, to which A. Schmitt has already drawn attention, is the occasional omissions of words. Some of these omissions are due to textual problems, but not all.\textsuperscript{272} For these reasons, it would be completely inaccurate to assume that Th intended to provide a translation by which we could retranslate back to the semitic Vorlage. Th's reverence for his text is evident in his basic technique of formal equivalence, but it was in an attempt to translate faithfully the meaning of the parent text.\textsuperscript{273}

In each section we looked at specific text-critical problems, but the results of the analysis provide us with additional guidelines for the use of the OG and Th for textual criticism of MT. The fact

\textsuperscript{270} Contrast Ulrich's conclusion ("Canonical Process," p. 285) that the Greek of chs. 1-12 "is of one piece."

\textsuperscript{271} For additional examples, see Schmitt, "Stammt," pp. 29-33.

\textsuperscript{272} See Zieg., pp. 60-61 where he discusses the important minuses of the B group in Th against MT. In 8:2, 3, 5; 9:19; 11:36 of 88-Syh there are asterisked additions to bring OG in line with MT, but in these cases the B group also has the minus. This is a clear indication that Th had also undergone revision toward MT. We encountered possible hints of later revision of Th in the translation of $\nu\tau\nu\kappa\varsigma$=νομος (p. 214), $\rho\mu\mu\alpha\lambda\omega$=ρημα/λογος (p. 215), and $\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\varepsilon\omega$=λατε\varepsilon\omega/δουλε\varepsilon\omega (p. 239).

\textsuperscript{273} See the discussion in CH 3.III.1.
that both OG and Th exhibit a tendency to omit means that we have to be very careful in the evaluation of shorter readings in the Greek texts. This is particularly true of omissions of repeated elements in MT and those which are redundant when transmitted into Greek. However, an omission by both OG and Th is a weighty combination. At the same time, OG exhibits a definite tendency to introduce slight syntactical changes or small additions in order to clarify the meaning of MT. Therefore, many additions are not based on a semitic Vorlage. OG also had more difficulty reading and understanding his Vorlage than Th. Therefore, we ought to be slow to accept retroverted readings from OG as preferable to MT when OG’s retroverted reading can be explained as an error. OG may be an older witness to Daniel than MT, but it certainly contains a number of mistakes. Finally, OG also employs dynamic equivalents more frequently than Th as well as more variety in his lexical choices. However, there are other occasions when OG levels out distinctions in his Vorlage due to the literary context. For example, φοβούμεθα in 3:17 is a dynamic equivalent motivated by a previous use of the verb in 3:12. Yet, in 3:15 OG employs ἐστινι for ἑλθὲ because throughout ch. 3 ἔφη is usually collocated with ὁλῆ; and in 3:15 OG ignores that distinction (or perhaps he did not notice). Like OG’s inclination both to omit and to add, these tendencies are working at cross-purposes and complicate the use of OG for the evaluation of lexical variants against MT.

The examination of the relationship between the texts of OG and Th has proved to be one of the most interesting aspects of the investigation. It also has provided the most fruitful results. Two questions have dominated the discussion: 1) How faithfully has the OG text been preserved? 2) How great was Th influence on the OG witnesses that have survived? Unfortunately, we cannot give an accurate answer to either of these two questions. However, it is no doubt due to the fact that previous scholars have not examined the texts of OG and Th in detail with these questions in mind that many have surmised that Th is a revision of OG. There is certainly a

274 Therefore, it is inappropriate for McCarter, p. 93, to refer to MT as "expansionistic" in Daniel. In all other respects McCarter’s introduction to textual criticism is excellent, but the general descriptions of the textual witnesses in the appendix, pp. 88-94 are misleading.
relatively large percentage of verbal agreement shared by OG and Th, as high as 50% through most of chs. 1-3 and 7-12. Common readings do not necessarily prove anything though, unless one is already predisposed to view Th as a revision, because the majority of them exhibit the expected formal equivalence to MT. The common readings would only indicate Theodotionic revision of OG if they were accompanied by a significant number of distinctive agreements, which of course is where our two questions come in.

Although we cannot answer accurately how great the influence of Th readings has been upon OG, we do know that Th influence has been significant. This was evident in Zieg.'s critical text prior to the publication of the remainder of 967 by Geissen, Hamm, and Roca-Puig. The evaluation of 967 in CH 2 revealed further evidence of Th influence on OG. Yet, it was obvious that 967 itself had undergone correction toward both Th and MT. During the analysis of TT in this chapter we discovered further certain examples of Th influence in the OG textual witnesses along with other instances where it seems only probable or merely possible. These findings are entirely predictable. Given the fact that these two versions co-existed in the same time and geographical area we should expect corruptions and "cross-pollinization." However, if the Th version supplanted OG because OG was perceived to be inadequate as a translation, then we should be especially vigilant to discover corrections in OG from Th. After all, our knowledge of OG is limited from the outset because we only have three major witnesses to OG! How much of the OG has been irretrievably lost through successive revisions toward MT and Th? It is impossible to know, but the loss is no doubt substantial.

When it comes to the evaluation of verbal agreements, then, besides the presence of common agreements because of equivalence to MT we should expect some distinctive agreements between OG and Th. These distinctive agreements are present because either the OG or the Th reading has been erased from the textual evidence, or because we have failed to recognize original readings. Such agreements would be entirely consistent with the view that the two texts are independent translations. Is this not an accurate depiction of the relationship?

\[\text{The number of common readings is generally greater in chs. 7-12, but that may be due to greater corruption of OG.}\]
that exists between the OG and Th in Daniel?

