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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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<td>HSM</td>
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<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
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<td>HUCA</td>
<td>Hebrew Union College Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBA</td>
<td>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>Israel Exploration Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBLMS</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJS</td>
<td>Journal of Jewish Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNSL</td>
<td>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSP</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSPS</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>Journal of Semitic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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**C. Text Critical and Grammatical Sigla**

- **+** = plus
- **>** = minus
- **{}** = add. of letter/s or word/s
- **[]** = omission of letter/s or word/s
- **.** = unattested root
- **1,3,2** = alternative reading
- **?** = different order of words
- **\[\]** = root
- **?** = doubtfult reading
- **a.** = active
- **abs.** = absolute
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>homoioarc.</td>
<td>hapax legomenon (Hebrew/Aramaic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homoiotel.</td>
<td>homoioarchton (Hebrew/Oriental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imp.</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impv.</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>infinitive</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>om.</td>
<td>omit, omission</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
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,

---

1. The 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

---

1 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. 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. He has also been instrumental in the CATSS 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."

It has already been mentioned that the primary reason for the analysis of TT arises from the crucial role it plays in textual criticism. 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, 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

---


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," JBL 94 (1975): 218-234; W.L. Humphreys, "A Lifestyle for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel," 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 textural 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?" 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, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions, 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, 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," 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 OG, 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.\textsuperscript{11} Reference is also made to the manuscript

fragments from Qumran, particularly 4QDan^{a,b,c}.\textsuperscript{24} The fragments from caves 1 and 6 do not witness any significant variants from MT, though 1QDan\textsuperscript{b} does have the beginning of the Aramaic section in 2:4b.\textsuperscript{25}

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. Therefore, all the variant readings from the aforementioned editions of 967 have been collated and evaluated against Ziegler’s critical text in CH 2. 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. 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

---

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.

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

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.

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. First, there is the morphological analysis of the LXX/OG. Second, there is a parallel alignment of the LXX/OG and MT. Third, there are the textual variants for the LXX/OG. 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. These texts were searched in order to isolate specific words, morphemes, or syntactical constructions for purposes of comparison. The programs LBASE and Bible Windows 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 Westminister Theological Seminary.

39 Developed by John Baima and distributed through Silver Mountain Software, Texas.
WinGreek\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{41} so the actual comparison and analysis of the data was done manually.

\textit{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).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{40}A shareware program developed by Dr. Peter Gentry and Andrew Fountain.
\end{itemize}
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 McCrystall, 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."^1

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."^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.^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.7

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

^1Blud., 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.

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

^6Blud., 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).

^7Blud., 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

---


10Mont., 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.

11If 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."

12See 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

---

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" כשותף יד 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. lii.

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.

22 Charles, xxxvii-1, argues Daniel was originally written
completely in Aramaic and was followed in this by Zimmerman. See F.
Zimmerman, "The Aramaic Original of Daniel 8-12," JBL 57 (1938): 255-
72; "Some Verses in the Light of a Translation Hypothesis," JBL 58
(1939): 349-54.

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.\textsuperscript{21}

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{28} In DA Barthélemy presented a translation of the Greek Scroll of the Minor Prophets, which is dated

\textsuperscript{21} 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."

\textsuperscript{26} Mont., p. 50.


\textsuperscript{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 א by καίγε (hence the name kaige recension) coupled with the non-translation of נא by σῶν. 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, פ and י 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?" 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." 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?" 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. Barthélemy also has responded to Schmitt's thesis with some specific criticisms of his own. 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


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."\(^6\)

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 יִבְּנֵי by הָגָהִּים in 1:20 is unique to Th. Barthélemy points out that in 3 other instances Th follows the normal rendering of יִבְּנֵי in Theodotion by translating it with עִנְשִׁים and suggests that 1:20 is an example of a later contamination. However, the usual translation of יִבְּנֵי by עִנְשִׁים in Th is not that remarkable, because it is the most frequent translation equivalent (18x) for יִבְּנֵי 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

---

\(^6\) 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. 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 Barthélémy 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.

The significance of Schmitt's reply to Barthélémy 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. 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 Barthélémy's

44Ibid., p. 12; see Stammt, pp. 62-100.

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

46A. Pietersma, "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues", 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.\textsuperscript{47} 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.\textsuperscript{48} 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 Grundschrift 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.\textsuperscript{49} 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.\textsuperscript{50}

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

\textsuperscript{47} 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—σιναςίος, καρκας, συντέλεια, ὅτι. 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.

\textsuperscript{48} 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.\textsuperscript{51} 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.\textsuperscript{52} 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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 deuterocanonical part explains why there seem to be different hands at work.

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. 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.

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. 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 armónica," J. Schüpphaus has also argued in detail that the deuterocanonical 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, AOAT, 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. 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.

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." 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. For example, Barr also states, "There are enormous differences in the degree to which a translator interprets," (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. 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

---

58 Ibid., pp. 150–184; 218–386.
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.
61 Ibid., pp. 284–294.
63 Jeans., p. 60, makes a similar point. See also CH 4.11.4.
concludes that the Greek terms used are Hellenistic even though OG "purports to describe Babylonian society." 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.

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, the translator exhibits little desire to maintain the "spirit" of the Hebrew of the MT. 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-Ptolemic empire.

66 Examples he gives are δυνάστης for בִּשׁ in 9:8 (only here); πρόσταγμα for בִּשׁ passim (rare in LXX, but it actually occurs 9x: 4 are in the Pentateuch while 3 are in Esther); δέκαπτης for בִּשׁ 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 ὑπαίμα for ἐνυπνιον in seven out of twenty-five instances reflects the fact that ἐνυπνιον 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 ἐνυπνιον to be "what is illusory." However, the contrast between ἐνυπνιον and ὑπαίμα is grounded in the classification of dreams in Artemedorus of Daldis (latter half of the second century C.E.) who distinguished between ὀνειρος and ἐνυπνιον. 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, εἴδωλον (3:12) in CH 3.II.2.1 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 ένομνιον 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 ένομνιον and δεικον, and though δραμα 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 Αg. Αp., 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 ένομνιον 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 ένομνιον and δραμα were distinguished in the papyri and even admits that the evidence suggests that the two were used as synonyms!72

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 ένομνιον is used 10 times in chapters 2 and 4 (for אצ, Hebrew-אצ, 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 ένομνιον, 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 ένομνιον. This use is found 16 times in six books, most frequently in Jeremiah (6x). The third category exhibits a cautious scepticism towards ένομνιον and is represented by the five

72Ibid., pp. 162, 168.
occurrences in Sirach. As for ὑπαία, 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 הלה. Elsewhere in the LXX ὑπαία is found 19 times and in none of these does it translate הלה. Based on these statistics and his analysis of the use of ἐνώσινος, McCrystall concludes that ἐνώσια were the focus of prophetic attacks, particularly in Jeremiah, while the "authentic" nature of the ὑπαία is revealed in texts like Jer. 39 (32):21; Gen. 15:1, 46:2; Num. 12:6; Is. 21:2. Therefore, the OG translator incorporated ὑπαία 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 ἐνώσινος translates a Vorlage in the LXX the semitic term is הלה (רל), while ὑπαία translates various terms. In other words, ἐνώσινος was employed as a stereotyped equivalent (SE) for הלה; therefore, any so-called classification of the uses of ἐνώσινος cannot be proved from the distribution of the term, because it was universally employed to render הלה (רל). Whether or not the semitic writers/editors used הלה in a pejorative way is a totally different question and best pursued elsewhere. We might also note that הלה/ὑπαία and [יבד/ἐνώσινος occur together in 2:28 (see also 1:17 and 2:1) where there is no discernible difference in meaning (הlehem רוחי ראש), 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 ὑπαία 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 הלה (15 times). For example, הלה (רל) occurs ten times in the first nine verses and two
substitutions of δράμα for ἐνύπνιον occur in verses 7 and 9. However, the rendering of θν by δράμα in vs. 19 may provide the key to understanding why the translator used δράμα for ἐνύπνιον—because θν=δράμα is a favourite rendering in Daniel. The third time the translator replaced ἐνύπνιον with δράμα 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 ἰσμαλί, there was no etymologically related verb for δράμα to render ἰσμαλί. Instead, he was able to preserve his preference for δράμα rendering θν by substituting the noun for ἰσμαλί in place of ἐνύπνιον and still provide a good translation—το δράμα ὑπενθύμισε. 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 δράμα in verses 36 and 45 (although θν 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 ὑπενθύμισε τὴν νῶτα. The whole phrase would be retroverted as ἰσμαλί (ἐλαί) ἰσμαλί. It is probable that the OG had this in its Vorlage, and ἰσμαλί (ἐλαί) ἰσμαλί 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

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.

In 6/9 occurrences OG translates θν with δράμα: 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 θν 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 ἰσμαλί (ἐλαί) ἰσμαλί (also 7:7, 13 where OG has ἰσμαλί in δράματι) and in these two places OG employs ἐννοοῖς for θν. 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).

See the discussion of this variant in the section on 2:1–10 in CH 5.
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 ἰδίεν twice in 7:1 may be explained similarly to 2:26. The first occurrence of "dream" is in the phrase ἰδίεν ἰδίεν. The translator did not have an etymologically related verb for ἰδίεν which he preferred for ἰδίεν, so he rendered the participle with ἰδίεν and ἰδίεν with ἰδίεν. The remainder of the verse does not follow the Aramaic word order though the elements are represented. The texts run thus:

MT: ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν
OG: ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν ἰδίεν

The main difference is that ἰδίεν appears in place of ἰδίεν and OG seems to add ἰδίεν. Some of the difference can be explained, however, if we grant that the translator read ἰδίεν with ἰδίεν in order to produce ἰδίεν ἰδίεν 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.81

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

---

80 See J. E. Miller, "The Redaction of Daniel," *JSOT* 52 (1991): 115-24. However, there is no evidence to support his contention that there was a Hebrew version of ch. 2.

81 Jeans., pp. 132-133.
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.\textsuperscript{66} 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 cannot 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 Th," but never provides evidence that she has systematically analyzed agreements and disagreements of Th and OG.\textsuperscript{67} A more detailed study of the texts is required to attempt to confirm whether Th is in fact a recension of the OG.\textsuperscript{68}

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.\textsuperscript{69} 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

\textsuperscript{66}Ibid., p. 57.

\textsuperscript{67}Ibid., pp. 58-69.

\textsuperscript{68}In CH 5 we will re-examine 8:1-10 with a view to determining the relationship between OG and Th.

\textsuperscript{69}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).
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. 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. 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. While a discussion of translation equivalents is useful, Wenthe rarely indicates how the OG could be retroverted into Aramaic.

90 Wills, pp. 87, 144.
92 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 passim), but does not evidence any careful analysis of the question.
93 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 יְדֵין 23x (15 untranslated in OG), יְדֵי 22x (2), בַּעַזְרָא 17x (3), לֹא 9x (2), וּ 5x (2), שָׁמַר 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 בִּקֵּץ 9x is usually translated by בַּקֶּשׁ 12x. He also indicates that OG has 2 additional occurrences of בַּקֶּשׁ in ch. 3, but leaves בִּקֵּץ 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 בָּקַשׁ (57x) for בָּקֵּץ, בַּקֶּשׁ (73x) and leaves it untranslated 23x. 57+23=80.
P.S. David's thesis is basically a restatement of the views of Höscher, 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 άποσταθησαται in 9:26 as a reference to the removal of Jason. David supports his interpretation of άποσταθησαται with the suggestion that the reading of χρίσμα in OG should be emended to χριστός, because it is the usual equivalent for μετέχω. 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 άποσταθησαται 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 8:11-14.98

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.99 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.100 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.

98David, 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.

99See 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. In his view, the early form of the tales was employed for chs. 4-6 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 (e.g. 4:34c) and the theme of conversion. 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.

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 Grelet 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.II.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 Talmun, 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.

105 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.
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.¹

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."² 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.

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." 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. There are then two stages of textual criticism.
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, ἐστὶν ἔρρξα occurs four times in ch. 2:28, 29(2), 45. Th renders it in each instance with ἀ(τί) δεῖ γενέσθαι. OG uses ἀ δεὶ γενέσθαι in 2:28 and τὰ ἐσμένα 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 πάντα ἀ δεὶ γενέσθαι from Syh; whereas 967 reads ὅσα δεὶ γενέσθαι. In the second, Ziegler again reads ἀ δεὶ γενέσθαι while 967 has ἀ μέλει γενέσθαι. 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 מִּיבִּי יַרְדָן, the readings of 88-Syh would be due to later scribal harmonization to the first

---


9The 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. 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? 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."

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

---

10 See also 8:19; cf. the remarks of F.F. Bruce ("Oldest," p. 24) who states that the use of & δεί 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 & δεί 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 & δεί γενέσθαι in vs. 28 also stems from Th.

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 \textit{Vorlage} for OG because of chapters 4-6.

The presence of an alternative \textit{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 \textit{Vorlage} in chapters 4-6 that the \textit{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. 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." For this reason, although the view that the OG translator was engaging in a type of wholesale theological reinterpretation of the text envisaged by McCrystall 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." 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:

... wishes to attribute deliberate changes, harmonizations, completion of details and new accents to the translator is under the obligation to prove his thesis

---


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

20Ibid., p. 71.
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 (eg. 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, MStU, 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 (eg. 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

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


\(^7\)See David, pp. 87-94; Albertz, pp. 159-163.

\(^8\)Geissen'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 ἀπολύουσαν to κατασύρον in vs. 10, though the ms. is in bad shape from the beginning of vs. 8. 11:15 from στήσονται (967 reads στεσει) to θελήσως in 11:16, though most of vss. 14 and 15 are not extant. 11:20 from βεσιμειας εἰς to [συνταγέν]τοις μετε 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 κ(ε)νησει το πολλοίς in 11:40. 11:45 καὶ ο(φ)κ to [όνειδισμόν in 12:2. 12:6 θν καὶ καθαρισμον to τίς ἢ in 12:8. 12:13 ἐπὶ τὴν 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, 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

αύτο'ν' 2:15 ν added by 2 corrector.
συνετε'α'ροις 2:17 Delete ε, add α by 2nd corr.
ἔσιμη'α'νας 2:23 Deleted η and added α by 2nd corr. Thack. §24, p. 284.

9Zieg., p. 21.
II.2. Errors 55x

These errors were due mainly to carelessness in transcription.

επιλέκτων επιλε 1:3
(νεώ) νεανίσκους 1:13 ditto.
οσπρίων σποσπορίων 1:16 Hamm, I-II, p. 115.
[eἰσήχθησαν +σαν 1:18 ditto.
ἐώς νεός 1:21
γαζαρηνῶν γαραδηνῶν 2:27; 5:7
σοι μοι 2:29
αὐτά αὐτό 2:34 Hamm, I-II, p. 239.
>τότε 2:35
ἐνε 2:38
ἐλάττω[ν] 2:39 Missing line over ω to indicate ν.
ἡγούμενον + μενον 2:48 ditto.
βασιλε[](ς) 3:10
κύριος κύριε 3:17 κε written for κς
ἐμβληθήσαι ἐμβληθαι 3:24
κύριε κυρίος 3:26 κς for κε
σ[τιμπ]ύων 3:46
(ει) εις 3:55 ditto.
πνεύματα πνα with line over top=πνεύμα 3:65 read πνεύματα
α[ύρανον 3:80
ido[ύ] 3:92(25)
>λατρε. μηδέ 3:95(28)
πληροθν(τα) 4:8(11) ditto.
πάσαν 4:8(11) twice by ditto.
σοῦ οὐ 4:30c
ἐξ[ν]θεσαι(ν) 4:34b 1st ν is an err.
πάντων τῶν τῶν 4:34c ditto.
περιέθ. αὐτῷ +καὶ ἐδοκεῖν αὐτῷ 5:29 ditto.
ἀσθερ[ή]θεσε(ν) 6:19(20) ρ omitted by err.
ἀπὸ +ἀπὸ 6:22(23) ditto.
τὸ θηρίον 7:11 ditto.
ἐκεῖνο +ὁ 7:20 ditto.
δοθείσα(ν) 8:13
ἐν νηστείαις: ἐννηστείαις 9:3 haplog.
ἡμῖν: ἡμῶν 9:7
διέσ-ρ-κάρποςάς 9:7
κατὰ: κακά 9:13
τοῦς +τους 9:18 ditto.
τὴν ἐρήμωσιν: ἡρμῶσιν 9:18
ἐβδομήκοντα: εν θ (with a line over it) 9:24 o mistaken for θ and εν for ἐννέα as a gloss?
+ἐτι 9:24 for ἐπὶ (1st), but then corr.
εἰκοσι-: ἠ (with a line over it) 10:13 967 has κε? misunderstood from κ = 20?
Geissen, p. 233.
καὶ εἰπε(ν) ditto? 10:20 There is enough space on the previous line for this to have been written.
σοὺ: μοι 10:21 Change in pronoun to harmonize with the change in person of the vb.
πρῶτα +τα 10:21 haplog. or ditto?
ἀνθεσθήκασιν: 11:2 ditto? Uncertain.
οὐ στήσει: συστήσει 11:6
χάραν) 11:19
ἐξόνθουσιν 11:30 err. due to previous ἠξος(ν). 11:35 ditto.
eἰς τὸ καθα +εἰς τὸ 11:35 ditto.
ἐπᾶ: ἐπάν 12:6
ἀν ἀποσταθῇ: ἀνασταθῇ 12:11