On the one hand, we have expected common verbal agreement and little evidence of distinctive agreements in which Th has borrowed from OG. In fact, there are very few distinctive agreements period. On the other hand, there is ample evidence that Th was translating independently from OG, and we have seen certain evidence of Th's infiltration and corruption of OG. For the most part, Th employs the common SE for MT that are found throughout the LXX. At the same time, we have seen how Th has his own pattern of translation equivalents for vocabulary sharing the same domain (eg. knowing, wisdom) and his own way of resolving conflicts when two words are collocated that he normally renders by the same lexeme. That Th's translation pattern is substantially his own is verified by the numerous HL and translation equivalents employed by Th that are not shared with OG. We have seen how Th consistently makes his own contextual guess, rather than follow OG, when he does not understand MT. Finally, we have seen numerous omissions against MT and OG that would not be there if Th were revising OG toward MT. For these reasons, we can affirm that in the book of Daniel, Th is basically a new translation of MT and not merely a revision of OG.276

To claim that Th is an independent translation does not necessarily deny that Th had any knowledge of OG or that he may have occasionally borrowed from OG. However, the evidence of such borrowing is scarce, and does not support a position that Th systematically revised OG toward MT. It also means that we have a different view of agreements where the direction of borrowing cannot be demonstrated, and of possible doublets where a reading in OG corresponds closely to MT and Th (eg. 12:13). Nor can we assume that Th is a witness to OG in an attempt to reconstruct a critical text of

276 For those interested in statistics, according to a search with LBASE there are 8859 words in Daniel MT. This figure includes all proper nouns, conjunctions, and prepositions. For example, the total includes 1150x where \( \lambda \) appears as the simple conjunction or with verbs in "converted" forms. In the course of this thesis we have examined the translation equivalents of almost 2000 of these words in OG and Th.
On the contrary, where OG exhibits a marked agreement with Th and formal equivalence to MT (eg. 3:11-20), we have every reason to suspect that Th readings have corrupted the OG. Based on the extant manuscript evidence we can never know how much of OG has been obliterated by Th.

Finally, the assertion that Th is a translation in Daniel means that it is an independent witness to MT for textual criticism. There are also implications when Th is compared with other texts that are associated with the allusive figure of Theodotion and the so-called kaige recension. It is to an evaluation of Th's relationship with kaige that we now must turn.

---

277 Cf. Jeans., pp. 8-10, who speaks more confidently of reconstructing OG readings from Th.

278 Gentry, pp. 381-382, also concludes that the Theodotion text in Job is an independent translation.
Chapter 6

Th and Kaige

In the years since the publication of DA a number of doctoral dissertations and studies have been published that have sought to delineate further characteristics of *kaige*. The list of possible characteristics has now grown to 97, but this number gives a false impression of the homogeneity of *kaige*. This judgment will be vindicated as we examine Th's relationship to *kaige*.

Armin Schmitt had already argued in 1966 that Th did not belong to the *kaige* tradition, but there are three reasons to look at this question again. First, it is clear that Schmitt's results have not been accepted as conclusive. Second, the enumeration of more characteristics since DA provides a larger base for comparison. The third reason to examine Th's relationship to *kaige* is that we are approaching the question from a different perspective.

The perspective of this evaluation is different, because it has been argued that Th is basically an independent translation; and not a revision of OG. At the same time, it has also been affirmed, though not argued in detail, that a *kaige* recension did not exist. The grounds for this conclusion are both negative and positive. Negatively, it has been pointed out that the *kaige* research since DA has not always been methodologically sound. For example, O'Connell attributes a number of characteristics to *kaige* that are technical terms rendering lexemes related to the cult and tabernacle. Or Bodine

---

1 A list is provided by Greenspoon, *Joshua*, pp. 270-273; Gentry, pp. 400-405. See also the comments in CH 1.11.

2 He has restated his position in "Danieltexte," pp. 1-15. However, Schmitt, pp. 8-9, only examines one of the *kaige* characteristics, Д/М=кайє.

delineates characteristics of *kaige* that are probably OG. Bodine's research was hindered because there is still no critical edition of the Greek text of Judges; however, there are other occasions when so-called *kaige* characteristics are nothing more than OG. The failure to distinguish *kaige* readings from OG has also been replicated in the failure to contrast the *kaige* texts with one another. For example, numbers 83–93 in Greenspoon's list are named "Characteristics Peculiar to the Vaticanus Family of Judges" by Bodine, but Greenspoon includes them as representative of *kaige*. Greenspoon includes all the suggested characteristics of *kaige* in his list in order to be comprehensive, but this actually distorts some of the recognized distinctions between the texts. *Kaige* research has concentrated on shared characteristics; consequently, the fact that none of the characteristics are found in all members of *kaige*, and that there are disagreements among the *kaige* texts, has largely been ignored. Even some of the agreements are not evidence of a relationship between the texts. For example, in many cases it is argued that *kaige* has simply employed a common or even the most frequent OG equivalent more consistently. However, unless that proposed characteristic is employed in significant numbers in any given text there are no statistical grounds to distinguish a *kaige* characteristic from OG.

For example, \( \text{ἐπίστροφον} \) and \( \text{ὁσίος} \) are common and expected equivalents in the LXX. There would have to be significant consistency (eg. 10/12) in several texts to indicate that any of these equivalents might be evidence of a single recension. Far too many of the *kaige* characteristics only indicate that a revisor (or translator) of a text employed a SE.

The positive basis to deny the existence of a uniform *kaige* recension is the recent comparison of vocabulary in the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, Theodotion Job, Aquila, and the Greek Psalter by

---


5See, for example, the discussion of \( \text{ἄνω} \) below and CH 1.11.

Peter Gentry. Gentry compares all attested nouns and verbs in the aforementioned texts and finds agreements and disagreements among all of them. He concludes that Theodotion Job does exhibit some dependence on the Greek Psalter, and shares some equivalences with the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll; but the disagreements with the Minor Prophets' Scroll are so weighty that the similarities only indicate that these translators (revisor for the Minor Prophets' Scroll) shared a similar attitude to translation. He states:

In fact, we must cease all together speaking of a Kaige Recension as if there were a monolithic revision behind the members of this group. There is no Kaige Recension as such. Instead, there is a continuum from the Greek Pentateuch to Aquila in which approaches and attitudes to translation are on the whole tending toward a closer alignment between the Greek and the Hebrew.

Ideally, we would want to compare and contrast Th's vocabulary with the material provided by Gentry, but that is beyond the immediate objectives of this research. However, a comparison of Th's vocabulary with the "characteristics" proposed by previous researchers will serve an important purpose. If kaige represents an approach to translation that is characterized by formal equivalence to MT, then we might expect to find some agreement between Th and kaige. On the other hand, given the thesis that kaige is not a uniform recension, we should also expect disagreements. These findings would be in line with those of previous researchers. However, the degree of agreements and disagreements with kaige characteristics will provide an indication of how closely Th is related to the kaige tradition.

---

1See Gentry, pp. 410-484. Gentry first examines (pp. 386-410) Theodotion Job to determine how many of the kaige characteristics are present. Of those that could be assessed he finds that a total of 19 agree with kaige and 14 do not, though many of the agreements are actually of little significance. Of the 12 agreements with the characteristics proposed since Barthélemy, Gentry concludes that only four (36, 58, 67, 94) are of any value as kaige characteristics.

2Munnich argues that kaige employed the Psalter as a glossary or lexicon for the work of translation in "Contribution," pp. 190-220.

3Gentry, p. 488.
I. List of Kaige Characteristics

Following is the list of 97 *kaige* characteristics that have been produced by Thackeray (1907, 1921),10 Barthélémy (1963), Smith (1967),11 Shenkel (1968), Grindel (1969),12 O'Connell (1972), Tov (1973), Bodine (1980),13 and Greenspoon (1983). Asterisks (60x) indicate that the Hebrew equivalent does not appear in Daniel, which leaves 37 equivalents for discussion in the following section. Each equivalent is also marked in the right hand column to indicate the scholars who have discussed that particular equivalent. The names of the scholars are abbreviated as follows:

Thackeray=T
Barthélémy=B
Smith=Sm
Shenkel=Sh
Grindel=G
O'Connell=O
Tov=To
Ulrich=U
Bodine=Bod
Greenspoon=Gr
Gentry=Gen

1. דָּו/דָּו=ָאַיִּי T B O Bod Gr Gen
2. *וֹ*=מַלְּהַת Gr14

10Barthélémy’s monumental work was actually preceded by research carried out by Thackeray in "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907): 262-78; *Jewish Worship*, pp. 114-115.


13Bodine adds what is the 97th characteristic in the list in his article, "*Kaige* and Other Recensional Developments in the Greek Text of Judges," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980): 52.

14Greenspoon, *Joshua*, p. 277, actually only suggests that "in some tradition, perhaps the *καίγε* recension, מַלְּהַת was the preferred translation," of *וֹ* . Given the vagueness of the evidence, it is
surprising that he includes it in his list of *kaige* characteristics. קי does not appear in MT in Daniel, but Th has פֶּלֶן 4x independently: 2:6 for יִדְּר; 4:12(15) for בְּגֵד, 4:20(23) for בְּגֵד; 11:18 for ולֶכֶת מְלִית. OG never has פֶּלֶן.

15 The Aramaic בּוּז is employed in 7:19 (OG=אֶֽפֶּלֶן; Th=אָפֶלֶן) and the n. הבּוּז appears in 2:41 (OG and Th have a distinctive agreement בּוּז).

16 Although the historical present is frequent in the OG of Samuel-Kings it has been noted by O'Connell (p. 208), Bodine (p. 14), and Greenspoon (Joshua, p. 285) that it is non-existent (Exodus and Joshua) or rare (Judges once) in the OG of their books. Theodotion Job has two aor.ind. where OG has the historical present (Gentry, p. 389). The historical present is not found in either OG or Th. In the one case in Judges, it is the B text that has the historical present.

17 Th has קִנְּיָה קִנְּיָה in 8:5 (樂) and 10:4 (לִֽיְרָת יִנְּאָה =OG). In 8:5 Th employs a periphrastic part. where OG has an impf.

18 In 11:20, 21, 38 MT has פְּלַעְלָה, which OG and Th recognize and translate correctly.
23. ὑπὲρ = εἰσπρέπεια
24. ταχέν
25. φτεικός
26. ἔν αἴθαλμοῖς
27. στόμα
28. θυσία
29. σιέκ
30. ἀρχιπ [τῇ] δυνάμεις
31. σοφ
32. κατέφθαε/κατηκόρ
33. ανομία
34. γαστρὶ ἔχων ὁ λαβάνω
35. τῆς ἔδρε
36. νίκος
37. κεφαρ[π. part.]=πεπαρ(ρ)σμένος
38. σκεπή/σκεπή=
39. φωτισμοὶ
40. κέρκιον
41. μογαλά
42. παρ(ρ)όν
43. ἀνά μέσον
44. μέσοφ
45. αἰρήματα
46. αἰρήματα

---

19. There are no occurrences of this semi-preposition in MT. OG (8/9) and Th both employ ἀφθαλμός for τῷ. See 4:31(34) OG=0; 7:8(2), 20; 8:3 (OG omits), 5, 21; 9:18; 10:5, 6. See the discussion of the semi-preposition by Sollamo, Renderings, pp. 123-146.

20. Greenspoon, Joshua, pp. 293-294 suggests that στόμα might have been chosen as a more literal translation of τῷ in expressions like τῷ ὀ. It should be noted that Greenspoon does not produce any supporting evidence from Joshua that this is a characteristic of kaige, though he does cite Margolis as an authority that the substitution happens in Theodotion elsewhere. However, this is not sufficient evidence to prove a characteristic.

τῷ occurs twice in MT (10:3, 16) but both times it is in the literal sense of "mouth." Both OG and Th employ στόμα.