II.3. Interchange of Vowels
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π.3.ι. σ/ε, ε/ας Θακκ. §6.11 45x
σ/ε 4x

ἐκπεδεύασι 1:5; συνεταξότα 5:6; εὐξηταὶ 6:5(6); βοηθήσατι 10:13;

ε/ας 41x


π.3.ι.ι. ν/ει, ε/τ, ε/ε Θακκ. §6.24-26. 115x + 20x listed with Proper Nouns

ν/ει 85x

βασιλεὐκῆς 1:5; πεθανεῖ 1:5, 8; ἀλαξομοθῆ 1:8; ἡμικεθαὶ 1:10; ἡμικεθαὶ 1:12, 3:27, 30; 9:12, 13; ὅμοιοις 1:13; ἀμφιβολοῦσαν 1:19; ἀκεφαλήθη 2:3; 11:38; ἀποκριθείσις 2:5; καθευδιστῶν 2:21; γνωσισμάχων 2:22, 3:15; βραχύων 2:32; 9:15; 10:6; 11:6, 15, 31; ἑρπ[p]ίειναν 2:35; ἀφανεῖσαι 2:44; ἦγ-κατεκαθισμόν 3:2; εἰκόνες 3:5, 14; κάμπεσιν 3:6, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22(2), 23, 24, 25, 46, 47, 48, 49(2), 51, 79; πεθανότοντα 3:7; συνανθίδων 3:14; σοβαροῦν 3:15; ἀλογώτωσεν 3:38; κρεβατίων 3:40; πακεβασίων 3:40; ἐξαιρετισά 3:40; ἐξανταξιοῦσα 3:49; ἡμῶν 3:67; ἡθελείν 4:30α; ὑπεστοίχω 4:30α; διακριτίκων 5 πρεσβεία; ἐπίθεμπτεν 6:10(11); μετῆς 6:10(11), 11(12); ἡμᾶς 6:19(20); ἀπευθυναμοθῆ 7:11; διακριτίκων 8:14; πάσαν 9:16; ἀνλάτεσουν 9:18; ἀρνόμενης 9:19; σαμβωνίων 9:19, 24; κρεβατίων 9:26; καθευδισθείσα 11:5, 6; ἐπεκκεισμοστέψευ 11:10; ἐξαπατείνα 11:24; ἔρενεισθήσαται 11:25; καθευδαί 11:25; ἤγ-κατεκαθισμόν 11:30; μεκανοῦσαιν 11:31; καθαρεύοντα 11:35; ἀφανεῖσαι 11:44; συνανθίδων 12:3; κρεβατίων 12:11, 12.

ἐν/ι 27x

κατάλεψις 2:35
καταφθάνει 4:11(14)
γινώσκεται 10:20

II.3.iii. Omission of ι 7x


II.3.iv. α/ε, ε/α Thack. §6.2.3 5x

II.3.v. ο/υ Thack. §6.41 4x

II.4. Non-Elision Thack. §9.10 6x

II.5. ἦτον for ἦν Mayser, PI.1. 267; Thack. §5.4 8x

3:6, 10, 11, 96(29), 4:34a; 5:7; 9:14; 11:3
There are three occasions where 967 has confused the writing of έως 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.\(^\text{10}\)

Ziegler had reconstructed the text to read έως, 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."\(^\text{11}\) Jeansonne has argued for the integrity of Ziegler'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.\(^\text{12}\) However, there is no doubt that Ziegler's text is correct.

In both the OG and Th έως is a SE for τῷ. έως appears 43x in OG, but 14x MT=0.\(^\text{13}\) In the remaining 29 instances έως renders τῷ in all but two passages.\(^\text{14}\) In 4:8(11) it is a good equivalent for ἐπὶ in the sense "unto" and in 9:20 έως translates τῷ, which is obviously an error of sight or hearing. We encounter the same equivalence when examining MT. τῷ appears 47x in MT, so there are 20x when έως=τῷ does not occur. 8x OG=0.\(^\text{15}\) Textual differences also explain the non-equivalence for τῷ in five other cases.\(^\text{16}\) while TT accounts for the omissions in 2:20;

---

\(^\text{10}\)Bruce, "Oldest Version," p. 25.


\(^\text{12}\)See Jeans., pp. 96-98.

\(^\text{13}\)3:1, 4:11(14), 14(17), 18(21), 28(31), 30(33); 6:6(5), 17; 7:25; 8:11; 9:27(2); 12:4, 7 (secondary addition). The second occurrence in 7:25 is also difficult to judge because of the textual differences.

\(^\text{14}\)See 1:21; 2:9, 34; 6:8(7), 13(12), 15(14), 27(26); 7:4, 9, 12, 18(2), 22, 25, 26, 28(27); 8:10, 11, 13, 14; 9:26; 10:3; 11:35, 36; 12:1, 4, 9. The second occurrence of έως in 7:18 of Ziegler's text is probably not original.

\(^\text{15}\)4:5(8), 14(17), 20(23), 22(25), 29(32), 30(33); 5:21; 6:25(24).

8:8 and 11:25. There remain four other passages. In 8:6 and 11:10 OG translates with ἔπι, while in 11:45 it has ὀφα. As in the case of 9:20 above, OG has probably misread ἧλ in 8:6, 11:10 and ἦλ in 11:45. Not only is the direct equivalence between ἐκς and ἦλ established, but there is no other instance in OG or Th where ὀς translates ἦλ.

In 2:43, 967 may have read ἦλ (see BHS) where it employs ἐκς for ὀς.

II.7. Consonants

II.7.i. Addition of ζ 5x

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

II.7.ii. Omission of ζ 6x

νεανίσκο(ζ) 1:4
δεκαπλασίω(ζ) 1:20
ἐπταπλασίω(ζ) 3:46
βασιλεύ(ζ) 4:30a
*λύχνο(ζ) 5 preface S. Geissen, p. 141.
καθα-ε-ρι-ε-[σ]θήσεται 8:14

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

967 often writes only one consonant of a pair.

ἐπρίπ(ε)ισεν 2:35.
ἐμβάλ(λ)οντες 3:46
ἐρίσατο 3:88
ἐ(ρίφησαν 6:24(25)
πρόσ(π)χες 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."

17 In 2:20 (cf. 7:18) OG omits the latter half of μο-λαμαμα-λαμ, while in 8:8, 11:25 OG translates ἦλ-ν 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 παραλογισθησεται is a corruption from the earlier variant παραργισθησεται (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).

διαμελιζομενησεται 3:96(29) This orthographic variant is quite interesting because διαμελιζου "dissect" is usually interpreted as a neologism (so LEH, p. 106), which Mont., p. 148, reconstructed on the basis of an analogy to μέλη ποιήσαντες in 2 Macc. 1:16. LSJ only has διαμελιζω attested in Plutarch. However, even without 967, we should consider the possibility of reading the far more common διαμεριζω "divide." The problem in reading διαμελιζου 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 διαμεριζοω 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 διαμελιζου may have been accepted into the language later. S. the discussion in CH 5.3.

ελαρασσες 6:22(23) Emended by 2 corr.
θαρσες 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

*σμ-ν-μολυνθη 1:8
*σμ-ν-μιγεις 2:43
*σμ-ν-κραθησα 2:43
*γ-ν-κατανικαμην 3:2
*σμ-ν-ποδισσαντας 3:20
εμ-ν-πυριμαιν 3:95(28)
εγ-ν-κακλιον 4:34b
*εγ-ν-κακλιμοδ 5 preface
*συγ-ν-κρμα 5:7(2), 16, 30
εγ-ν-κατελιπεαν 9:11, 11:30
εμ-ν-μενων 12:12 S. 6:12a where Zieg. should be emended to read with the compound.
II.7.vi. νό-ἐφελκυστικόν Thack. §9.7 125x

As far as verbs are concerned, 967 consistently employs the variable v and there is only one occurrence in 967 in which the v is omitted against 88. There are 13x where 967 has the final v on nouns and adjectives against 88 as well. Since the v 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 v in 967 111x

κατατρέχουσιν[v] 4:21(24)

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

Addition of v in 967 13x

κατατρέχουσιν[v] 4:21(24)
Ex 4:34b, 34c, 6:24(25) v 7:7, 19

II.8. Number 17x

II.8.i. Nouns 9x

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

*τὰ πρόσ. ὑμ. διατ. ἄσθ. τὸ πρόσωπον ήμῶν διατετραμμένον ἀσθενές 1:10

Given the predominant use of (ο)λους 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. ἄψις.

*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας; ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος 2:44 Syh=sq. 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 ὅλος is in 7:18 according to Zieg., but the formal correspondence to MT is unlikely there. S. CH 5.11.

ἔσχάτων ἔσχάτου 2:45 967=MT In 2:28 and 2:29 OG has ἐπ ἔσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν where MT has ἄχρηστος ἀκμῆς (vs. 28) and ἄλλος ἑκάστου (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.

tῶν χειρῶν; τὴς χειρὸς 6:14(15) Here MT =0, but MT only has the pl. of ἄμι 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.

19:3, 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


*ἐσχάτου· ἐσχάτων 8:23; 10:14 The plural follows 8:19 and the pattern in 2:28, 29, 45.

tοῦ λόγου τούτου· τῶν λόγων τούτων 12:8 MT has ἡλικίαν ἡμείς. λόγος 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.20 The OG rendering probably stems from a misunderstanding of MT. OG has the sing. for ἡλικίαν 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

συνήθησαν 6:23(24) Elsewhere OG has the pl. S. 3:7; 4:9(12); 7:27; 8:4; 12:10. στήσοντας· στέσεται 11:15 967 identifies "king of Egypt" as the subject.

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

ἐδομματίσθησαν 2:13 Secondary harmonization to following verb. Hamm, I-II, p. 185.

*ἐξητίθη δὲ· καὶ ἐξητήσαν 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.

ἐγένετο· ἐγένοντο 2:35 γίνομαι occurs twice more in the s. in 2:35. The 3 pl. of γίνομαι is unusual, but there is one other passage where it is employed in OG (12:1).21 However, there are a diversity of uses of the vb. in ch. 2, and the vb. in MT is pl. If we consider the occurrences of the nt. pl. sub. with a finite vb. where OG has a Vorlage,
there are 27. 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.

επιτελεσθησεται... 8:13 OG transforms the n. into a vb. and provides a dynamic translation, and the nt. pl. sub. (τὰ ἀγαθά) is viewed collectively.

ἐπαναλευσθησεται... 11:16 The vb. stems from reading ἐλέησον as if it were a pu. 3.m.s., but the sing. vb. would conform to OG's usage.

διανοηθησονται διανοηθησονται 11:35 967 has the prep. ἐκ changed to ἐν, so perhaps 967 read ἐν as ἐν which led to the change in person of the vb.

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.

*ἐκ-χ-θεσιν 1:5 Thack. §7.9. ἀν-ν-αγγελιτή 2:5

οἰκείως-οις 3:5
καθε-τρος 3:46 Thack. §6.22.
χερουμπιν-ν 3:55 Thack. §4., p. 33.
ἵθω-ἵθον 10:8
οὐθ-θ-είς 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.

Ἰωάκηνημ 1:1, 2

22Neuter plural subjects with a plural verb occur in 3:7, 94(27); 4:9(12)bis; 6:27(28); 7:3, 8, 17; 8:4. Singular verbs occur in 2:5, 28, 29(2), 30; 5:3; 4:19(22), 30(33); 7:4, 5, 25; 8:8, 19; 9:12(2), 13; 11:37; 12: 7.

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

*τοιν βασιλέα 1:2 Hamm, I-II, p. 81.
*της Ιουδαίας 1:2
εἰς +τὴν 1:2
τῷ τῶν 1:9 Hamm, I-II, p. 95.
βασιλέα +τὸν 1:18 Hamm, I-II, p. 125.
*τῷ Δαν. 1:19 967=Th Hamm, I-II, p. 127.
(τῷ) Αναν. 1:19
[τοις] 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 3:48; 9:1 and DJD, I, p. 150.
(ὁ) βασιλεὺς 2:10

*καὶ +τῷ 2:17 Hamm, I-II, p. 197.

*Μετεξετασθαὶ +τῷ cj. by Hamm, I-II, p. 197.


*[καὶ] τὰ e.τ. φωτί 2:22 S. discussion of 2:22 in III.


*[τῆς] Βασμεωνίους 2:24

*δὲ >δὲ 2:27 Hamm, I-II, p. 221.

«τούς» δισταχ. 2:34 Hamm, I-II, p. 133.

*[τῆς] ισχοῖν 2:37 S. Hamm, I-II, p. 137, but reference to 2:37 has been omitted.

*[τῆς] τωμῆν 2:37

*[τῆς] δόξαν 2:37

*[τῶν] Ισθήνων 2:38 Hamm, I-II, p. 133.

>τῆς

*[τῶν] χαλκῶν 2:45

*[τῶν] άργυρῶν 2:45

*[τῶν] χρυσῶν 2:45

πάντων >τῶν 2:48 haplog.


>δ> 3:2 Hamm, III-IV, p. 147.

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

«ό» θεός 3:17

* +ό =Syh Hamm, III-IV, p. 215.

Μισ. +τῶν 3:13

περὶ>τῶν 3:49 S. 3:23.

αὐτῶν +τὸ 3:50 Hamm, III-IV, p.331.


*>τοῦ 3:57 Hamm, III-IV, p. 351.

εὐλογ. +τὰ 3:81

ύμνετε καὶ + τὰ 3:81

ἐστιν>αν +ό 4:34(37) S. 2:47.

«ό» Νεβου. 4:34c Cf. Hamm, III-IV, p. 525.

πατρός σου >τοῦ 5:12

*>τῶν 6:1(2) S. Geissen, p. 161.

>θ> 7:1 Omitted in 967 due to the previous reading of a rel. pro. (Δανυλά+δός Δανυλός).

*>>τῶν 7:22 S. 7:9, 13.
>αί 7:27
*[ό] ἰσχυρός 9:4 OG tends to omit articles in a series.
*καὶ [ό?] φοβερός 9:4
παῖδος >τοῦ 9:11
κυρίον +τοῦ 9:13 967 =Th.
ἀφαιρέθ. ἦ 9:27
>*τῷ 10:1
στρατηγὸν >τοῦ 10:13
τῶν τῷ 11:35
*αὐτῇ +ό 11:42 Cf. Th and MT. More likely that the art. was dropped later.
*ἀς +οί 12:3 88-Syh=MT, but the article might have been added because it is better Greek.
*>οί 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.

*ἐαυτόν 1:20, 2:17, 6:10(11); 7:1; 11:7
*ἐαυτών 3:21, 95(28)
[ἐαυτοὺς 11:35

II.13. Miscellaneous Nouns 24x
Included below are variants in nouns that are primarily differences in case.

πετεινῶν πετηνῶν 2:38
*χαλκῆς χαλκοῦ 2:39 Hamm, I-II, p. 255.
αινετῶν αἰνετός 3:26 S. 3:55.
*τ. δούλων: τῶν δούλων 3:33 967=88
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II. 14. Verbs

II. 14.i. 1st and 2nd Aorist

Thack. §17.1, 2. BDF §81 3x

*εἶπον· εἶπαν 3:9; 6:12a.
εἶπαν εἶπον 3:16.
*ἐνέτυχο-α-ν 6:12(13) Thack. §17.2.

II. 14.ii. Verbs Terminating in ὀσάν

Thack. §17.2; Mayser, I.2., pp. 83-84. 3x

ἐνεβάλοσαν ἐνέβαλον 3:22
ἐνεβάλοσαν ἐνέβαλον 3:46
*ἐξῆλθον· ἐξῆλθοσαν 5 preface

II. 14.iii. The Temporal Augment

Thack. §16.4-6; BDF §67, 69. 20x

*ἐό-ω-ρακα 2:3, 10, 27, 29, 31, 34, 41, 45
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Παρην η-ν χλησεν 3:50 παρην ο' χλησαν 6:23(24) superscript by 1 corr.
*ε-η-ολόγουν 3:51
οκουν οικουν 4:8(11)
*έξε-η-ρήμωσας 4:19(22)
*αφήρηται· αφείρηται 4:28(31)
*άπο-ε-καταστάθη 4:33(36) S. vs. 34b.
εώ-ο-δώθη 8:12 S. 3:25.
*παρο-ο-ξυνθήσεται 11:10
συν(ε)τελεσθή 11:36 Incorrectly added ε on a subjunctive.

Π.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.