*47. τοπος=θήκαι
*48. κοσμος=όδοι
*49. ὑπο(pi.)=ἐνισχύω
*50. ἁμαρτα=βομβαία
*51. τιμι=(n.)=μηχανήματος, μηχανήματος
*52. και=λόγιον
*53. γαμβρός/μήτηρ=νεαφίος
*54. παιδία=παιδία, παιδία
*55. τοξεύομαι
*56. περίττον
*57. μεταλλάντος
*58. ἐκπαθοφόροςς, ἐκπιάδος
*59. σύνεφιγμένοι, σύνεφραγμένοι
*60. εὐφέρεταις
*61. δουλεία
*62. ἄλογον=άλογον and/or άλογος
*63. διασκεδάζω=νοτοποιέω
*64. διασκεδάζω=διασκέδαζο
*65. περόναι
*66. σανις
*67. διανυστα
*68. πρός κοδέν
*69. ἄποτινω=άποτινω
*70. εξερεύς
*71. συνεφίταις/συνεφοίταις=χαλαστα
*72. τελειότητες
*73. ἀπαρχή
*74. ὁντ' αὐτ' ἐν δόσα
*75. Various=ήνικα
*76. κράτει=κρατεῖ
*77. ἀποκικεῖο
*78. ἀγαθός (cognates)
*79. εὐθύς
*80. αὐθάλιτο

---

*76. appears 8x in the Aramaic section, but never in the sense of exile. S. 2:19, 22, 28, 29, 30, 47(2); 10:1. Th employs ἁποκαλύπτε 8/8, whereas OG employs various equivalents, but never ἁποκαλύπτε.
II. Evaluation of Readings

The 37 characteristics of the kaige group which are found in Daniel will now be examined to determine Th’s relationship to kaige. Disagreements are assumed to show independence from kaige, while agreements will be investigated as to whether they can be considered as bona fide kaige characteristics.

1. μν/μν=καίγε

There are only two cases of μν: 11:8, 22. Th has καίγε in 11:8, but only καί in 11:22. The evidence is mixed.

3. ών=καί

Th employs καί as a SE 8/8 while OG prefers ἄνθρωπος 5/8.21

However, Barthélemy argues that the main trait of kaige for this characteristic is that it even employs κάι for the distributive sense of μν, but there are no cases of μν as a distributive in Daniel.

---

The use of ἀνήρ may indicate a kaige characteristic, or it may just be the SE chosen by Th.

4. ἀνήρ-ἐπάνωθεν (ἀπάνωθεν) + gen.

Th employs ἐπάνω in 12:6, 7 (s. CH 5.VI.1.iii.).

8. ἔριξεν-οὐκ ἐστιν (in a series of aor. vbs.)

MT has ἔριξεν 9x and in each case Th employs an equivalent which is contextually appropriate. Th has οὐκ ἐστιν in 1:4; 9:26; 10:21; 11:16; 45; οὐκ ἐστιν in 8:4, 5, 27; οὐκ ἐστι in 11:15. In three instances Th renders ἔριξεν where the context has a series of aorist verbs (1:4; 8:4, 5), but οὐκ ἐστιν is appropriate in 1:4 to describe the type of youths the king desired for training, "youths in whom there is no blemish."

13. ἐπάνω-ἐγερόμενος

ἐπάνω appears 4x in MT: 9:4; 11:36(3). OG and Th both employ τὸν as SE, though Th omits 2x in 11:36 by parablepsis.

14. ἐνέπαντο

Barthélemy suggests that this equivalence was developed in order to avoid confusion with the established equivalence ἔριξεν-ἐνώσιον (see below). The LXX translators employed a variety of equivalents for ἐνέπαντο and that is what we find in OG and Th. Both have κατέφερσιν in 6:11(10, Hebraism); ἐνώσιον in 8:15; while in 10:13 OG=ἐνώσιον, Th=ἐνέφερον, Th=ἐνέφερον. At best this

---

24Barthélemy (p. 54) argues that kaige also replaced ἀνθρωπός with ἄνηρ as a SE, but that is difficult to prove in Daniel when there is no other supporting evidence.

25OG and Th have common readings in 8:4; 11:15, 16, 45. OG has a dynamic equivalent in 1:4.

26Bodine, p. 15 offers 10:21 as evidence that Th exhibits the characteristic. However, though aor. vbs. occur in the previous vss. and OG employs an aor. for ἔριξεν, 10:21 begins with the fut. and the present tense is applicable in the context.

27In DA. p. 84, Barthélemy discusses these under the one precursor pattern: ἐνέπαντο forms of ἐνέπαντο.
characteristic exhibits mixed findings, but there is no real distinction from common Old Greek renderings.

15. \( \lambda \eta \sigma \zeta \nu = \theta \nu \nu \mu \pi \lambda \sigma \nu \)  

Th does prefer to restrict \( \theta \nu \nu \mu \pi \lambda \sigma \nu \) to \( \eta \lambda \zeta \) (9/15), while OG only has it 3x and employs a greater variety of equivalents.\(^{28}\) However, as Sollamo notes, \( \theta \nu \nu \mu \pi \lambda \sigma \nu \) is the most common equivalent for \( \lambda \eta \sigma \zeta \nu \) in the LXX.\(^{29}\) Therefore, Th's tendency to employ \( \theta \nu \nu \mu \pi \lambda \sigma \nu \) may be evidence of a \textit{kaige} trait, but it is not definite. When we consider 14 and 15 together, it is perhaps best to consider them as offering mixed evidence for \textit{kaige}.

17. \( \eta \nu \lambda \zeta \neq \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \nu \alpha \iota \nu \)  

\( \eta \nu \lambda \zeta \) does appear in 12:3, but it is OG who has the \textit{kaige} equivalent while Th has \( \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \nu \alpha \iota \nu \alpha \varsigma \).\(^{30}\) MT also has \( \eta \nu \lambda \zeta \) 18x in the Aramaic section, but Th almost always follows the number of MT and is not dependent upon OG (s. CH 5.III.1.i.).

19. \( \pi \kappa \lambda \kappa = \varsigma \nu \nu \gamma \varsigma \)  

Barthélemy, p. 86, argues that \( \pi \kappa \lambda \kappa = \varsigma \nu \nu \gamma \varsigma \) is a precursor to Aquila who employs \( \varsigma \nu \nu \gamma \varsigma \). \( \pi \kappa \lambda \) does occur in 11:10 and both OG and Th employ \( \varsigma \nu \nu \gamma \varsigma \). Both also read \( \pi \kappa \lambda \) in error and employ \( \varsigma \nu \nu \gamma \varsigma \) at 8:25 (see the discussion in CH 4.II.2). Furthermore, \( \varsigma \nu \nu \gamma \varsigma \) is the most common equivalent for the vb. \( \pi \kappa \lambda \) in the LXX (121/200; 24x in the Pent.), so it is questionable whether there is any significance to Th's readings.

23. \( \eta \zeta \tau \alpha \nu / \eta \zeta \tau \alpha \nu \gamma = \varepsilon \iota \mu \rho \kappa \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha \)  

The nominal form appears 4x and Th has \( \delta \zeta \alpha \) in 4:27(30)=OG; 5:18 OG=0; 11:20=OG. In 4:33(36) Th has \( \chi \lambda \theta \nu \varsigma \).\(^{31}\) The verbal form appears 3x in the Aramaic and each time Th employs \( \delta \zeta \alpha \kappa \) 4:31(34), 34(37);

\(^{28}\) See CH 5.II.1.iii. for a breakdown of the equivalents.  

\(^{29}\) Sollamo, \textit{Renderings}, p. 18.  

\(^{30}\) \( \eta \nu \lambda \zeta \) is rendered by \( \alpha i \epsilon \nu \nu \nu \) in 9:24; 12:2(2); \( \alpha i \epsilon \nu \) in 12:7.  

\(^{31}\) Collins, \textit{Daniel}, p. 212, inexplicably states that Th omits.
30. ἀρχαῖος (τῆς) δυνάμεως

This title only appears in 8:11 where both OG and Th have ἀρχαῖος.

31. σοφος

Th employs σοφία as a SE for μαθητής 8/9, while OG has it 5/7. As Gentry notes, the equivalence is already found 139/171 in the LXX. μαθητής appears 14x in the Aramaic section. Th's SE is σοφός (14/14), while OG's SE is σοφιστής (7/10). OG has θάνατος in 2:13; σοφος in 2:21; and spells out who the wise men are in 5:8.

It is obvious that forms of μαθητής is stereotyped throughout the LXX; therefore, it should be discarded as a kaige characteristic.

33. ἀνομία

In all 3x Th has ἀδικία (9:13, 16, 24).

38. σκηνή/σκηνή

σκηνή appears in 11:45 and OG and Th employ σκηνή.

41. μογιλαλόν

is only in 10:15 and Th has κατανόεισθε where OG renders with

33 Th does employ δίνωμις as a SE for μάθημα and ἄφθονον for ἀρχαῖος when they appear separately. S. CH 5.IV. for renderings of μάθημα and CH 5.VI.1.iii. for renderings of ἀρχαῖος.

34 S. 1:4, 17, 20; 2:20, 21, 23, 30; 5:11(2), 14. OG=0 in 5:11(2), 14. Th has σώσεις in 5:11 while OG has it in 1:20. OG has a free rendering in 1:17. Th shares the second OG minus in 5:11 which looks like a late add. to MT.


36 2:12, 13, 14, 18, 21, 24(2), 27, 48; 4:3(6), 15(18); 5:7, 8, 15. OG=0 in 4:3(6), 15(18); 5:7, 15.

37 OG has ἀμαρτία in 9:13, 16; ἀδικία in 9.24.
43. ἀνὰ μέσον

Both OG and Th employ ἀνὰ μέσον in all 4 cases (8:5, 16, 21; 11:45). This is also the most common equivalent in the LXX and cannot be used as a criterion for kaige. 39

49. ἴνισχύω

Forms of the vb. ἴνισχύω occur 13x in Daniel and compounds of ἴσχω are the most common equivalents in OG and Th. 40 The pi. is only in 10:18 and once in 10:19. In both places Th employs ἴνισχύω. OG has ἴνισχύω in 10:19, but κατισχύω in 10:18. However, OG does have ἴνισχύω in 11:1 where Th employs κράτως and in 11:5 Th employs ἴνισχύω twice for the q.

The pi. of ἴνισχύω appears a total of 64x in MT, and 10x outside of Daniel it is translated by ἴνισχύω. O'Connell proposed this characteristic on the basis of one example and Bodine offers possible support from another example in the B family of Judges (9:24). 41 However, in two other cases of Judges all witnesses agree in reading ἴνισχύω (3:12; 16:28). O'Connell suggested that ἴνισχύω = ἴνισχύω "may be part of a concerted effort at reinterpretation" since Reider-Turner lists 12 instances in which Aquila has ἴνισχύω for some form of ἴνισχύω. Though Aquila might have made the equation between ἴνισχύω and forms of ἴνισχύω, it is anachronistic to read it back into kaige on the basis of the scanty textual evidence. Th does not make the equation in any case.

50. ὁμοφαία

Both OG and Th employ ὁμοφαία in 11.33, and it is the most common equivalent in the LXX. Therefore, the agreement between Th and

---

38 O'Connell, p. 287, proposes this characteristic on the basis of one reference in Ex. 4:11. (?)

39 Similarly Gentry, p. 407.

40 10:18; 19(4), 21; 11:1, 5(2), 6, 7, 21, 32.