*οιεν οιη 2:11 Thack. §17.12.
Δυνήσθη Δύνασαι 2:26 967=Th Hamm, I-II, p. 219.
*ἐ(υ)στήκει 2:31 Thack. §16.5
*τιμήθηναι· τιμήντα 2:45 Hamm, I-II, p. 267
προσκόνησαν· προσκονόσαν 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)
πονηροτάτω-η- 3:32
πληθο-η-ναι 3:36 Thack. §6.46.2.
εὐλογετε-ο- 3:64 Cf. 3:74.
ἐλπίσαντας· ἐλπὶζοντας 3:95(28) Hamm, III-IV, p. 409.
ἐφωτιζον· ἐφωτισαν 4:8(11)
ήκοιοσ· ἡκούσθη 4:28(31) Hamm, III-IV, p. 479.
*δήσουσιν· δήσωσιν 4:29(32) Future forms in context.
ἐπέγραψα· ἔ-ν 5 Preface
ἐπέσευσ-δ-εν 5:6 967 harmonized to previous imperfect.
*ἐξήρται· ἔξηρθη 5:30 Geissen, p. 159.
ἐστησε-α-(ν) 6:10(11), 9:12
*συνιστά(νο)μουν 7:21 Thack. §23.3.
ἐδωκε-α- 7:27
*ἡγοῦκ·-σ-αμεν 9:15 Geissen, p. 205.
III. Minuses, Pluses, Substitutions, Transpositions

1:1

Iωσικ(ε)μ τῆς Ἰουδαίας 2,3,1

1:2

*ἀπήνεγκεν ἀπενέγκας Hamm, I-II, p. 83.
*Βαφυλονίαν ἄνακ. Depends on vb. vs. part. above.
*ἀπηρείσατο ἀντί Hamm, I-II, p. 85; Blud., p. 54.

1:3

*ἀγαγέιν ἀντί Hamm, I-II, p. 85.

1:4

*γραμματικός > καὶ συνετοῦς doub. Hamm, I-II, p. 87.
>δόστε A decision here is quite difficult. Hamm. (I-II, p. 87) suggests it is a hexaplaric addition to render the δ (see also 1:12), but one would expect this more frequently. δόστε 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. δόστε is witnessed by all three major mss. in 2:35 and does not appear in Th at all. There are no compelling reasons why δόστε 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 οἶκου 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.

Although ἐκ τοῦ οἶκου 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.

*ὑμέραν >καὶ Hamm, I-II, p. 89.
*καὶ [ἀπὸ] τοῦ οἶκου Hamm, I-II, p. 89.
*στήναι: στήσαι =88 vs. cj. by Katz, s. Zieg. pp., 93-94.

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

1:7

1:8
*ἀλισγηθῆ: ἀλ(ε)ἰσθῆ 88-Syh=Th Munnich, "Origène," pp. 187-188, points out that OG stems from ἀλίξω as a military metaphor and that Daniel did not want to be "recruited" into the king’s service. See also CH 5.11. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 92.

1:9
*Δανιὴλ +εῖς Hamm, I-II, p. 95.

1:10
*πόσιν >ὑμῶν Hamm, I-II, p. 97.
*νανίας: νεανίσκοις 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.
*αλλογενῶν >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
*ὀσπρίων σπορίμων Hamm, I-II, pp. 103, 105.
1:13

1:15
*αὐτῶν >καλή Hamm, I-II, p. 111

1:16
 ἦν Ἀβιεσδριν ἐδοκείμασεν err. Based on 1:11 we should emend to Σολομόρ(ος). Hamm, I-II, p. 113.
*ἀντεδίδοι >αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν Hamm, I-II, pp. 113, 115.

1:17
σύνεσιν + φρονήσεως (καὶ φρόνησιν 88-Syh) Hamm, I-II, p. 117.
>τέχνη
*Δανιὴ >ἐδωκε Hamm, I-II, p. 121.
*διρήματι =Tert. +καὶ δράματι 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. >καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Hamm, I-II, pp. 121, 123.

1:18
*[εἰς]ήχησαν S. previous.
*άπο ὑπὸ Hamm, I-II, p. 123.


1:19
*ἔστησαν ἥσαν =88-Syh, vs. Zieg. cj., p. 97.

1:20
(καὶ) κατέλοιπαν Apodictic 7 is untranslated. Hamm, I-II, p. 127; Charles, p. 8.
*cj. >σοφωτέρους Hamm, I-II, p. 129.
*ὑπὲρ τοὺς σοφιστὰς ύπερφέροντας τῶν σοφιστῶν Hamm, I-II, p. 129.
1:21

*καὶ >τοῦς 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 σοφοὺς παρὰ πάντας τοὺς αὐτοῦ Hamm, I-II, p. 137.

*>τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ καὶ εν doub. Hamm, I-II, p. 137.

*τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ: τῇ ἐαυτοῦ βασιλ. Pre-positive attributive.

2:1

*ἐτει τῷ δευτέρῳ δωδεκάτῳ ἔτει 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

*τὸν βασιλέα: αὐτὸν Hamm, I-II, p. 143.

*ἐνυπνίων: ὄπνῳ Hamm, I-II, p. 145.

*>αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ ὄπνος 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 (ἐνυπνίων: ὄπνω) it could easily have been concluded that 967
was missing this portion due to homiotel.

2:2

eἰσενεχθῆναι: καλέσαι =Th Hamm, I-II, p. 147.

2:3

ἐπιγνῶναι >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
5.111.

2:4

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

24 McCrystall, p. 275.
Κύριε βασιλέω trans.

ήμεις >σοι

2:5

*δό λόγος ἀπ' ἐμοὶ ἀπέστη as original. S. CH 5.III.25


2:7
*καλ ὁ στὶ 2:7 Hamm, I-II, p. 93.

2:8
*>οἶδα ὑπο Hamm, I-II, p. 161.

*>ὑμεῖς =Th

*>καθάπερ ἐφόρκατε ὑπ’ ἀπέστη ἀπ’ ἐμοὶ τὸ πράγμα 

*καθάπερ ὁ στὶ προστέτομα >οὕτως ἦσσα 

2:9

*ἐν ὑπ’ ἀπόδωσέ μοι OG employs ἀπόδωσε as a favourite equivalent for the ha. of ὑπ’ (s. 2:1-10 in CH 5). 967 has a later addition. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 165.


*>σύγκρισιν κρίσιν S. 2:5.

*>τὸ ὄραμα εὕρητε 3,1,2 Zieg.’s cj. of ὄραμα correct.

*>μοι Hamm, I-II, p. 169.

25Aemmelacus, “ΟΠ,” p. 123, also notes that "διότι is often corrected to ὑπ’ in the later transmission of the text." S. 3:29(96) for another example of the correction.
2:10
[τής] γῆς haplog.
*ὁ & Hamm, I-II, p. 173.
σὺ >ἐρωτᾶς
*[πάς] δυνάστῃς Hamm, I-II, p. 175.
toitōto τούτο τό Hamm, I-II, p. 177, suggests 967 is an error, but s. the discussion of this variant in CH 5.III.
*ἐπερωτῶ· ἐρωτᾶ See prior retention of vb. above. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 177.

2:11
δὲν ξητεῖς βασιλεύ· δὲν ξητεῖ ὁ βασιλεύς Hamm, I-II, p. 177.
*ταῦτα >τῷ βασιλεί Hamm, I-II, p. 181.

2:12
*[στυγνός· σύννομος =Syh
*[γενόμενος καί περίλυμος: 2,3,1 =Syh
*[σοφοῦς· σοφιστάς Hamm, I-II, p. 185.

2:13
ἐξήπηθη δὲ· καὶ ἔξη Hamm, I-II, p. 187.

2:14
*γνώμην γνώσιν Hamm, I-II, p. 189.
>ἡν εἰσέν OG employs the verb more frequently by ratio than any book of the LXX (21x). 26 It is more likely that 967 has omitted it by conformity to MT. Cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 191.

προσέταξεν προσέταγη Ἄδω appears also in 2:13; 3:26(93)δις, 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 ἔξερχομαι, also 5:5) while in 5:2, 3 it uses ἤνεχθη for both. προσέταξεν appears for ἄνε 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
άπελθὼν Δανηλ: trans.
*[e]αύτου +ὑπεδείξεν ἐκαστα Hamm, I-II, pp. 197, 199.
συνεςει αἴροις +αύτοῦ
>ὑπεδείξε πάντα trans. to above

2:19
Z=88-Syh- τότε τ. Δαν. ἐν ὁράμ. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτί τὸ μυστ. τοῦ βασ. ἐξεφάνη
967- τότε το ὁμοντ. το βασ. τ. Δαν. ἐδηλώθη τῇ νυκτί ἐν ὁράμ. τὸ πράγμα ἐξεφάνη
* cj.- τότε τ. Δαν. τῇ νυκτί ἐν ὁράμ. τὸ πράγμα ἐξεφάνη
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 ἐξεφάνη as well as between πράγμα and μυστήριον το βασιλ. The difference between my cj. and Hamm is in the evaluation of μυστήριον. Although μυστήριον is the expected equivalent for ΠΠΠΠ because it renders it 7/7 elsewhere, there would be no reasonable explanation for the origin of πράγμα unless it is OG.
[ἐκφηνήσας cf. Hamm, I-II, p. 203 who prefers 967 on the basis that it is more free.

2:20
εἰς τὸν αἰώνα: ἀπὸ αἰῶνος ἦς 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.
σοφοὶς σοφίαν trans.

2:22
{kai} ἀνακαλ.
σκοτεινά >καὶ =Th
κατάλυσις· καταλύει

The Aramaic reads: פְּרֶשׁ פְּרֶשׁ אֲלֵי.

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 בְּשִׁיר (Th=τὸ φῶς μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστι, 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, homoiotele?), 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’ αὐτῶν 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
*εἰσῆγαγεν(ν) τὸν Δαιν. 2,3,1
κ. (οὗτος) εἶπεν 88-Syh=Th ἐκ· ἀπό 88=Th S. 5:10.

2:26
ἀποκρ. >δὲ Hamm, I-II, p. 219.
*επικαλ. >δὲ
*σύγκρισιν κρίσιν S. 2:5.
2:27
>το 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.
*δὲ ἐδήλωσε· καὶ ἐδήλ. 88-Syh reads Τ for І Hamm, I-II, p. 227.

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

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

2:30
*μυστήριον +μοι Hamm, I-II, p. 233.
*ἐξεφάνη· ἀπεκαλύφθη =Th Hamm, I-II, p. 233.

2:31
καὶ >ἡν S. vs. 32.

2:32
*κεφαλή >ἀντίς Hamm, I-II, p.235.

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

2:34
*καὶ ἔδω· ρακάς S. vss. 41, 43 where OG adds the conj.
*κατήλεσεν· κατηλόσεν Hamm, I-II, pp. 237, 239.
2:35
edες αυτῶν· ἐν αὐτοῖς Hamm, I-II, p. 243.
ed(eiç) ὄρος 88-Syh=Th

2:37
βασιλεύο>βασιλεύς haplog.
*σοι ἔδωκεν Hamm, I-II, p. 245.
*>τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ doub.
>ἔδωκεν 88-Syh =MT

2:38
ὑπὸ eιç Hamm, I-II, p. 249.
*ἡ κεφαλὴ ἡ χρυσὴ 1,4,2

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

2:40
*>τετάρτη
*δαμάζων πρίζων Hamm, I-II, p. 257.

2:41
*διστράκτην ou κεραμικὸ μέρος δὲ τι σιδήρου(ν): 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."
*ἔσται +καὶ This variant and the following are omitted by homoiotel. in 88.
*τὴς ρίζης τῆς σιδηράς: 1,4,2
*ἀναμεμειγμένον (ἀμα) συνμεμιγμένω επτ. μενον 88=Th Hamm, I-II, p. 263.
2:42
*καὶ οἱ δάκτυλοι ἀστράκινον Hamm, I-II, p. 263.

2:43
*ἀνάμμεμβρυμένον (ἄμα) ταραμμεμμένω επτ. μεν ον S. 2:41
>δὲ Hamm, I-II, p. 265.
σιδηρος +οὖ Later interpretive error?

2:45
*τὸ ἀστρακον τὸν σίδηρον trans. and coordinate with καὶ The decision is difficult to make, but OG has the order σίδ.-οστ. in vss. 33, 34, 41, 43.
ἀργυρον καὶ [τὸν] χρυσὸν 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.
προσεκόνησε(ν) τῷ Δαν. 2,3,1 Hamm, I-II, p. 275.
*ποιήσαι ἐπιτελέσαι 88-Syh has changed the unusual reading of OG.

2:47
>ὕμων θεὸς homoiocarc.
θεῶν καὶ +κόριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ Scribal flourish?

2:48
δωρεὰς +αὐτῷ

2:49
τῆς +βασιλείας doubt?

3:1

\(^{28}\) See Talshir, "Linguistic," pp. 311-313; Charles, p. 60.
>βασιλεὺς S. 3:2; 6:1(2); 11:1, but here the text is part of an OG plus.

*έπι θῆς γῆς Hamm, III-IV, pp. 131, 133; cf. Jahn, p. 26; Char., p. 60.

*Aἴθιοπ + καὶ Hamm, III-IV, pp. 133, 135.

ἐξ ἀλώδεκα 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>σατράπης στρατηγοῦς trans. after διουκτᾶς and insert καὶ. Retain 88-Syh order, but include the conj. Hamm, III-IV, p. 143.

ἡν ἢς S. 3:5, 7, 14, 18; cf. 1:5, 8; 3:12, 15, 27; 4:28(31).

*ἐστις > ἐστίμησαν 88-Syh harmonize to 3:1, 5, 7, 12, 14, 18.

3:3

*+τότε συνήχθησαν S. also 3:94(27); 6:23(24). Blud., p. 58; Mont., p. 201; Hamm, III-IV, p. 147.

*καὶ ἤστη, οἱ προφητ. 3,4,1,2 =Syh

3:4

πορευόμενον ἀπαγγέλλω The secondary character of 967 is betrayed by the change in voice and number. S. also the discussion of ἀπηγγέλλω in CH 5.III.iii.

*καὶ χώρα ἂν doub. Blud., p. 49; Jahn, p. 29

3:5

*σύργυρος>καὶ Later harmonization to Th.

*συμβολήσ>καὶ

*μαλακτικοῦ+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

*>τίνι κατέμενην S. 3:17, 21.

3:7

*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.
μουσικ. +γένους doubt.

3:11

3:13
*οἱ ἀνθρώποι ἤχησαν 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.
αὐτοίς >διὰ τί
Αβεδ. + ἐπὶ ἀληθείας

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

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

3:17
οὐρανοίς >εῖς S. 4:34c.

3:19
*HELLIOBEITHE + ἐπὶ αὐτούς S. 3:20, 23.
3:20
τὸν Σεδ. Μ. Αβεδ.: τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἀζαρίαν  The decision here is difficult. 967 has a more 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 accommodate the insertion of the additions to the chapter. 967's reading emphasizes Ἀζαρίαν which ties it to the insertion. Cf. Hamm, III-IV, p. 225.

3:21
*ἐνεβλήθησαν  OG prefers compounds.

3:23
>οὖν Hamm, III-IV, p. 235.
ἐξελθοῦσα· ἐκκοεῖσα 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
*προσέταξεν· 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 ὁδοὶ σου εὖθ. 4,1,2,3=Th Hamm, III-IV, p. 251.
ἀληθινοὶ· ἀλῆθειαι Hamm, III-IV, p. 253.

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

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

3:31
αληθιναι: αληθειαι S. 3:27
+και

3:32
ἐχθιστων +και Hamm, III-IV, p. 271.

3:34
σου την διαθ. 2.3.1 =Th

3:35
*[δια] ἴσος(α)κ OG tends not to repeat prep.
ἀγιόν λαόν

3:36
*ἀέγον +πολύ =88-Syh S. Hamm, III-IV, pp., 281-284.
*τοῦ οὐρ. +τῷ πλήθει =88-Syh

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

3:39

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

3:41
*καρδια +ἡμῶν =88-Syh

3:42
ἡμῶν +έλεος Hamm, III-IV, p. 307.

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

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

3:46
>μὲν
*>αὐτοὺς Hamm, III-IV, p. 321.
>ὁςαν
*>φτιμπύον καὶ πίσσαν: 3,2,1 Hamm, III-IV, p. 325, 327.

3:51
ἀναλαβ. δὲ· τότε =Th

3:52
όνομα +σου

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

3:55
eὐλογητός· εὐλογημένος=Th
>καὶ αἰνετός
deδοξασμένος· ὑπερυψωμένος S. 3:26, 52, 54.

3:58
*>κορίου S. 3:61, 84.

3:61
*>κορίου 3:59, 84.


3:69

83
πάγων καὶ ψύχας· πάγη· κ. ψύχη· Hamm, III-IV, p. 361.

3:70


3:78 + Vss. 62-63

3:81
tetra +καὶ τὰ κτήνη· Conflation, Hamm, III-IV, p. 371.