41 O'Connell, p. 28; Bodine, pp. 26, 42.
kaige cannot be considered as evidence that Th belongs to kaige.

54. θηλίτικον παιδία

Th employs παιδία 4/6 against OG which prefers νεανίσκος 5/5. The pl. of παιδία only occurs 47x in MT and O'Connell suggests this characteristic on the basis of one passage in Ex. 1:18. The equivalence also occurs in Lam. 4:10. does not occur or the pl. is not rendered in Theodotion Joshua, Judges, or Job. Furthermore, the equivalence θηλίτικον παιδία is made 3x in the γ' section of reigns (I Ki. 12:8, 10, 14 + 15x in the sing.) and Zech. 8:5, while γ' employs παιδία (II Ki. 2:24) and νοίκος (II Ki. 4:1; also Ruth 1:5). Gen. has θηλίτικον 8/10 and all forms of διόν παιδία 13x (s. HR). Clearly, there is no basis here to establish any kaige characteristic.

60. θηλίτικον εὐαρέστησις

The only reading is 2:46 where OG has σπννή and Th employs εὐαρέστησις.

61. ἀλλὰ = δοὺλι

Th employs παιδία 6x and δοὺλος 6x for the n. ἄλλο, while OG prefers παιδία (11/12). In 7:14, 27 Th employs δοὺλευο for ἄλλο. The criterion is a weak one in any case since ἄλλο = δοὺλι is common throughout the LXX.

---

42 S. CH 5.II.1.iii. for references.

43 ἄλλο occurs 4x in Job, but it is not rendered by Theodotion.

44 This is another reading proposed by O'Connell, p. 289 based on scanty evidence, Ex. 29:18 and Lev. 1:9.

45 S. CH 5.III.1.iii. The Aramaic vb. ἄλλο occurs 12x, but is not counted because it is most naturally rendered by ποιέω.

46 Th normally employs λατρεύω for ἄλλο (7/9). S. CH 5.IV.1.iii.

47 Though ἄλλο = δοὺλι is consistent in Exodus, O'Connell notes that the equivalence is "a common pattern in the OG." While there is evidence of an increased use of this pattern among various witnesses in both Judges (Bodine, pp. 27-28) and Joshua (Greenspoon, pp. 309-312), it is not consistent.
75. Various=ηνίκα

ηνίκα appears in 6:11(10) for 'נִכְךָ, but Bodine (p. 19) has already rejected its use as a kaige characteristic.

78. בֶּן-גַּאֲבָרְכָו/cognates

Bodine argues that it is the consistency with which this equivalence appears in kaige that makes it a characteristic, and there may be some validity to this argument.48 However, Th employs גַּאֲבָרְכָו only in 1:15 but קָוֶל in 1:4. Therefore, Th cannot be judged to exhibit this kaige characteristic.

79. יַשָּׂם=טְתָבָךְ

Once again, Bodine argues that it is the consistency of the usage that marks this equivalence, but the evidence is hardly compelling.49 In any case, Th only has one reading in 11:17 (טְתָבָךְ), which is not enough to prove a relationship to kaige.

81. לָשׂון-טֵוָם

Th has יָכַפְּרָא 3/5 and טֵוָם 2/5, so he does not support the equivalence.50

82. בֵּית (q.)=טִיסְטַרְפֶּה

Forms of בֵּית appear 16x in Daniel of which 12/13 are q.51 Th shares the common LXX equivalent with OG in 10:20; 11:13, 19, 28(2), 30(2). 3x Th reads it independently (9:25-OG=0; 11:18, 29). However, OG has טִיסְטַרְפֶּה independently 2x as well (11:9, 10), plus once for the hi. in 11:18. The equivalence טִיסְטַרְפֶּה-בֵּית is common in the LXX, particularly in the q. form. For example, Bodine notes that the equivalence is made 11/19 in the βγ section of Reigns and 29/44 in γ6.

---

49 Bodine, p. 52.
50 S. CH 5.IV.1.iii. for a discussion.
51 9:13, 16, 25(hi.), 25; 10:20; 11:9, 10, 13, 18, 18(hi.), 19(hi.), 28(2), 29, 30(2). In the first case in 11:18 OG reads with the Q while Th reads the K. Bodine, pp. 55-56, admits that Th does not support the characteristic, and for some reason he does not include the occurrence in 11:10.
However, he does not note that it occurs 22/33 in ϒΥ’. Therefore, the value of this criterion is highly suspect.

Numbers 83-93 in Greenspoon’s list come from Bodine’s chapter entitled "Characteristics Peculiar to the Vaticanus Family of Judges" so we would not expect there to be a marked equivalence in Th. Most of these examples involve common OG equivalences that are employed more consistently in Judges.

83. τηρεῖν=διαφαίνεσθαι

In 9:17 OG=ἐπιβλέπει; Th=ἐπιφαίνει.

84. αὕτη=φέρω, εἰσφέρω

αὕτη is found 10x in Daniel. OG and Th share a common reading only in 9:12, 14 (ἐπάγω). Th has good renditions with forms of φέρω or εἰσφέρω only in 1:2(2); 11:6, 8, so it does not support Bodine’s proposed characteristic.

85. προσερχόμενος/κεφαλή=βοῶ

προσερχόμενος only appears in 6:21(20) and Th does employ βοῶ (OG=κλανθύμω). However, the equivalence is common throughout the LXX, and βοῶ is employed by Th also in 3:4 and 5:7 for αὕτη.

87. πολέμω=καταστρέφει

πολέμω appears in 10:20; 11:11 and in both cases Th employs καταστρέφει. OG=Th in 11:11 and has διαμάχομαι in 10:20.

88. πολέμω=καταταξίς


92. ἀνατάξεως=ἀφρηστός

Th has ἀνατάξει in 11:18 (OG=ἀφρηστός).

93. κομψότητα

51 S. CH 5.11.1.iii.

53 Bodine, p. 71, notes this as well.
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OG has the common LXX equivalent κακά 3/3 (9:12, 13, 14), while Th has κακά 2/3 and a more dynamic rendering with the per.pro. αὐτά in 9:14.