3:88

*ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἑλυτρώσατο ἡμᾶς· 4,5,1,2,3 88-Syh=Th

3:90

*σεβόμενοι· τὸν κύριον =88-Syh Hamm, III-IV, p. 383, om. art.

>ομνεῖτε err.

3:92(25)

*δρῦς· θεωρῶ· 88-Syh=Th

3:95(28)

Μεία. +καὶ· S. 2:49, 3:12, 13, 14, 16, 93(26), 97(30).

>ὁλλ' >ἡ· S. 6:12(13); 10:21.

3:96(29)

*φυλακίσι κ. >πάσα· OG tends to omit repeated elements.

κύριον· τὸν Hamm, III-IV, p. 415

*οἰκία· οὐσία· 88-Syh=MT Hamm, III-IV, p. 417.

4:9(12)

*ἐν σωτήρ τὰ πετεινά· τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· 3,4,5,6,1,2 Hamm, III-IV, p. 437

*ἐνδοσος. +τὰς νοσσιάς· ἐσωτήρ Hamm, III-IV, p. 437.

4:8(11)

μεγάλη· +καὶ· Hamm, III-IV, p. 441.

4:10(13)

μου· +καὶ· S. καὶ ίδιού· 4:7(10); 7:2, 13, 15.

*ἀπεστάλη· ἐν ἀγχώ· 2,3,1 Cf. Hamm, III-IV, p. 443.
4:11(14)
*εἰπεν >αὐτῷ

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

4:15(18)
κρινόντων +αὐτῷ

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

4:19(22)
*καρδία +ἐν? S. Th 4:34(37); Sir. 48:18, 2 Macc. 1:28; 3 Macc.2:17.
*ἀφθη- ὑψώθη 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 οἱκ. βασιλ. μου ἐν ἰσχ. 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)
συντελείας =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

4:30a

4:33(36)
ἐκείνῳ τῷ καυρῷ ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρῃ S. 3:7, 8. (καυρός for ἱλιονδρός) 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 +καί
χώραν >μου
εῖς >τὸν θεόν τοῦ err.
*καταλημ. λαλ. τι λαλήσωσιν Hamm, III-IV, p. 513.

4:34b
*γλωσσαῖς >πάσαις Hamm, III-IV, pp. 517, 519.
*χώρας >ἐν =88

4:34c
βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ >βασιλείαν err.

Daniel 5 Preface
*θεοὺς >τὸν ἑθνὸν
αὐτῆ τῇ trans. Geissen, p. 69.

5:6
*ἡλιοφωτὴν >καὶ φόβοι The evaluation of this variant depends on several factors. If 967 is correct, then the OG may render ἤλιον φόβοι 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 φοβηθείς τρόμου λαβόντος αὐτόν 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 ἤλιον φόβοι. 

συνετούροι +αὐτοῦ S. Geissen, p. 56.
καὶ ἡφασμακώς καὶ Χαλδαίως καὶ homoiotel.

*γραφής* καὶ εἰσεπ. ε. θεω. ἰδεῖν 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>ἀνήρ 88-Syh=MT

5:13
*εἰσήχθη· εἰσηνέχθη 88-Syh=Th

5:29
βασιλεὺς + Βασίλασσα

5:30
βασιλεύον + αὐτοῦ Geissen, p. 56.

5:31(6:1)
*Ἄρτας' ἰδέης S. 9:1.
*Μήδων + βασιλεὺς S. Syhg.

6:5(6)
οὐκ ἡξίωσεν· οὐ καταξίωσε S. 6:7, 12.

6:10(11)
*ἐποίητ&; ἐτι=Syh Improbable addition.

6:12(13)
οὕτωι οἱ ἄνθ. 2,3,1 = MT
*οὐ&; οὔτι Geissen, p. 171.

6:14(15)
αὐτοῦ· αὐτῶν
+ὁ βασιλεὺς
*ἐφοβήθη· ἐβοήθη=88-Syh, vs. cj. by Katz, s. Zieg., p. 161.
+ἔως
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)
*θεὸς· κύριος
>αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐναντίον homoiotel.
βασιλείς >καὶ

6:25(26)
+καὶ Δανιῆλ κατεστάθη ἐπὶ πατρίς 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 Δανιῆλ homoiotel.

6:28(29)
*tó γένος· τοὺς πατέρας =Syhmg S. Geissen, p. 191.
αὐτοῦ >καὶ Δαν. . . βασίλ. Δαρείου S. 6:25.

7:7
cαταπατοῦν +καὶ =MT, Th

7:8
>καὶ ἰδου ἐν κ. . . κέρασιν αὐτοῦ homoiotel.
*τ. κεφ. τ. πρῶτων: 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 καιροῦ: trans. =Iust. Both ἡμι and ἦμι are translated by καιρός, 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
*ὡς νιῶς ἀνθρ. ἠρχετο: 4,1,2,3
αὐτῶν· αὐτῷ S. above.

7:14

7:19
dιαφ(θ)έλοντος =88-Syh, vs. cj. by Zieg., p. 172. S. Jeans. p. 94.

7:20
ἐνὸς τοῦ (+ἄλλου τοῦ 88-Syh) +λαλοῦντος 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 >καιροῦ καὶ homoiotel.
>ἐως = Iust., Dial.32:3, Th S. Roca-Puig, p. 22.
ἡμίςους· ἡμίσου =Th

7:26
>καθίσεται homoiotel.

7:27
τ. βασιλ. καὶ τ. ἐξου. trans.
αὐτῶν· παντῶν

8:5
>καὶ ὦχ ἠπετεῖ τῆς γῆς homoiotel.
*>αὐτοῦ 88-Syh = MT.
8:6
*πρὸς· ἐν
πρὸς· ἐπ᾽ 967 may have read Τιμία. S. Jeans., p. 52.

8:7
*ἰσχύς· ἐν τῷ κρίῳ· 2,3,4,1
ἐσπάραξεν· ἐρραξέω· ἐσπαρ. is (1-4), while ἔρρ. (2-8) is also in 8:10, 11 (8:11=Th).

8:13
*ἑτερος· τῷ φελμοντι τῷ λαλοντι 88-Syh=MT, Th
ἔρημωσεως· ἐρημωθησεται  S. Geissen, p. 51.

8:14
καθα· -ε· -ρι· -στησεται  Contrary to Geissen, p. 129, 967 probably does reflect a variant reading from καθαρεῦω whereas 88=Th.

9:1
οἱ· ὅσοι

9:2
*τοῖς βιβλίοις· 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. σποδῷ· κ. ἐν σπο· κ. σάκ.  967's order is against MT, but it is also an unusual order. The prep. was a later add.

9:4
ιδού κύριε trans.
+ὁ κύριος

9:5
*ἡδικήσωμεν· ἡσεβήσωμεν· trans. A decision is impossible. Both Greek words are HL in OG. [Πατρι] is a HL in Daniel. [ἐθέσατο] as a vb. is 4x (9:15; 11:32; 12:10) and as an adj. 2x (12:10). 967 by default.
*ἀνάστημεν κ. παρέβημεν trans. ἀφίστημι is one of OG’s favourite words (12x)\textsuperscript{31} and is used to translate both [רֶשֶׁה] (9:9) and רֶשֶׁה (9:11; 11:31; 12:11) in the only other places where they occur. παραβαίνω is a HL in the book, so as in the above there is no way to decide. 967 by default.
+καὶ παρῆλθαμεν

9:6
*βασιλεὺς >ἡμῶν 88-Syh =MT, Th

9:7
*Ἰουδα >καὶ

9:11
έννενεγραμμένος Compound not found in LXX.

9:12
*ἐπογ. ἐφ ἡμᾶς OG omits as unnecessary.

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

9:14
*>ἡμῶν
πάντας ὁ [σο] ὅσα is quite common in OG (11x).

9:16
θυμός σου +ἅψ’ ἡμῶν Add. vs. MT, Th. Not from Vorlage, s. Geissen, p. 205, but a later addition for clarification.
*ἀψίου >σου
>καὶ εν τ. ἄγν. τ. πατ. ἡμῶν homoiotel.

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

\textsuperscript{31}See CH 4.Π.2.
9:18
[έπ]άκουσόν
>μου Add. vs. MT, Th.
*κύριε +έλησον ἐπάκουσσον τοῦ λαοῦ σου δέσποτα Geissen, p. 209. Presumably, this was omitted from 88-Syh through homoiotel.
+κύριε doub. to δέσποτα

9:19

9:20 Very poor shape in 967.
>μου καὶ τάς ἀμαρτίας homoiotel.

9:21
λαλοῦντός «έμου trans. 967=MT, Th. S. 10:12.

9:24
*ἐβδομάδες>ἐκρίθησαν
*λαόν σου +ἐκρίθησαν
πόλιν +σου =MT

9:25
+ἡ Beginning of vs.
*ἀποκρίθηςαν διανοηθήνατι=Syr-Mg. Has 967 harmonized to earlier appearance of διανοηθήνατι or does 88-Syh betray Th influence? Th influence is fairly extensive in 967 and in OG as well. Finally, OG probably read בָּשָׁם (s. also 11:24, 25).

9:26 Very poor shape in 967
*μετὰ +τάς
*βασιλείας βασιλείας There is no Vorlage, but a king of the nations makes better sense. αὐτοκρατήρει; 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 πολλ. 3,4,1,2 88-Syh=MT, Th
*μετὰ +ἐτῶν
10:1
*ἐνιαυτῷ· ἔτει    S. Giessen, p. 50.
*ἐξεῖχθη    ἐδὸθη    ἐξεῖχθη 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 ἐνὶ οὐκ ΟΓ employs ἐκφοινω or ἀνακαλύπτω (2:19, 22, 28, 29, 30, 47). Also OG uses compounds of δεικνύω in 17 other places. 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 5.11). 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 ἐκείναις: 3,1,2    88-Syh=MT
*τρεῖς ἐβδομάδας    S. 10:3, below.

10:3
*ἀρτον· ἄρτων    OG makes MT explicit.
*κρέας >καί
*τοῦ συντελ. με· ἐγώ? συντελέσω    88-Syh=MT
*cj.    >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 ἐβδομα ). 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.
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10:5
[εἰδον This is Geissen's reconstruction. However, the previous li. of the ms. would read ἤρα [τ]οις οφθ ἀλμούς μου καὶ and ιδον 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 εἰδον. Therefore, we suggest that either μον or καὶ 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. >μον OG often omits suf.
*βυσσίνῳ (2nd): χροσίον 88-Syh harmon. to earlier.
*φος· φος =88-Syh, vs. cj. by Katz, s. Zieg., p. 193.

10:6

10:7
>οὐκ Om. to give reason for the fear.
*ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς αὐτοῖς 88-Syh=Th, MT

10:8
*καὶ ἐγὼ κἀγὼ Crasis. Thack. §9.11.
*οὐκ ἐ<γ>κατελείφη: οὐ κατελείφη ἐπεστράφη ἀποστραφέν S. 10:16.

10:9
*>ως cj. from Schleusner, s. Zieg., p. 195. 88-Syh have οὐκ.
μον +καὶ S. Geissen, p. 231.

10:10
χειρ(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
*ἐμε S. 9:21.
*τὸ πρόσωπόν τὴν διάνοιαν Like Th (15/15), OG (8/10, 5x OG=0) usually employs καρδία (s. also 11:27) as a SE for בּלָל, בּלָל. 967 offers the better rendering here.

κυρίου τ. θεοῦ: 2,1,3

*σον +καί Add. vs. MT, Th Cf. Geissen, p. 233.


10:14 ὥτι

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

10:16 κυριε + 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 ρασίς. κε would allow for 6-7 letters, so καί is probably present in 967.

10:17 Almost missing.

10:18 Most is missing.

10:19 ὁγίανε +καί S. Geissen, p. 62.

*λαλή. αὐτ. μετ' ἐμοῦ: 2,3,4,1 S. 10:15.
10:21
μάλα +καὶ
ὑποδείξω· δείξαι leg. ε. Later error based on misunderstanding of the person. OG
prefers the compound (12x). S. 10:1.

οὖν >ἡ S. Hamm, II-IV, p. 413.
*cj. >ὁ ἄγγελος Either this reading or the following + is OG. In favour of ἄγγελος
is the similar use in 12:1. However, στρατηγὸς renders πῆς 3/4 in this chapter (10:13,
20[2]; cf. once in 10:13, but it may be Th. Also employed in 3:2), so ὁ στρατηγὸς ὁ
dευνατός has a strong claim to being original, whereas ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ ἐστώς ἐπὶ τῶν
υἱῶν τοῦ λαοῦ is a harmonizing addition from 12:1.33 ὁ ἄγγελος 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.

*+ὁ στρατηγὸς ὁ δυνατός This reading has a strong claim as OG, but should perhaps
be bracketed in order to indicate that there is some doubt.
+ὁ ἐστώς ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ λαοῦ

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

11:2 Most is missing.
>παντὶ βασιλεῖ ἐλλήνων κ. στήσεται homoiot.

11:3 Most is missing.

11:4
tοῦ οὖρανοῦ· τῆς γῆς S. 7:2; 8:8.

11:5
*βασιλεὺς· βασιλεῖαν =88-Syh vs. cj. by Katz. S. Zieg., p. 199.

11:6
εἰς ἐξελεύσεται 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.
11:7
έσωτόν;? Only auto is extant.
δύναιμαν· ἐνέργειαν;? Only last 4 letters of ἐνέργειαν are extant S. 3:20 for same equivalent; 3:61; 6:23(24).

11:10
Επεσελήνουστρέψει Geissen, p. 251.

11:11
Αλγύπτου >καὶ πολεμήσει

11:13
αὐτῆν +ἡ Introduces ἐν' αὐτῆν (which Zieg., p. 201, has in brackets) as a variant to the previous ἐλαβὲν αὐτῆν. S. 10:13.
*cj. >ἐν' αὐτῆν doubt.

11:15
>οὖ =88-Syh, vs. Mont., p. 440, s. Zieg., p. 202, but the cj. is no doubt correct.

11:17
αὐτῇ-δὲ-ν Difficult to know.

11:18

11:23
διᾶγοστιγρὶ διὰ γὰρ τῷ S. Th.

11:24
μάτην ἐμαρτιάν S. Geissen, p. 257.

11:25
Αλγύπτου >ἐν ὄχλῳ πολλῷ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Αλγύπτου homoiotel.
Geissen, p. 259, suggests the add. is a corruption from παροργισθήσεται (s. 11:11) which was a variant to ἐρεθ. ὀχλῳ +πολλῷ καὶ. From the portion om. by homoioi.tel.

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

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

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

11:37
>καὶ ἐν . . . προνοηθῇ homoioi.tel.? There are obvious textual problems for vss. 37-42, so it is difficult to judge these omissions and the plus.
>δὲi Due to previous om.
ὑψωθήσεται +καὶ θυμωθήσεται? ἐπ' αὐτοὺς?

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

11:41 om. in 967, homoioare.?

11:45
*τὴν +τιμήν. 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· ὡ ὡ κύριε Later interpolation.
μοι +ποιήσεις (ποιήσεις) Dependent upon previous.
12:8
*Tíveq τί \ Syh (88=Tíνος by error) exhibits correction for grammatical agreement.

12:9
κατακεκαμμένα >καὶ ἐσφραγισμένα homoiotel.

12:10
>καὶ οὐ μὴ διανοηθῶσιν πάντες οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί homoiotel.

12:12
*καὶ ὅτι 88-Syh=MT
συνών-ξ-ει =88-Syh vs. cjr., 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
*ἀναπόσου ἀπόθου 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>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthographical</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>(168 accepted as original)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minuses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>(227)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>(98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minuses</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>(90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluses</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transpositions</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>(256)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The totals for the variants are then:

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

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

\(^{35}\) For example, see the important readings in 1:8, 13(2), 20(31); 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.\(^1\) 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."\(^2\) 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. Aejmelaeus, "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.

\(^2\) G. Marquis, "Lexical Equivalents," p. 407; a similar meaning is assumed by Tov and Wright, "Criteria," 149-187; and again by Wright in Difference, p. 29.
the original message." 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. 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.

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.II.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." Likewise, a generally literal translation will often exhibit good idiomatic renderings.

---

1E. 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.

2B.G. Wright also makes this distinction in "Quantitative Representation," p. 312.

3Nida, 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.


5It 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:

\[ \text{Th} = \text{"Ev ετοι χρόνον τῆς βασιλείας Ἰωακίμ βασιλέως Ιουδαίας,}\]

\[ \text{MT} = \text{Σάκχαρος Σαλώνας λελάβει τῆς ιουνταίας ἐτῶν χρόνον}\]

\[ \text{OG} = \text{"Εν οἴει τῆς βασιλείας Ἰωακίμ βασιλέως Ιουδαίας ἐτῶν χρόνον.}\]

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 לְמַלְכָּה, which consists of three morphemes: ל is an inseparable preposition (bound morpheme) that specifies the particular third year, i.e. of Jehoiakim’s reign. מַלְכָּה is the stem (free morpheme) meaning kingdom/reign. Finally, מַלְכָּה is also in the construct state with the attributive genitive בְּיוֹיִכַד, 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.

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

---

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 5.9

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.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.11

II. The Criteria for Literalism

In 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.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.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

---

9See also the review of McCrystall beginning p. 26, above.


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

12TCU, pp. 54-60.

13Wright, 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.\textsuperscript{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. Stereotyping\textsuperscript{15} describes the tendency of translators to use consistently the same Greek term to render a term in the HA,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{17} Marquis, on the other hand, regards any term rendered more than once by the same Greek word as a consistent translation.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{19} though statistics are always relative. The fact that one word is employed in three of the four places where the same

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{16}TCU, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{17}Sollamo, Semiprepositions, p. 13.


\textsuperscript{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. Tov has also demonstrated that the later translators consulted the Pentateuch as an aid to their work. 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.

Amongst other things, Olofsson has emphasized the significance of a SE being "doubly consistent" and the role of semantics in the translators choice.

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

---

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.


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.

Hebrew text as something different. 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. 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. 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." 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, so

\[25\text{Barr, "Typology," pp. 295-303.}\]

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

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

\[28\text{TCU, p. 57.}\]

\[29\text{Ibid., p. 58.}\]

\[30\text{B.G. Wright, "Evaluating 'Literalism,'" p. 314.}\]
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."[3]

Quantitative representation, on the other hand, "concerns the one-to-one representation (or lack of it) of multi-word Hebrew phrases, clauses and sentences."[4] 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.[5] On the other hand, his system does not take into account the subtle semantic aspects of translation which Barr examines.

Adherence to word order[6] 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.[7] 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.[8]

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.[9]

---

[4] Ibid., p. 56.
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.

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.

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, 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

---


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.

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. In many cases this attempt led to very unusual Greek usage, but the majority of these Hebraisms do not violate Greek grammar. 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. For example,

---

41 See also the recent article by Aeijmelaeus ("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). Aeijmelaeus ("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.\(^4^6\)

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."\(^4^7\) 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.\(^4^8\)

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

\(^4^6\)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 εἰδὼλῳ 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 σου after εἰκόνα 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 הַלְוָה (אֲלֵהִים) by ἐλεως is not without precedent in the LXX. In 3:12 and 3:18 OG employs ἐλεος when the three refer to Nebuchadnezer's "idol," whereas in 3:14 OG has ἔος 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 McCrystall, 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 can not 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. 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.

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

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

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 ס 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 ס and the other conjunctions are used as alternatives for רותי 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 Aeijmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," pp. 369-370. For an example of a thorough examination of the treatment of ס, 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 פָּ֖ק 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 פָּ֖ק 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.\textsuperscript{61} Indeed, it may be that there is no apparent reason for the change(s) other than stylistic variation, but often there is.\textsuperscript{62} 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 υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ) the article is omitted. The difference in the twelve cases is that the phrase is used in the context to modify "assembly" (i.e. συνάγωγή υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ).\textsuperscript{63}

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 μὴ (οὐκ ἔστι) by εἰδελθον. 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.\textsuperscript{64} 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

\textsuperscript{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.

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


\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{55}

A good illustration of the above principle can be provided from Galen Marquis' article on the consistency of lexical equivalents.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{57}

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 בָּשָׂל in section 3 of LXX Ezekiel. It is translated in five cases by διέπομαι and twice by διοδείνω, παραδέξομαι, ἐπάγω, and διάγω. Four of the seventeen equivalents for בָּשָׂל occur as singular translations: διαπορεύομαι, πορεύομαι, ἀποτροπαίεσθαι, and ἀφορισμος. The percentage of singular translations for בָּשָׂל 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

\textsuperscript{55}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.

\textsuperscript{66}Marquis, "Lexical Equivalents," pp. 405-424.

\textsuperscript{57}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-Söminen, "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: רות and מְלֹאך. רות appears 2x in Daniel, 1:9 and 9:4. OG's choice of מְלֹאכ 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 עִדְּמַך which offers a closer formal correspondence (Th uses עִדְּמַך on both occasions). מְלֹאכ is found 4x in Daniel. Once again, OG's choice of מְלֹאכ 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. 71 In 9:9 and 18 OG uses a word whose range of meaning is closer--עִדְּמַך. So, OG can use עִדְּמַך to translate both the words found in 1:9, but it does not use them for either in this particular context. Th's עִדְּמַך for מְלֹאכ is a SE (4/4).

Unfortunately, in this instance, we cannot discern an apparent motive to explain why the OG translator did not use עִדְּמַך 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 γοή in 2x (s. the dynamic use in 2:13), but Th never uses it. On the other hand, διψαμμός 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.

71 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.
Besides 9:9, 18, OG has ἔλεος 8x. In 9:3 it is a dynamic translation of מְנַעְתָּ (1/4) and 9:4=Th for ἐρυθή; 6x MT=0.75 Th uses ἔλεος only 8x in total: 1:9, 9:4=OG, and 9:20 for יִרְבוּ. 5x MT=0.76 OG employs τιμή only 3x (s. also 2:37 and 4:27[30] =Th) while in Th it is a SE (7/8) for πρέπει.77 However, we should note that in 11:38 OG employs the vb. τιμήσει for יִרְבוּ and gives a dynamic rendition of the clause. The non-translation of πρέπει in this vs. seems to be due to the fact that OG did not know the meaning of יִרְבּוּ and so offers a contextual translation (motivated by the connection of τιμή for πρέπει) with the vb. τιμήσει. The only other occurrence of יִרְבּוּ 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 מְנַעְתָּ with ἔλεος in 9:3 (1/4) while Th employs ἔλεος to render מְנַעְתָּ (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 מְנַעְתָּ, OG has δεήσις-9:17, 23 and προσευχαίς-9:18. In 9:20 OG translates מְנַעְתָּ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל with δεήμονος εν ταῖς προσευχαίς. 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 מְנַעְתָּ. Th uses δεήσις only 3x, but it is as a SE (3/4) for מְנַעְתָּ. The one vs. where Th employs an alternative is 9:18 where Th crosses semantic domains once again with the use of οἰκτίρμον.

In the above example we considered every occurrence of סְלָא, וְסָרָה, מְנַעְתָּ, יִרְבּוּ, ἔλεος, χάριν, τιμή, τιμήσει, δεήσις and οἰκτίρμον,
and their inter-relations. 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 $\text{ Erdogan }$ 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." We have to agree with his concerns about methodology; hence the present thesis. However, it is not the use of computers 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. 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

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

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 Aejmelaeus ('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, \textit{An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics}, Rev. ed. (London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), 195-209; J. Lyons, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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. \textit{TT is Primarily Synchronic.}

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


\textsuperscript{15}J. Lyons, ed., \textit{New Horizons in Linguistics}, (Middlesex: Penguin, 1970), p. 14. Descriptive and synchronic are often used interchangeably, but for our purposes it is useful to distinguish between them.
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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.\(^7\) 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.\(^8\)

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.\(^9\) 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

\(^7\)See our criticism of McCrystall, p. 26.


\(^9\)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

\begin{itemize}
\item[\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., 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, 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," 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," JSOT 59 (1993): 120 and the introduction to LEH, pp. VIII-XV.

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

\item[\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, Structural Semantics, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), pp. 40-41; E. Nida, 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 ἀφιεννύοντος (Dan. 1:3, passim) comes from combining the Greek translations for the individual Hebrew words בר and ודים. 

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 Hiph'il 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 יִשְׂרָאֵל untranslated not only in 7:15 where it occurs in the difficult phrase נַנְתָּ הָיוֹת, but also 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 renderings 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 ἀναλόγων in 11:21, 34 and ἀναλόγων in 11:32. Κληροδοσία only appears in three other passages in the LXX [Ps. 77(78):55; Ecc. 7:12(11); iMacc. 10:89], and never for λήμμα which is usually rendered by μερίς, μερίς. However, κληροδοσία is related to the nouns κληρονομία and κληρος and the verbs κληρονομέω and κληρόω 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: הַלּוֹם, meaning in various contexts "possession," "portion," or "inheritance;"\[^{34}\] הַלּוֹם meaning "portion," "share," "possession."\[^{35}\] In 11:21, 34 (32?) the translator incorrectly guessed that ἀναλόγων "flatteries" was derived from λήμμα.
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 ἔξη (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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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 ᾑ φιλα 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 \textit{Tendenz} because it is not a "normal" Septuagint translation. The fact is OG decided not to render ᾑ φιλα with μερις, and OG never uses μερις 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 \textit{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 ἐσήν (vs. ἐσήν) in MT (pp. 296-297, 312-313). How can there be any controls on methodology if he wants to propose a \textit{Vorlage} for the LXX but prefers a reading of MT in order to justify it?
Even a glance at HR under ἀφίστημι, ἀφίσταναι, ἀφίστανειν would reveal there are twelve occurrences of ἀφίστημι for five Semitic verbs in OG.⁴⁰ In OG, and the rest of the LXX, the verb is most often employed in the sense "turn away, depart"—whether it is ἀποκοπή μεν ἀπὸ σοῦ (i.e., God, Dan. 9:9) or ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτίων σου (Dan. 9:13)⁴¹—and "remove, withdraw."⁴² This latter sense overlaps with the meaning of the Hebrew הָרָע "will be cut off," so the OG translator employed one of his favourite words in the general sense of "will be removed."⁴³ This explanation is confirmed by the very similar situation in 11:4 where the OG uses ἀποσταθήσεται to translate ἔλευθερος (a niphal imperfect of a verb which is a HL in Daniel!).⁴⁴ 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

¹⁰סיל: 7:12 (aph.); מיר: 9:9; רד: 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.

¹¹See Jer. 40(33):8; Sir. 2:3; 1 Ki. 16:14.

¹²See Dan. 3:35; Jer. 14:19; Jud. 13:14; 1 Ki. 6:3.

¹³See also the similar use in Prov. 23:18. An examination of the renderings for הָרָע 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.

¹⁴McCrybasket, pp. 90–91, argues for the future middle in 11:4 (ἀποστάθησαι) 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 αἴ 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.II.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, יָתָן בּוֹ "without hand," which OG renders with καὶ ποιήσει συναγωγὴν 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 פְּנֶה as a hiphil perfect of פָּנַה (פָּנָה). The argument that the translator has reread the consonantal text is based on the fact that the addition of the auxiliary verb ποιέω was one of the means of the translator's to render causatives and συνάγω frequently renders פְּנֶה. In effect, the translator read a ק for כ, transposed the letters פ נ, and read the changed letters as a hifil perfect with ק consecutive. The motivation for this change was that the translator did not know the meaning of the HL פְּנֶה. 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.

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. 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

---


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

48Lyons, 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 II.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.1.1).

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. 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. 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.


54 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 \textit{langue} and \textit{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. \textit{TT is an Analysis of Structure}.

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

\ldots 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.\textsuperscript{55}

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

\textsuperscript{55} Lyons, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{57}

The selection and combination of different units also affects the semantic information of the message.\textsuperscript{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.).

\textsuperscript{56}See Gleason, Linguistics, 14–26; Yule, Language, pp. 44–48.

\textsuperscript{57}Lyons, Semantics, p. 241; Silva, Biblical Words, pp. 108–112. 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.

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, 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. 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  ἡ 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 ἡ with καί. καί has a high rate of occurrence throughout the LXX, while ἀντίκρισις appears relatively seldom. In original Greek the situation is reversed. As Aejmelaeus has so cogently argued, the significance of the translation of ἡ 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).


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 ἅρπα and ὁ ὅρα 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

---

61Aejmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," pp. 369-370. See particularly her criticism of McGregor (Ezekiel, pp. 51-54) who describes the statistical differences in how '1 is rendered in the Pentateuch as meaningless.

62This 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: נָבָע תַּיֶּשֶׁר. OG substitutes an adjective in the attributive position for the definite noun in the genitive and translates with ἀπὸ 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 ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης βασιλέως.

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 also 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 ἀφένθη ἴσχιος, which could be translated as "length of your prosperity." However, Th has μακρόθεμος τοῖς παραπτώμασί σοι "forbearance toward your sin" by reading the pointing of MT as ἀφένθη ἴσχιος. It is easy to see how ἀφένθη ἴσχιος "healing" and ἀρένθη "lengthening" (the marker of the vowel ı may not have been written), and ἀφένθη ἴσχιος "neglect, error" and ἴσχιος "ease, prosperity" (with the addition of the pronominal suffix they were written identically in a consonantal text, ἴσχιος) could be confused. The decisive reason why the pointing of MT is accepted as correct by commentators is the fact that the adjective ἴσχιος "at ease" appears in 4:1.0

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

---

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

70See 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. Johannessohn, 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.\textsuperscript{75} 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.\textsuperscript{76} In the case of the LXX, the pervasive influence of the LXX on the NT and the appearance of Septuagintisms (e.g., καὶ τῇ]{ }βίβλῳ) at one time engendered fierce debates about the semitic character of the gospels.\textsuperscript{77} 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.\textsuperscript{78} 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

\textsuperscript{75} Sollamo, "Improper prepositions," pp. 473-475; \textit{Semiprepositions}, pp. 3-10.

\textsuperscript{76}\textit{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.}

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{The Philology of the Greek Bible: Its Present and Future}, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), p. 65; A. Thumb, \textit{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 \textit{langue} and \textit{parole} in "Bilingualism," pp. 198-219. See also Rife ("Mechanics" and "Daniel"), Wikgren ("Comparative Study"), and Martin ("Syntactical Criteria" and \textit{Semitic Evidences}) for discussions of the characteristics of translation vs. original Greek.

\textsuperscript{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.
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- Omission
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- Antithesis
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[Style Semantics]
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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. 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.

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. 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

---

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.

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 (e.g. 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.

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." 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, 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.

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. 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."\(^2\) 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.\footnote{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, \textit{Science}, pp. 195-201, 228; for examples, see Rabin, "Indefinite Subject," pp. 60-76.} She also notes that mood might be another category to investigate, and we would add definiteness to this list as well.\footnote{See the discussion of definiteness in Hebrew in J. Barr, "Determination and the Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew," \textit{JSS} 34 (1989): 307-35.} 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.\footnote{Tov classifies many of these morphological differences as non-variants (\textit{TBU}, 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.} For example, the fact that the bound morpheme $\overline{b}$ has diverse functions in Hebrew (as a preposition used spatially, temporally; with the inf. cons.; marker of dative, apposition, idiom with $\overline{b}$ denoting possession, etc.)\footnote{See Waltke and O'Connor, pp. 602-610 for uses with inf. cons. and 205-212 as a preposition.} 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 $\overline{b}$ is bound to an infinitive construct to form $\overline{y}m\tau\overline{m}$, but the aorist active infinitive $\overline{\delta}n\overline{\gamma}\gamma\varepsilon\overline{\lambda}m$ is all the OG requires for
translation. Likewise, in 2:24 the כ marking the dative and the emphatic state of the noun marked by נ in the word לְכָּלַכְךָ are both represented in the Greek texts by the article τοιαύτα.

Very important morphological differences between HA and Greek also exist in the nominal and verbal systems. For example, aspect/tense and mood are far more distinctive in the morphological structure of Greek than in HA. 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. 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

97 Compare Th which has the pleonastic article τὸν.

98 In Rife's examination of Daniel 1:1-2:16 he continuously makes reference to the non-translation of כ as significant when it is simply a marker of the dative or is used with the inf.

99 See the discussion by Wevers, Use of Versions, pp. 16-19, where he remarks on the differences in the verbal and nominal structure of Greek and Hebrew. Eg., Greek inflects nouns in five cases, three genders, and two numbers whereas Hebrew has three numbers (dual), two genders, and no case system, though it does inflect for state. Works specifically treating the translation of verbs include J. Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verbs in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts," in VI Congress of the IOSCS, ed. C. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 381-403; Soisalon-Soininen, Infinitive; "Neutrum Plural," pp. 189-199; Sollamo, "Paronymous Finite Verb," 101-113; Aejmelaeus, "Participium Coniunctum," pp. 385-393. See the detailed analysis of the translation of the verb in Theodotion Job by P. Gentry, pp. 170-241.

100 The function of the Greek tense forms has been the subject of intense debate over the years. For an excellent review of the discussion and forceful arguments that aspect (how the action was perceived to unfold) was the key function of the verb, see S. E. Porter, Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the NT, with Reference to Tense and Mood, (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), pp. 1-109; B. M. Fanning, Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), pp. 8-125.

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. γάρ, δέ, οὖν) or require a particular grammaticalization of the verb (e.g. ἵνα, ὅπως + 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,
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 (eg. 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.
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.\footnote{See the examples of τοῦμην and γάριν from Dan. 1:8 in CH 1.II.3 and the discussion in Harl, Septante, pp. 243-253.} The interaction of these opposing forces had significant consequences on the vocabulary of the LXX.\footnote{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.} 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 λαίσο as a SE for ...
which occurs 19x in Daniel. In this case the translators are doubly consistent because they do not use \textit{ka\textit{\textit{x}m}} 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. 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. 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 (e.g. bite, nibble, and chew). Syntagmatic relations between words are also referred to as the study of their collocations. 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.