94. Transliteration of Unknown Words

Tov offers an important contribution to the study of transliterations in the LXX. He groups transliterations into four categories: 1. proper nouns; 2. technical terms; 3. words unknown to the translator; 4. transliterations of common nouns erroneously transliterated as proper nouns because of the context. Group 3 forms the largest number of transliterations and it is to these that he devotes his attention. He concludes:

The practice of leaving unknown words untranslated has been shown to be characteristic of kaige in Reigns 76 and of Th. (i.e. the notes referring to the contents of Origen's sixth column). . . Or, to phrase our conclusion, with due caution, in a different way: we were able to point out a new characteristic common to two members of the kaige-Th. group. When used critically, this criterion may also be applied to other members of the same group. "Critically" is the key word in the last sentence, because Tov is quick to point out that the practice was in use prior to kaige-Th; therefore, the presence or absence of transliterations is not determinative for inclusion within kaige. Nor does the presence of transliterations guarantee that a text is a revision.

As for the unknown words transliterated by Th, Tov provides a separate listing, because he accepts Schmitt's conclusion that Th is unrelated to kaige. They are καῦμα ὀρθομυν 1:3; (ττ) τις = ηπ 4:10(13), 14(17), 20(23); ὄμοιος = οὐσίας 8:2, 3, 6; ὄμοιος = οὐσίας 8:13; ἰδιαὶ = διάδοσις 10:5; 12:6, 7; μακαριν = μακρίζειν 11:38; εὐσκανεῖος 11:45. However, Tov omits the transliteration of ἔβαλε(τ) = ἔβαλε(τ) 11:16, 41, 45 (δύναμιν, reading ὅποιος in 8:9) from his list.

In his list of words from the LXX in group 3, Tov puts in a separate subsection transliterations of unknown words which were

54 Tov, "Transliterations," p. 82.
55 Ibid., p. 85.
56 Ibid., p. 92.
probably understood as proper nouns. If we apply the same
distinction to the transliterations in Th, all but נְדֵמָה could
be classed in this category. For example, in 1:3 the king commands
the chief eunuch to bring some of the captives of Israel "from the
royal line and from the בֵּרוּם." Th could easily have understood the
Hebrew as some type of royal title or technical term (Tov's category
2). בֵּרוּם may not have been understood exactly as a proper noun, but,
given the context, Th might have understood that there was something
intrinsically special about בֵּרוּם, since it adorned heavenly beings.
Similarly, מִרְדֵּס was probably understood as a title, though Schmitt
notes that מִרְדֵּס is also transliterated in Jud. 6:26 (A מֵאָל B מֵאָל). The remaining transliteration (בֵּדוֹם) is a Persian loan word.

The reason why the possible motivation for the majority of these
transliterations is noted is in order to contrast them with other
occasions where Th did not employ transliterations of unknown words.
For example, in 2:5 and 3:29 Th does not transliterate דּוֹס and in
2:22 Th employs a contextual guess for מִסָּה. It seems that an
important factor in Th deciding to transliterate was the fact that a
word could be understood as a proper noun.

In Schmitt's investigation of the transliterations he argues
that only ונ and מַדַּי could have derived from previous
transliterations in kaige elsewhere. Schmitt believes that the
presence of these two transliterations is due to later revision of Th
by "Theodotion." However, ונ does not actually appear anywhere else
in kaige, so there is only one proven agreement between Th and kaige.

57 See also the discussion by Greenspoon, Joshua, pp. 334-336.
59 Th seems to have known מִסָּה in the sense "to loose" (3:25[92];
5:6, 12), but did not know the figurative sense "to dwell" (s. BDB, p.
1117).
60 Schmitt, "Stammt," pp. 57-59. Schmitt does not note that the
use of διωμόν for פֶּס in 8:9 could be equated with translations
attributed to Theodotion in Is. 28:1; Ez. 20:6, 15 (διωμός). However,
the connection is unlikely given the use of transliteration in ch. 11
and the fact that מִסָּה appears in 8:10.
61 Ibid., p. 59.
In conclusion, Tov’s criterion is certainly viable as a *kaige* trait, but as he states, "The subject deserves to be treated in a detailed monograph." 62 Th does employ transliterations, particularly for terms which he understood as proper nouns, but it was also a common practice among the Greek translators.

95. (\(\text{Σείωκ} \)) 1\(\text{άδρός} \)

Th employs μέγας as a SE (13/15) and πολύς in 11:28, 44. 63

96. ἕβας=καὶ μάλα

In both instances of this reading Th employs ἄλλα, whereas OG has καὶ in 10:7 and καὶ μάλα in 10:21.

97. ἰεβας=δυνατὸς

Both OG and Th employ δυνατὸς in 11:3. Although the equivalence is fairly common in the LXX there is a marked increase in Judges, Reigns, and Psalms, so it may mark a *kaige* characteristic. The n. ἦρος appears twice in the Aramaic section (2:20, 23) and Th employs δώρας for both.

III. Does Th belong to *kaige*?

In Th there are 12 agreements with the proposed *kaige* characteristics (3, 19, 31, 43, 49, 50, 54, 75, 79, 85, 94, 97), 22 disagreements (4, 8, 13, 17, 23, 30, 33, 38, 41, 60, 61, 78, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 92, 93, 95, 96), and 3 with mixed findings (1, 14, 15). There are only 2 (3, 19) agreements and 3 with mixed findings (1, 14, 15) that agree with Barthélemy’s 9 core patterns and 12 precursor patterns, while there are five clear disagreements (4, 8, 13, 17, 23). Among the 12 agreements 6 are based on one reading (19, 50, 75, 79, 85, 97). The first 5 of these are common OG equivalents and at least 3 (75, 79, 85) should be discarded as *kaige* characteristics. The evidence for 5 of the 7 remaining agreements is tenuous, and it is extremely doubtful that 4 of these (31, 43, 49, 54) should even be considered *kaige* characteristics.