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

\begin{itemize}
  \item[114] \textit{See the discussion of 2:1-10 in CH 5.}
  \item[115] W. Porzig, \textit{Das Wunder der Sprache}, (Bern: Francke, 1950), 68.
\end{itemize}
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 מָכָל־ה ל (hi. substantive part.) with בָּנֵי (3/5). In 8:25 the noun מָכָל occurs in a difficult passage to refer to Antiochus' insight. There are then four instances where Th does not render מָכָל with בָּנֵי 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.

Therefore, Th had to choose a different verb for the inf.cons. of מָכָל. In this case Th chose the fairly rare term מַלְפָּב (1-10 in LXX). The same phenomenon accounts for 12:10, except in this case מַלְפָּב is the subject of בָּנֵי. In this instance Th uses בָּנֵי because he prefers to translate the verb with the 3.act.f.i. of בָּנֵי. Even though בָּנֵי is also cognate with בָּנֵי, we can see

118 Lyons, Semantics, p. 265.

119 S. 9:13, 25. According to Zieg., in 1:17 Th has בָּנֵי וּפָרָנְסָא for מַלְפָּב 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 פָּרָנְסָא (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 בָּנֵי. This is another HL (1-59 in LXX) for Th that is not found in OG.
that Th employed it for מִלָּה in 11:33 for the same reason that he made a change in 12:10, מִלָּה was the subject of בִּי וּסְבָּלָה.

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 קִרָאתוּ "a decree went out" with ἕδωκαν "it was decreed" and in 1:4 where קֶרֶם "... to the king is translated καὶ εὐθείας ... καὶ γραμματικοῖς καὶ σοφοῖς. Other syntagmatic features to consider are the construct genitive relation in HA 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

These examples combined with Th’s use of no less than four HL (νοημονες, ἐπιστημης, προσνοουν, συμβιβাসαι) to render vocabulary in the domain of knowing that are not even found in OG indicate that Th was working to his own agenda.
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substitution. 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.i. 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 ἔκλαμψε for ἠλιθ "enlighten." Or OG can employ both ἐπιθαλα and βύτω to translate ΜΟΥ, though in this case the distribution of the terms indicates the activity of different translators.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{132} We could diagram these relationships as in Figure 4.

![Figure 4](image)

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 (eg. 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 εἶναι instead of the more specific infinitive of ἐρχομαι to translate the

\textsuperscript{131}See CH 5.IV.1.iv.

\textsuperscript{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. Graded opposites involve a degree of comparison, such as big:small, high:low. Size or height is always relative to a point of comparison whether or not that point of comparison is explicitly stated. Lyons reserves the term antonym for graded opposites because they tend to rely on polarized contrasts (good: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 married:single, male:female and conversives such as buy:sell, give:take.

The significance of binary relations for TT is that the translator may choose to express the meaning of the 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 Vorlage. For example, a translator might have chosen to employ ποιμήν as the equivalent for ἄρπαμ (the SE in the LXX is ἄρπαμ), in a particular context in order to express a contrast with ἄρπαμ. 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

---

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

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


136 Lyons, pp. 279-280. Conversives are especially helpful in defining social roles (doctor:patient, master:servant), kinship terms (uncle/aunt:niece/nephew), and spatial and temporal relations (above:below, before:after). Nida (Semantics, p. 34) also distinguishes reversives such as tie:untie, alienate: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


[14] 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.


[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 ἀπ' ἰφρύτει ἐκφρύτει for ἀπ' ἰφρύτει ἐκφρύτει. 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 σῴζω.

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 καταράζειν καταράζειν, which Th translates with ἀνομίζοντος ἀνομοῖο. OG retains the play on sound, but with different equivalents, ἀμάρτωσαν οἱ ἀμάρτωλοι.144

Literary Technique refers to translations that were motivated due to some type of literary consideration in the text. For example, ἔσοβε occurs in Daniel 3:17 and OG employs ἔσοβε as a translation equivalent instead of the more usual ἄφησο. The motivation for this rendering was to supply a parallel with 3:12. In 3:12 OG translates the Semitic idiom דְּבָרָיָת "pay regard to" (+ ἐν pers.)145 with ἔσοβε ἔσοβε ἡ 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.\textsuperscript{147} Szpek delineates various degrees of synonymy based on the proposals of Ullmann and Collinson,\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{147}\text{See Szpek, pp. 49-59.}

\textsuperscript{148}\text{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.

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.

98 τα πρόσωπα υμῶν
99 (σκυθρωπά) διατεραμμένον
100 κτό πρόσωπον υμῶν +και ἀσθενές

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 (\(\text{\textsuperscript{M}}\) in l. 98) corresponding to the three areas of linguistics for the analysis of TT: \(\text{\textsuperscript{M}}\)=Morphology, \(\text{\textsuperscript{S}}\)=Syntax, and \(\text{\textsuperscript{L}}\)=Lexicology. Third, possible pluses and omissions of words in OG are designated by the signs + and - (s. l. 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 \(\text{\textsuperscript{I}}\), directive \(\text{\textsuperscript{N}}\), interrogative \(\text{\textsuperscript{I}}\)), 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 \(\text{\textsuperscript{MN(TKN)}}\), 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. 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. 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 "Th retains the OG." 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

---

5 See 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 Mss. 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.

6 See 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Sigla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hithpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hithpe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homoioarc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homoioitel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(ing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

1:1 Th 1:1 MT
1 Ἐν ἡτει τρίτῳ
2 τῆς βασιλείας
3 Ἰωακίμ
4 βασιλέως Ιουδαία
5 ἔλθε Ναβουχοδονοσόρ
6 βασιλείας Βαβυλώνος
7 εἰς ἱεροσαλήμ
8 καὶ ἐπολιορκεῖ αὐτήν
1:2 καὶ ἔδωκε κύριος
9 ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ
10 τὸν Ιωακίμ
11 βασιλεία Ιουδαία
12 καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους
13 τῶν σκευῶν
14 οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ
15 καὶ ἅγιοι αὐτῶν
16 εἰς γῆν Ἠσσαρ
17 οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ
18 καὶ τὰ σκεύη
19 εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν
20 καὶ ἐπολιορκεῖ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτὸν
1:3 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
21 Ασσαναζ
22 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
23 Ασσαναζ
24 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
25 Αβιεσδρι

1:1 OG
$ ἔπι βασιλέως Ιωακίμ
tῆς Ιουδαίας ἔτους
tρίτου
$ καὶ Παραγενόμενος
Ναβουχοδονοσόρ
βασιλείας Βαβυλώνος
eἰς Ιεροσαλήμ
$ ἐπολιορκεῖ αὐτήν

$ καὶ $παρέδωκεν αὐτήν
κύριος εἰς χειρας αὐτοῦ
$ καὶ Ιωακίμ
βασιλεία Ιουδαίας
καὶ $μέρος τι
τῶν $ιεραν σκευῶν
tοῦ κυρίου
καὶ $ἄπιστηκας αὐτά
$ εἰς τὴν Βαβυλωνιαν

$ ἀπηρείσατο
ἐν τῷ $εἰδωλείῳ αὐτοῦ
καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
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25 τὸ ἱερά χρυσόν ἄυτὸ
26 ἔλεσαγαγεῖν
27 ἀπὸ τῶν νυών
28 ἔτης αἰχμαλωσίας
29 - Ἰσραήλ
30 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπήρματος
31 τῆς βασιλείας
32 καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱσορθομμένων
1:4
33 ἴνα εἰσερχομέτοις αὐτῶν
34 οὕς ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς
35 -μόσος
36 καὶ καλοῦσ τῇ ὑπερ
37 καὶ (συννέντασ)
38 εν πάσῃ ὑποθείᾳ
39 καὶ γιγνώσκοντας γυναῖκας
40 καὶ διανοούμενοις
41 (φόνησιν)
42 καὶ ὅς ἔστιν ἱσχύς
43 εν αὐτοῖς ἢστάναι
44 εν τῷ ὅψι τοῦ βασιλέως
45 καὶ ἡ διδάξας αὐτοὺς
46 γράμματα καὶ γλῶσσαν
Χαλδαίων
1:4
48 καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς
49 τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας καθ᾿ ἡμέραν
50 ἡμέραν
51 ἀπὸ τῆς ἰτραπέζης
52 τοῦ βασιλέως
53 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου
54 τοῦ νοτοῦ αὐτοῦ
55 καὶ ἡ ἐπέφευρα αὐτοὺς
56 ἐν τῇ τρίᾳ καὶ ἡμέτα ταῦτα
57 ἡ στήναν
58 λευκοί τοῦ βασιλέως
1:5
59 καὶ ἡ ἑτατείνη τοῦ βασιλέως
1:6 καὶ γένετο ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῶν οἴων Ιούδα
1:7 καὶ Ἰακώβ τὸν Ανανίαν καὶ τὸν Μισαήλ καὶ τὴν Αλκαίαν
1:8 καὶ ἔνεβηκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰριδιενοῦχος ὁνόματα
1:9 καὶ ἤθετε Δανιῆλ
1:10 καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός τὸν Δανιῆλ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ καὶ εἰς ἔλεον καὶ εἰς οἰκτιμόν ἐνάφιον
1:11 τοῦ Ἰριδιενοῦχου ἀπὸ τῶν οἴων τῆς ἱστορίας
1:12 Δανιῆλ Ἀνανίας
1:13 Μισαὴλ Ἀλκαίας
1:14 καὶ ἔνεβηκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰριδιενοῦχος ὁνόματα καὶ τῷ δὲ Ἀνανίᾳ σέσεσθαι καὶ τῷ Μισαήλ Μισαήκα
1:15 καὶ τῷ Ἀλκαίᾳ Ἀβδενάγο
1:16 καὶ ἔθετο Δανιῆλ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτόν ἐν τῇ ἁπατείᾳ καὶ ἔδωκεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τοῦ ἔλεος καὶ εἰς τὸ ὀλυμπιακὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἦν οἱ διαπέταξεν τῶν Ἰριδιενοῦχων ἐν τῷ οἴῳ ἦν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ βασιλείας καὶ εἰς τῷ οἴῳ καὶ εἰς τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ εἰς τῷ οἴῳ καὶ εἰς τῷ αὐτῷ 
1:17 καὶ ἔδωκεν τὸν Δανιῆλ καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰς τὸν θεόν 
1:18 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰριδιενοῦχος τῷ Δανιήλ Ἀγαθὸν
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.

1. 25-OG renders the Hebrew 3 m.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 ב 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

---

Footnote:

8S. 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 תִּנְס 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 l. 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 καί ... καί (both/and) construction. It removes any ambiguity that might exist in the Hebrew concerning the removal of Jehoiakim.
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.
1. 35-OG substitutes the n. with an alpha privative to render the rel. phrase. Th omits μᾶς, but otherwise =MT.
1. 42-OG substitutes an acc. ptcp. for the rel. phrase, which renders מַלְאַכָּב redundant. Th follows MT but adds the 3 s.vb. that is implicit in the Hebrew.
1. 43-OG employs διότι (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.
5 on the inf. cons. signifies consequence.

1. 49-τῇθεαίν is a substitution for רְבָּא 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 μίν/δέ (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. δοθή 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 (ἄλληγγηθή) for ἄναμμι while OG uses variety.

1. 79-ἀξίον + acc. + ἰα 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 ἰα + subj. in a clause which is consecutive, while Th has a more idiomatic rendering with μίμησε (s. BDF §370.2).

1. 99 to 100-OG requires addition of the n. in 1. 100 to the part. διατρέπει (1-4) in order to render the sense of the Hebrew.

1. 101-OG and Th employ παρά + acc. for the comparative. Comparative ἐσ is occurs 5x elsewhere. In 1:15 OG has κρέσσεσσεν + 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 υπηλότερον, Th ὑπηλότερον + gen. The comparative + gen. and the positive with παρά/ὑπέρ + acc. are common equivalents in the LXX. 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. ἐπέλθε + ἐσ and it is Th who has the dynamic renderings.

---

11S. the discussion in 3:11-20, Syntax, 1. 51.

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.

I. 104-Added by OG for clarification of the identity of the other youths in training.

II.1.iii. Lexicology

1. 4-παραγγελνομα is 2/2 for ον in OG (also 2/2), never in Th.

1. 8-πολιορκεω for ἡσα (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-διδομι and its compound form with παρά is an expected SE in Th for ἑν (21/21) and ἂν (20/20). There are 6 other instances of διδομι 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 ἑν for ἃν (HL). Finally, the simple form is found twice in 5:21. In the first instance it is a contextual guess for the rare vb. ἡσα, which is only found twice in Daniel. In the second case, Th evidently read ἄνειν as ἂν due to influence from 4:14(17), 22(25), 29(32). The texts read as follows:

4:14(17), etc. ἄνειν ἄνειν ἄνειν ἄνειν

5:21 κλεαρ φιδανειν αξιον αξιον αξιον

Th reads καὶ ἂν δόντω δοσσα αξιον in all four cases.

OG is similar to Th in his extensive use of διδομι and its compound forms for ἑν (16/18) and ἂν (13/15), but exhibits

\[\text{\textsuperscript{13}1:2, 9, 12, 16, 17; 2:16; 4:14(17), 22(25), 29(32); 8:12, 13; 9:3, 10; 10:12, 15; 11:6, 11, 17, 21, 31; 12:11. Th has παραδίδουμι in 11:6, 11.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{14}2:21, 23, 37, 38, 48; 3:28(95); 4:13(16); 5:17, 18, 19, 28; 6:3(2); 7:4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 22, 25, 27. Th has παραδίδουμι (=OG) in 3:28(95) and αποδίδουμι in 6:3.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{15}It is untranslated by Th in 3:29(96).}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{16}OG has παραδίδουμι in 1:2; 11:11; αποδίδουμι in 1:16; γίνομαι in 8:12 (textual difficulty); ναρκάω? (1-5) in 11:6. OG=0 in 4:14(14), 22(25), 29(32).}\]
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 διδωμι to translate the sense of the Vorlage. This is the case for יְָּֽעִי in 1:5, מֶֽסֶּר in 7:22, יְָֽזָּר in 8:25, מֶֽלָּל in 9:24, and 10:1.18 11:17 and 18 both read διδωμι, which is interesting because there is a difference in the K-Q in vs. 18.19 OG reflects the reading of the Q=דָּזַּר (K=דָּזַּר). 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 דָּזַּר (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 נַּעַּר (7x) is rendered well.20 OG seems to take the m.pl.suf. of the n. to refer to the f. הַָֽר, but gives a very literal "Theodotionic" type of rendering without including טָּֽמָּס to get the sense that it is "at the end of" the 3 years. Th's rendering using meta + 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 נַּעַּר (hi.) OG chooses a different vb. אַּמוֹר in 1. 20 of OG is fairly rare (1-9) in the LXX. Th uses a form of חָּפֹּר 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 מַאֲדַּמְּדַּס 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 מַאֲדַּמְּדַּס and vs. 19 מַאֲדַּמְּדַּס. 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 מַאֲדַּמְּדַּס n for מַאֲדַּמְּדַּס in 2:42.

21 MT has נַּעַּר in the hi. 10x. The OG equivalences elsewhere are אָּֽפָּּֽו in 1:18(2); אָּֽפָּּֽו in 9:12, 14; מַאֲדַּמְּדַּס in 9:24; a textual problem in 11:6; אָּֽפָּּֽו in 11:8. Th has commo readings in 9:12, 14. Th has
1. 17, 32-OG's use of ἐπιλεκτός (1-16) for ἀρχόμενος (1-3) "nobility" (BDB, p. 832) in l. 32 is most likely an exegetical rendering based on the parallel with מרגלים, but OG manages to convey that the trainees are to be chosen from the cream of (Israelite) society.¹²

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-OG and Th share a common loan translation. Also 1:11, 18.

l. 33, 101, 103-וסי(ה) appears 5x in ch. 1 and OG translates consistently with νεανίσκος¹¹ (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 δησι after also in 3:19, whereas OG employs it in 1:13, 15 for נשים. S. Lexicology in 3:11-20.

l. 37-The hi. substantive part. וַיִּשְׁלַחְתָּם occurs 5x. OG has several equivalents: ἐπιστήμων (1-12, 1. 37), ἐννοεῖ (1-9, 11:33; s. Th in 9:23), συνημί (11:35; 12:3), διανοομα (12:10). Th employs συνημί 3/5 and prefers to render all words related to שָלַח with σωσίς or its cognates.¹⁴

l. 38-OG (5/7) and Th (8/8) both employ σοφία as a SE for נשים.²⁵ There are two additional uses of the n. in 5:11, but the omission by

eἰσαγω in 1:18(2); αὐτῷ in 9:24; φῆμ in 11:6, 8.