---

63 S. CH 5.V. in vs. 8 for references.
This examination of the *kaige* characteristics in Th vindicates the conclusion of A. Schmitt. The most that we can say that Th has in common with *kaige*-Theodotion is that they share a similar approach to translation, i.e. formal equivalence. If we were to depict their relationship in kinship terms, they might be described as distant cousins. In Gentry's terms, Th belongs within the continuum between the translation of the Pentateuch (c. 281 BCE) and Aquila in which translations were tending to employ greater formal equivalence to the semitic *Vorlage*. However, it is impossible to identify the translator or to date his work with any certainty. On the basis of Th's TT (frequent omissions, occasional dynamic renderings), and the inclusion of the deuterocanonical additions, it is possible that Th originated some time prior to the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll; therefore, before the common era.

---


65 The developing trend toward literalism was discussed previously in CH 3.III.1.
Conclusion

The primary concern of this study was to develop a model for the analysis of TT and apply it to the OG and Th versions of Daniel. This aim was accomplished in four stages.

First, all of the variant readings from papyrus 967 to which Ziegler did not have access were collated against his critical edition and numerous corrections to his text were proposed. The analysis confirms that the pre-hexaplaric 967 is the nearest extant witness to the OG and underscores the need for a revised critical edition of OG. The original readings of 967 reveal that 88-Syh has suffered corruption from Th and correction toward MT; yet, it is obvious that 967 has suffered similarly. For this reason, emendation of Ziegler’s text was proposed in a few cases where he did have access to 967.

Second, the methodology for the analysis of TT that focuses on the features of literalism in a text was critiqued. Three criticisms of the methodology were given: it assumes that the translators intended for a reader to be able to retranslate from the target text to the source text; literalism offers an incomplete description of TT; and the focus on literalism is inadequate for the application of its results to textual criticism of MT. Although the recent studies that have focused on literalism can provide a general overview of the TT of the LXX translators, they have not paid sufficient attention to details.

Third, in order to offer a positive alternative to the focus on literalism, a model based on linguistic principles and the presuppositions underpinning it was presented. Particular attention was given to clarifying some of the presuppositions for the methodology because this has not been done. In order for future researchers to evaluate, improve, and/or employ this model it had to be clearly defined.

In the presentation of the model for TT it was argued that the foundation for an analysis of TT is the comparison of the morphological, syntactical, and lexical elements of the source text with the target text. On the basis of a detailed analysis of these elements of translation the analyst has an informed perspective on the types of
adjustments that the translator has introduced into the translation, the motivation for these adjustments, and the effect of these adjustments on the meaning of the text.

In the fourth stage, the effectiveness of the proposed model was demonstrated by applying it to five lengthy passages in OG and Th Daniel. Each of these passages was examined in detail, along with numerous related passages throughout the remainder of the book. By this means we were able to define more clearly the features of OG that make it more of a dynamic translation in contrast to the formal equivalence exhibited in Th. Besides some of the more outstanding results of the investigation, which are detailed below, there were many insights into the TT of both translators and how they understood the Vorlage they were translating. Though there were differences between the two translations, they were both concerned to provide a faithful rendering of the parent text. The results of the analysis for each passage were also employed for textual criticism of MT. In several instances it was suggested that MT should be emended, but, generally speaking, it was found that OG and Th were translating a text virtually identical to MT.

There were four additional conclusions that emerged from the analysis of TT.

1. The analysis of OG supported the thesis of Albertz that chs. 4-6 originate from a translator different from the person(s) who translated 1-3; 7-12.

2. Based on the unique equivalents in 3:20-30(97) it is probable that a later translator/redactor inserted the deuto-canonical material into the text of OG. The Prayer of Azariah and The Song of the Three Young Men are additions to the OG text.

3. The analysis uncovered more evidence that Th readings have displaced and replaced the OG text. It is impossible to know the extent of the corruption of OG, but in many cases the original reading is beyond recovery.

4. On the basis of the analysis of TT in Th, and in conjunction with the previous conclusion, it was demonstrated that Th is an independent translation of Daniel. This conclusion has significant implications for the recovery of the text of OG as well as the understanding of the transmission history of the LXX.
The results of the analysis are based on detailed study of the OG and Th texts and, if they stand the test of future research, are by no means insignificant for LXX research. Both the linguistic principles upon which the model for TT is based, and the results that have been achieved through its application should encourage the use of the model in future research on the LXX.

In the final chapter Th's text was compared with the characteristics that have been ascribed to kaige. Th exhibits significant disagreements and only superficial agreement with kaige. On this basis it can be concluded that Th and kaige have little, if anything at all, to do with one another. It is impossible at this stage to be more specific, because the relationship between the kaige texts as well as their relationship to OG has not been adequately defined. However, we can say that the kaige recension never existed except as a scholarly construct. Kaige research has focussed primarily on comparing agreements, and, in the process, has failed to contrast the significant disagreements that exist between the same texts. Consequently, the means do not yet exist to determine which texts are most closely related. Many of the proposed characteristics of kaige are useless for this purpose.

As one line of research draws to a close, several more avenues of research have been opened. The analysis of TT in the LXX has barely scratched the surface of the research that remains to be done. Continued analysis in this area will be of enormous benefit to the editors of critical texts for both the LXX and MT.

In the book of Daniel, Th has often been neglected in the research like a younger sibling following in the footsteps of the successful older brother. If we take his independence seriously, then fresh approaches to his text are possible. Particularly significant in this regard are chs. 4-6. Perhaps our eyes (and minds) will be open to the possibility that other texts as well are translations rather than revisions of OG.

Finally, an exhaustive comparison of lexical and syntactical translation equivalents of each of the kaige texts would be an excellent foundation for the task of clarifying the relationship of the kaige texts to one another and their relationship to OG.
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