²²Here we are taking the conjunctive in הדמורת הפלג as explicative. This position is argued in detail in the forthcoming thesis of R.G. Wooden at St. Andrews.

¹¹OG has νεανίσκος 5/5 in 1:4, 10, 13, 15, 17. 11:6=0? Th has νεάνις in 11:6.

¹⁴See CH 4.III.1.iii. for discussion.

²⁵OG and Th in 1:4; 2:20, 21, 23, 30. 1:17 OG has σωσίς; 1:20=free; OG=0 in 5:14.
both OG and Th as well as the content of the saying (דַּמֵּם תָּחַם) indicates that this is a later insertion.

1. 
39-γνῶσις is a SE (2/2) for דְּעֵת in Th (s. also 12:4).

140-This is the only place where Th employs διανοομαί for בִּין. It is usually the common equivalent employed by OG, but OG has rendered the syntagm with a dynamic equivalent (s. below).26

1. 41-מְדִיר is only here and 1:17. OG employs the acc. pl. of σοφοίς to render_more ομόβλεψεν in 1:4, but has a more formal approach with ἐπισκόπησε in 1:17. Th possibly has φόρνησις in both cases.27 The related term also appears in 2:21, 4:31(34), 33(36); 5:12. Th employs φήν in ch. 4 while φόρνησις is found in 2:21; 5:12. OG only has an equivalent in 2:21, σίμνεσις.

1. 43-OG employs the more general εἶναι, but the meaning has been retained.

1. 44-One might argue that Th's choice of οἴκος for ἱερόλοχος 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 οἴκος for both νῦν (11/12)28 and ἱερόλοχος (3/7),29 and we can account for why Th does not render 3 of the other 4 with οἴκος. Both terms occur in 4:1 and Th chooses to omit ἱερόλοχος as redundant; or it was not in his Vorlage. In 5:2 the context required a more specific word (ναός) as opposed to the more general term. Now, we might ask why οἴκος 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

26 For a detailed discussion of the renderings for νῦν, see the section on 8:1-10, vs. 5.

27 It was noted in CH 4.1.iii. that the 4th century Sahidic ms. 925 does transpose σώζειν and φόρνησιν in 1:17, and it is quite possible that this should be the original Th reading.

28 1:2(3); 2:5, 17; 3:29(96); 4:1(4), 27(30); 5:3, 10, 23; 6:11.

29 1:4; 4:1(4), 26(29); 5:2, 3, 5; 6:19.
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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 נָאְוָ in 5:3 and the non-translation of נִבְּרָ א could be due to harmonization with the previous vs. On the other hand, נִבְּרָ א has the air of a gloss and this impression is supported by the witness of the versions (s. BHS). The remaining vs. is 4:26(29) where the OG has the king walking ἐπὶ τῶν τεῖχῶν (walls) τῆς πόλεως and Th again employs νάος.

1. 48, 94—Elsewhere Th renders ὅμιλον (4/5) with καθίστημι where it has the sense "to appoint someone." Both διήταξέν (1–21, not in OG) and ἔπταξαντα (1–6) (ἐπιστατεῖν) are fairly rare in the LXX. Both OG (16x) and Th (11x) employ ἐπιστατεῖν frequently, but l. 94 is their only common use. OG prefers to use the compound forms προστάσσω (6x) and ἐπιτάσσειν (6x), while Th only employs ἐπιτάσσω in 6:10(9), and prefers to use ἐπιτάσσον.

1. 52, 53, 75—OG and Th have a common reading in 1. 52, 53, but both ὕπεκτεσα and δείκνυον represent good renditions for the difficult ὅμιλον (s.

30Cf. the recent argument that the phrase Καλλίκριτος Καλλικρίτου 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?

31S. 1:11; 2:24, 2:49; 3:12. OG also has καθίστημι in 2:24, 49; 3:12, though only in 3:12 do OG and Th have a common form (καθίστημας). In 5:26 ἄνω is rendered by ἀφιμένο in OG and μετρέο in Th. In 1:11 OG has ἀποδεικνύον.

32S. 2:9, 12, 14; 3:10, 13; 4:11(14).

33S. 1:18; 2:2, 46, 3:19, 20, 24. The use of συντάσσω (aor. ptc.) is a dynamic rendering in 11:23. τοποτάσσεα for ἦλθεν in 7:27 is a unique reading and the verb occurs as part of a plus in 11:37.

345:24, 25; 6:11(10), 13(12), 14(13); 10:21. τοποτάσσεα is employed in 6:14(13) where Th has an omission and also as a dynamic rendering for the hi. of ἔρχεται in 11:39 (cf. the more literal rendering in OG). Elsewhere Th always employs κυριεύει for ἔρχεται (11:3, 4, 5, 43). The simple form of τάσσεα occurs in Th 6:13(12) and 11:17.
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BDB, p. 834). OG has δεσπνυν 4/6 (s. 1:13, 15, 16) while Th prefers θανεξα 4/6 (Th=OG in 1:15).

1. 55, 78, 96-Th and OG translate Κομπιη with Ποσιν (HL in LXX!) in 1. 96. The choice of Ποσιν could have been motivated by the similar sound in βροσν in 1. 95, but it is a distinctive agreement. Elsewhere Th translates with ποτος (s. 1. 55, 78) and πομα (1-4) in 1:16. OG has the vb. πωνεω in 1. 55, 78 and omits in 1:16.

l. 56-OG (HL) and Th employ good as well as distinct renderings for the vb. Th also employs ρεφειν as a good rendition for the hithpe. νοηω (HL, s. BDB, p. 1091) in 4:9(12).

L 59, 86-Th prefers to restrict the rendering of εναντιον to ινν (9/15), particularly in the opening Hebrew section (5/6), whereas OG uses a variety of equivalents throughout the book. The same is true in the Aramaic section of Daniel where Th prefers εναντιον for Ṣי (19/41). At the same time Th does not depend on OG nor is Th a mechanical literalist. For example, of the 57x Ṣי and Ṣי occur in MT, Th shares a common rendering with OG in only 5 instances.

l. 65, 67-S. the discussion of Th's relationship to OG.

35 The remaining reference is 11:26 where Th guesses with δεω (f.s.acc.part.) "his wants (reading ινν?) will devour him" and OG with μερμυν "his thoughts (reading Ṣי?) 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 οναντιον in 1:18; 9:20; 10:12; προ in 8:3; the more literal κατα προσσουν αυτο in 9:10; 11:16. The prep. οναντιον only occurs in three other places in Th, but is a good rendering in each: 3:3 for Ṣי, 3:40 MT=0, and 8:15 for Ṣי. OG has εμπροσθεν in 1:5; οναντιον in 1:9; 9:20; 10:12; 11:16; δυς ημων in 1:13; προς in 1.18; παρα in 1.19; 2:2; ακηναντι in 8:3; εν in 8:6; κατηναντι in 8:7; οναντιον in 8:4; 9:10, 18.

37 εμπροσθεν in 6:11(10); οναντιον in 8:4; 9:18; οναντιον in 9:20; ἀπο προσσουν αυτο (for Ṣי) in 11:22. The last case is a distinctive agreement, but note that it is Th who has the literal reading κατα προσσουν αυτο in the previous use of Ṣי in 11:16.
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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. לְמָנָה (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 ἀλισθεῖν. There is only one other occurrence in the LXX (Sir. 40:29). Therefore, the rendering in Th most likely has been influenced by Mal. συμμολουθή in 1. 81 is a HL. 88-Syh read with Th in 1. 74, but 967 has the OG reading with another HL ἀλλ(ε)σθῆ (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 ḫhr 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-כֶּלֶד is a rare term (1-5, s. BDB, p. 277). Th gives a good dynamic rendering with סְקֻנְרְוָה (1-4, s. BAG, p. 758). OG, s. 1. 99-100, Syntax.

1. 102-לְּבֵית is a HL in MT.\(^{40}\) OG (1/3, s. IV Macc. 13:21, 24) offers a cj. συντρέψεω (s. LSJ). Th uses συνήλιξ (1-3), which is a good translation of the Hebrew.

1. 105-בָּרֵךְ is rare in MT (1-2?, s. BDB, p. 295). Appropriately enough, OG קִיםְרְוָע (1-7) and Th קָאִדְקָיוּ (1-10) again use rare and

---

\(^{38}\) A weakened form of יִלְבַּשׁ, 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. (û 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 ד"כ ת"ש. 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 pro. 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 בַּלְתַיָּהוּ? 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 מִלְשָׁנִיתָהוּ 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 ד'ג ת"ש 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 מִלְשָׁנִית for the prep. מ and borrowed OG's מַסְכָּן for נְפָךְ, but it is a correct rendering. The distinct readings for the same Hebrew in 1. 57 confirm

---

41That is, only if 88-Syh and not 967 is regarded as OG.

42Munnich, "Origène," p. 188.

43The 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 מְדִיטַר בֵּית שָׁם (also 1:11, 18).

1. 26—Similar to l. 16 it is possible that the compound was inspired by the simple vb. in OG, but the hi. of מָצַד is translated the same way by Th 2x in 1:18 (cf. OG ἀγαγεῖν and ἠμαθείνει; 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 ὁκ. The remainder are expected equivalents, though ἰσόμετα 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 τρομεῖα, though OG has δείνον in l. 75. It is possible that OG’s reading is corrupt because he prefers δείνον in 1:8, 13, 15, 16. However, Th does employ δείνον 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
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fifteen possible readings of בְּדָשׁ in MT.\(^4\) One involves a Q in 11:18 (s. Lexicology, 1. 9), 6x OG=0, and in only 2 places OG employs \(\varsigma\eta\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu\) (s. also 6:18[17]).\(^5\) In contrast, excluding 11:18, Th offers a good translation of בְּדָשׁ in almost every occurrence and employs \(\varsigma\eta\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu\) 7x.\(^6\) 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 ῥαβδὴκεν; but it is Th who consistently employs \(\varsigma\eta\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu\).

1. 68—The shared reading of βαλτασσαρ 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 ῥασσα of 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 βρασίν 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 βρασίν for ἀλαμό (10/30

\(^4\)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.

\(^5\)OG=0 in 4:3(6); 5:12; 6:14(13), 15(14), 27(26) and 1:7. Except for the use of δεσμι in 11:17; 18, OG uses a variety of equivalents or more dynamic renditions for this particular vb. ἐνθυμέω in 1:8; προστάσιο in 3:10; ψώξω 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).

\(^6\)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. בְּדָשׁ the translation offers a good dynamic equivalent, and in 6:15(14) Th has ἀγονιομα! κατάγη in 6:14(13) and τάξε 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

OG uses a vb. twice and leaves it untranslated in 1:16. Th, on
the other hand, uses three different equivalents for נָּחַק, two of
which are very rare in the LXX. The omission of נָּחַק 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 1.55 OG could have employed the vb. quite easily as a
contextual guess (and by extension 1.78), but the context did not
allow it in 1:16. In any event, it is at least as likely that the
rendering in 1.96 is due to revision of OG in the light of Th! The
alternative explanation, that Th in 1.96 reflects OG, which merely
omitted נָּחַק as redundant in 1:16, is less likely for two reasons.
First, Th demonstrates considerable independence in the latter half of
vs. 10, 1.99-107. This is obvious in the choice of terminology (s.
Lexicology, 99, 101, 102, 105) and the syntax (s. 1.97 and 1.102).
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 1.8, 13, 26, 33,
46, 52, 58, 65, 67, 68, 79, 94-96 and the five occurrences of

However, only νεανισκός in 1.33, πόσις in 1.96, and
βαλτοσαρ in 1.68 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 מִלֵּי, it
is possible that 1.33 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 1.65, 94-96 OG may
also be dependent upon Th. The omission in 1.67 probably reflects an
original reading; and the other common readings in 1.8, 46, 79 are
not particularly important either. There may be significance in the
common reading of ἀρχιεννόνης, 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 בִּתְחִלָּתָה יָאֲרַדַּכְלִית by
parablepsis. The vb. in l. 20 is marked with the ה, but it is followed
by ע and l. 21 begins with והי as well. A third possibility is that
תְחִלָּתָה יָאֲרַדַּכְלִית was inserted as an explanatory gloss to
תְחִלָּתָה יָאֲרַדַּכְלִית. In this
case only תְחִלָּתָה יָאֲרַדַּכְלִית was deemed redundant, though the phrase is
retained in 88-Syh with בַּתָּא. 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 בִּתְחִלָּתָה יָאֲרַדַּכְלִית by אָסָאָל (s.
Lexicology).

1. 28-S. 2:25. Charles, p. 12, is most likely correct when he argues
that בַּתָּא has been omitted (OG reproduces יָאֲרַדַּכְלִית 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.

36; Mont., p. 118. Collins, Daniel, p. 127, suggests all of 1. 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, 1. 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, 1. 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>2:1</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>OG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ δευτέρῳ</td>
<td>Kαι ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ</td>
<td>Ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ δευτέρῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>τῆς βασιλείας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>οὐκ</td>
<td>οὐκ</td>
<td>οὐκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ἐκ (ἡμισθίασθαι)</td>
<td>eis ἐόραμα καὶ +</td>
<td>eis ἐόραμα καὶ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ἡ ἐνόπτην τήρησεν</td>
<td>Ἡ ἐνόπτην τήρησεν</td>
<td>Ἡ ἐνόπτην τήρησεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξέστη (ἐξέστη)</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξέστη</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξέστη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>ὑψώθη</td>
<td>ὑψώθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>καὶ ὁ ἄνωτος ἄνωτον</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ τῷ [αὐτοῦ]</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ τῷ [αὐτοῦ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ἐγένετο ἄν' ἄνωτον</td>
<td>ἐγένετο ἄν' ἄνωτον</td>
<td>ἐγένετο ἄν' ἄνωτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>καὶ εἴπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
<td>καὶ εἴπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
<td>καὶ εἴπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ὁ καλέσασα</td>
<td>ἡ εἰσενέχθη</td>
<td>ἡ εἰσενέχθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>τοὺς ἐπαίδευσαν</td>
<td>τοὺς ἐπαίδευσαν</td>
<td>τοὺς ἐπαίδευσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς μάγους</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς μάγους</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς μάγους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς φαρακίους</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς φαρακίους</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς φαρακίους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς Χαλδαίους</td>
<td>τῶν Χαλδαίων</td>
<td>τῶν Χαλδαίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>τοῦ ἀναγγέλτην</td>
<td>ἀναγγέλτην</td>
<td>ἀναγγέλτην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>τῷ βασιλεῖ</td>
<td>τῷ βασιλεῖ</td>
<td>τῷ βασιλεῖ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>τῷ ἐνόπτην αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>τῷ ἐνόπτην αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>τῷ ἐνόπτην αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>καὶ ἦλθαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἦλθαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἦλθαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>καὶ ἔστησαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔστησαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔστησαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ἐνέπνευσεν τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
<td>ἐνέπνευσεν τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
<td>ἐνέπνευσεν τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>2:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>καὶ εἴπεν αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>καὶ εἴπεν αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>καὶ εἴπεν αὐτοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
<td>ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
<td>ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>— ἡ ἐνόπτην ἠράσθη</td>
<td>ἡ ἐνόπτην ἠράσθη</td>
<td>ἡ ἐνόπτην ἠράσθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξέστη</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξέστη</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξέστη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>τὸ πνεῦμα μου</td>
<td>τὸ πνεῦμα μου</td>
<td>τὸ πνεῦμα μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>τοῦ γνώναι</td>
<td>τοῦ γνώναι</td>
<td>τοῦ γνώναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>τῷ ἐνόπτην</td>
<td>τῷ ἐνόπτην</td>
<td>τῷ ἐνόπτην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλαλησαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλαλησαν</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλαλησαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
οι Χαλδαίοι  
τῷ βασιλείῳ  
Σωριστὶ  
Βασιλεὺς  
εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας ξῆθι  
τῷ ἁγιᾷ τὸ ἐνύπνιον  
τοῖς πατίνι σου  
καὶ τὴν ἱσύγκρισιν  
Ἀναγγελοῦμεν  

2:5  

ἀπεκρίθη ὁ βασιλεῦς  
τοῖς Χαλδαίοις  
Ὁ 'λόγος  
ἅψ' ἐμοῦ ἀπέστη  
ἐάν μὴ ἐνφρίσθητε μοι  
τὸ ἐνύπνιον  
καὶ τὴν ἱσύγκρισιν  
e ἐίς ἅπαλείαν ἐσεῆ  
καὶ οἱ οἰκοὶ ύμῶν  
ἐν (διαρπαγήσονται)  
νίν, καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσται  

2:6  

ἐάν δὲ τὸ ἐνύπνιον  
καὶ τὴν ἱσύγκρισιν  
γνωρίσθητε μοι  
δόματα καὶ δορεὰς  
καὶ τιμὴν πολλὴν  
λήψεσθε  

2:5  

παρ' ἐμοῦ  

2:6  

tὸ ἐνύπνιον  
καὶ τὴν ἱσύγκρισιν  
"Αναγγελωτὲ μοι  
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2:7

άπεκρίθησαν  
δειπνείον καὶ εἶπαν  
(Ὁ βασιλεὺς ἠειπάτω)  
tὸ ἐνύπνιον  
tοῖς πασίν ἀυτοῦ  
καὶ τὴν ἑσυχρίσειν  
+αὐτοῦ ἔναγγελοῖμεν

2:8

καὶ ἀπεκρίθη  
ὁ βασιλεὺς  
καὶ εἶπεν

2:9

όδα ἔγω ὅτι  
καὶρὸν ὑμεῖς ἔξαγοράζετε  
καθότι  
eἰδετε ὅτι  
ἀπέστη ἀν’ ἐμοῦ  
tὸ ἱῆμα

(οἶδα ὅτι)

κῆμα  
ψευδες καὶ ἀδιεσθάρμενον  
συνέδεσθε  
εἰπεῖν  
ἐνώπιον μου  
εἰς ὅ  
ὁ καίρος (παρέλθῃ)  
(— —)
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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 1. 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. ἡδυ occurs 18x, of which 6x
there is a plural. OG retains the pl. only in 7:18(?), while in 4 more places it changes the pl. to the favoured sing. (2:44[2]; 3:9; 6:27[26]). On two occasions OG employs the adj. αἰώνιος (7:14, 27). Given OG's preference for the s. and his omission of מִּלַמְדוּת 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.  

Th follows the number of מָלֶל 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. מָלֶל; furthermore, מָלֶל 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 l. 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

50 מָלֶל occurs 3x in a series in 7:18, 2x in 2:20, and 2x in separate syntagms in 4:31(34).

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 מָלֶל, 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 מָלֶל in 9:24; 12:2(2).

52 S. Zieg. p. 171. The apparatus reads καὶ ἐς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων Syh Just.] om. τῶν αἰῶνων 967; om. καὶ ἐς τοῦ αἰῶνος 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 מָלֶל which is supported by 2:20 and the preference for the s. elsewhere. This reading would explain Syh Just. 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 Ν/Ν in MT.

L. 92-OG employs the pl. for the s., while Th follows MT.

III.1.ii. Syntax

L. 3-OG's choice of σνιθη 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 ὠπάματα, s. Text-Critical.

L. 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 l. 9 was omitted as redundant, but the omission of ΤΤΤ is harder to explain given its inclusion in l. 26. However, if the και at the beginning of vs. 2 were regarded as a later insertion associated with the hexaplaric addition, then και ραχθήναι ἐν τῷ ὀνόμα [αὐτοῦ] ἐπέταξεν would read well; and we can see how the ΤΤΤ would have been regarded as unnecessary. The meaning of OG is basically synonymous with MT.

L. 11-OG uses a different vb. (εἰσπέρω) 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 l. 6.

L. 15-The gen. probably reflects an alternative Vorlage, but would make the preceding terms various classes of Chaldeans. S. Text-Critical.

L. 19-OG employs a hypotactic construction to avoid the parataxis of the Hebrew.

L. 26, 52-Wifstrand, p. 49, notes l. 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.

L. 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.

L. 27?, 61, 82, 98-The use of postpositive conjunctions like δὲ, ὥν,
and γὰρ is a sign of a dynamic translator, because employing a postpositive entails a change in the word order of the Vorlage.\textsuperscript{51} OG employs the conj. οὗ 9x as a free rendition of MT. Only 2x is it found outside of chs. 2-3.\textsuperscript{54}

Th never has this conj.

1. 31-OG's choice of the prep. is surprising since the article would do, as in 1. 17.

1. 33-S. Text-Critical.

1. 39, 53, 65, 69-OG employs ἐκ 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 ἐκ relatively infrequent in chs. 4-6, but it is almost totally absent from chs. 7-12.

Th only has ἐκ 11x, and ἐκ is totally absent from chs. 1, 7-12.\textsuperscript{56}

1. 39, 65, 72, 105-All four instances involve the Semitic idiom "answered and said." A literal rendering is the part./vb.(ἀποκριθο) + finite vb. (6x, usually ἔφη). In 3/4 cases Th translates with the formal equivalent, but it does omit ἔφη in 1. 40 against both MT and OG. OG also has one omission of ἔφη in 1. 72, but exhibits more variety in general. In 1. 40 he has the common literal rendering while in 1. 65 OG employs the even more formal equivalent participle (λέγοντες) for ἔφη. Finally, in 1. 108 OG has the most idiomatic rendering when he translates ἔφη with ἐν as an introduction to direct discourse.\textsuperscript{57} Thus,

\textsuperscript{51}See Aejmelaeus, "Clause Connectors," pp. 363-372. ἐκ and γὰρ are discussed in more detail in later sections.

\textsuperscript{54}2:3?, 6, 8, 9; 3:23, 24, 26(93), 30(97); 5:6; 12:6.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{56}2:6, 15, 24, 30, 41, 42; 3:15, 49; 4:15(18); 5:17; 6:23(22).

\textsuperscript{57}Aejmelaeus notes that Daniel's three uses (including 2:5) of ἐν recitativum rank it among the most frequent users, even though we would expect it more often. Similar cases to 1. 108 are 1. 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 מַגֵּד אֱלֹהִים is found 30x in the Aramaic section of Daniel. Generally speaking, מַגֵּד is most often represented by some form of a finite vb. (OG-16x, Th-19x, usually ἐστίν). Only 3x does OG use a participle alone (also λέγειν 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 מַגֵּד 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 ἐνεργεῖν.

Significant changes begin to occur where the deutero-canonical 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 סְדָא or סְדָא and 2:25 where סְדָא translates מַגֵּד. 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 lQDan. 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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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. \textit{Lexicology} and \textit{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 1. 45 (if original).

1. 48, 54-It is argued below (s. \textit{Lexicology}) that these additions probably do not reflect an alternative \textit{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 1. 57 OG renders one of the

\textsuperscript{61}5:7, 10, 13, 17; 6:13(12), 17(16), 21(20).

\textsuperscript{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. βασιλέω as in l. 33 before he arrived at the vb. and realized that Μακά 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 περισσω (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 ἡδι elsewhere where it occurs in the Vorlage. For example, in 2:13, 15 OG has δογματικώ and in 7:25 νομίς. Th has

61 In 2:48 OG renders ἡμιν with δορεά, while in 5:17 OG=0. Th renders ἡμίν 3/3 with δομα and ἡμών 2/2 with δορεά (s. 5:17).

64 See CH 3.III.3 for a discussion of ἰπέ.

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 ἡ γνώμη ἡ ἀναιδής "the ruthless decree!" and 6:6(5) where he employs νομιμος. This is further evidence of Th's independence, but in 7:25 Th does have νομιμος.

1. 91-OG employs the postpositive conj. γὰρ 19x, whereas Th only has it 4x. 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).

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 ἄνα, which requires the omission of καί in l. 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 καί against MT and OG.

III.1.iii. Lexicology

1. 3-This is the only place where OG uses συνθαΐνω (s. Syntax, 1. 3)


67See 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 δοι.

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 δοι in the sense of "that." In two other cases (9:18; 10:21) OG and Th have ἀλλα 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 δοι (11/20). The cases where OG has δοι 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 ὁψάματα, see Text-Critical discussion.

1. 4, 24—יִכְבָּד as a vb. is only here in Daniel. Th employs etymologically related words to render the vb. and cog. acc., and יִכְבָּדוֹנָא is not found in OG. OG uses variety, though συνβαίνει is unusual.

l. 5, 18, 24, 28—OG (5/5) and Th (4/5) both employ the expected יִכְבָּדוֹנ as a SE for יִכְבָּד. Th omits in 1. 24, probably in error.

1. 6, 25—Both OG and Th offer good renderings of the Hebrew מָט (2-5, s. BDB, p. 821), though OG once again illustrates variety while Th employs the same rendition. OG uses ταπάδσασε elsewhere to render different vbs. in 11:12 (תָּחֵל), 44(לָתֵל). Th also has ταπάδσασε in 11:44, though in a different person, and uses it 10x in total. OG employs κινέω elsewhere in 3:79; 4:16(19); 11:38, and the vb. does not appear in Th. Th uses κινήσει only in these two places, while OG does not employ this compound vb.

1. 10—OG always uses ἐπιτάσσει for ἔντολα in the sense "command" (s. 1:18; 2:46; 3:19, 20). Also in 3:24 where MT=0.

1. 11—Both OG and Th use a variety of equivalents for מָט. The most frequent equivalent in OG is (ἐπι)καλέω 3/8 (9:18, 19; 10:1; =Th, 6x OG=0). OG’s characteristic variety is seen in the selection of

68Also in 1:17.
69Also found in Gen. 41:8; Jud. 13:25; Ps. 77:5.
70S. also 4:2(5), 16(19); 5:6, 9(2x), 10; 7:18, 28.
71In 11:38 κινήσει is a contextual guess for נָרְק. See p. 120.
725:8, 12, 15, 16, 17. OG’s presumed Vorlage is very different from MT for the second occurrence of מָט 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 Καλέω: (ἐπι)καλέω 6/14 and ἀναγινώσκω 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 Καλέω in 5:12, because elsewhere in the ch. he chooses ἀναγινώσκω 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 φωνέω in 5:7, but employs βοῶ in 3:4 where one would expect him to follow the alliteration of OG. The fact that Th has already employed καλέω 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.  

1. 16, 35, 37, 38, 44, 48, 54, 56, 61, 64, 67, 68, 85, 87, 99, 100, 104, 111, 113—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 καὶ ἐκάλεσε . . . 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 רמא/וינא 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 רמא 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: רמא (hi. from [דכנ]), רמא, רמא, רמא (ha. or hi. שד). These verbs are translated with 6 different verbs in 2:1-10 in OG and Th: אַֽאֹֿ֛גֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, אַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ, וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽa. 78 9x in the Maccabean literature and also in Deut. 1:5.

789:23, 10:21; 11:2. וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽאֵ occurs 9x elsewhere in OG. In 4:15(18), 34c; 5:9 MT=O. It renders רמא in 2:17, רמא in 5:7, רמא in 10:14; it also occurs in 5:12 where רמא and רמא are found and 5:16 where רמא 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 רמא in MT. One interesting use of וְַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽa is the difficult construction in 9:22 where it translates הבא. 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 רמא elsewhere (1:4; 8:25; 9:13, 22, 25; 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10). Therefore, there is a possibility that OG read וַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽa elsewhere (1:4; 8:25; 9:13, 22, 25; 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10). Therefore, there is a possibility that OG read וַֽאֹֿגֶּֽגִּלֵ֑לָֽa for רמא in 9:22. The latter would appear more likely because it would involve the omission of ט, and the misreading of ו for ו for 담. It may also have come more easily to the translator because הבא 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 ἔσοδεικνύω while the appearance of δηλώσις (1/4, not in Th) in 2:27 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 ἄλλος, using ἀναγγέλλω 11/14 and γνωρίζω in the other three.

The reading of ἀναγγέλλω for ἄλλος in 1. 56 of OG is interesting, because OG also has an unusual addition of διασαφήσις 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 διασαφήσις (1-11). This is suggested by the presence of the rare term διασαφήσις, the frequent use of ἀναγγέλλω by Th, and the fact that we already have reason to question the rendering of ἄλλος 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 ἄλλος (5/11) or ἄλλος (8/14). Therefore, ἄλλος 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.

80 2:6, 9, 11, 16, 24; 3x OG=0 3:32, 5:12, 15.
81 1. 38-φράζω, (1-3, not in Th); 1. 56-ἀναγγέλλω or διασαφήσις; 1. 71-a dynamic translation with κρίνω; 1. 112-εἰπον.
82 5. 2:6, 10; 5:7. Elsewhere in Th γνωρίζω is a SE (17/21) for the ha. and hi. (only 8:19) of ἄλλος. The exceptions are ἀναγγέλλω in 2:9, 25, 26 and δηλόω in 4:15. γνωρίζω does not occur in OG.
83 Otherwise δηλόω appears for ἄλλος in 2:47. The ha. and hi. of ἄλλος 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 ἔσοδεικνυω 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,
natural equivalent for δηλώ. However, δηλώ looks like an add. because ἀπ-ν-αγγέλλω\(^6\) appears in 1. 44 as the formal equivalent for בדיה. As in the preceding case, it is possible that ἀπαγγέλλω is the result of later revision of OG, though OG does employ ἀπαγγέλλω to translate בדיה 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 1. 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 ביב; 8:4 for בחר. Never in Th.

1. 29-λαίπω is a SE for בחר 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 ἀμιλέω (1-9) in 1:19 has a more specific sense of conversing than the more general term λαίπω; so it is well-suited to a context that assumes a dialogue. In 11:27 OG employs a compound περιδιολογήσωσιν (HL in LXX!) to translate בחר בחר. In the 17 other occurrences Th and OG share many exact verbal agreements, but many

30; 7:16), σημαίνω is found 3x (2:15, 23, 45), ἐποδεικνύω 1x in 2:17 and ἀπαγγέλλω 2x in 5:8; 8:19.

The fact that δηλώ 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, δηλώ is used 13(14)/15 to render either בחר or בחר 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 δηλώ in 4-6 does support Albertz' thesis, it is not quite as significant as it seems at first.

\(^6\)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 λαλεῖ (4/5) as a SE for יֵלְדֵּשׁ. 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 τὸ ἐν + inf. (λαλῆσαι) to translate the inf. cons. + ἃ (-Israel 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 τὸ λαλεῖν, 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 ὀραμα, including 1. 67 and 99 were discussed in CH 1. Th consistently employs ἐντυπνιόν for מִלְבָּם.

1. 36-παίς is an expected equivalent for דָּבָר and appears in OG 11/11. However, Th employs παίς exclusively for דָּבָר (4/4) in chs. 1-2, whereas in chs. 3-12 he has the alternative equivalent δοῦλος 6/8.

---

See 8:13(2x); 9:12, 20, 21, 22; 10:11(2x), 15, 16, 17, 19; 11:36.

See 7:8, 11, 20, 25. In 6:22(21) OG presumably has a different Vorlage, and Th has εἶπε. The only other occurrences of the vb. are in 3:36=Th; 4.29(32); 4.34(37)bis where MT=0.

See Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, pp. 81, 206. However, there is a slight difficulty with his statistics on p. 188. Soisalon-Soininen's table suggests that ἃ + inf. con. is found 7x in Daniel and that in all 7 cases Th employs τὸ ἐν + 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 τὸ ἐν + 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.


The n. דָּבָר 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 ποιήσις. OG displays greater variety. In chs. 4–6 the n. is either not in the Vorlage or OG employs σύνκριμα as a SE. Elsewhere the main equivalent is κρίνει 7/14, while the remaining cases involve some type of dynamic rendering. In 2:24, 25 OG employs ἐκκατοστά, 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 δηλόω "what has been revealed" is an excellent idiomatic translation. The final two translations involve l. 63 and 70, where ποιήσις is collocated with the vb. θέλω (also 1. 37, 55, 104). In both of these cases OG transforms the n. into the etymologically related vb. κρίνω. 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 σύνκριμα to chs. 4–6 is evidence that a different translator is responsible for these chs.

1. 42, 81, 92, 111, 113, 118–Taken by themselves the 5x that ποιήσις 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 σύνκριμα 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. σύνκριμα 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.
is found 11x in chs. 2-3 and OG employs at least eight different equivalents:

- λόγος-2:9, 11
- πράγμα-2:8?, 10
- προστάσια-2:8?
- ἀ κώρακεν-2:10
- ἐκκαστα-2:17
- πρὸς ταύτα-2:23
- πρόσταγμα-2:15?, 3:22
- προσταγή-3:28(95)
- 2:5?, 15?

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 ἃλλο is found 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.

1. 43, 80-Th translates Νην ἔνω 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 ἀκέστη is a

---

95 We argue below that λόγος in 2:5 and πράγμα in 2:8 are not original. The suggestion that προστάσια 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. προστάσσω is also etymologically related to πρόσταγμα in 3:22 and προσταγή in 3:28(95). Munnich ("Origène," p. 190) also lists the asterisked addition in 2:5 as a reading that conforms to Μφ and Th.

96 Note that πρὸς ταύτα of 2:23 also appears in 1. 71.
contextual guess for ㈱forcing.97 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 l. 42-43 were not present in OG. If the argument that OG omits l. 42-43 is correct, then l. 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 καθαρπ έωράκατε δι' ἀπέστη ἀπ' έμοι τό πράγμα (s. also the discussion in Text-Critical, l. 78-83). Second, in l. 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.

l. 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-eις ἀπόλειαι ἐσονται και οἱ οίκοι αὐτῶν εἰς διαρπαγήν

MT-μετακινθήσεται καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ δημενθήσεται

OG-διαμελισθήσεται καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ δημενθήσεται

McCrystall argues that there is a shift in meaning in the OG in these passages from "physical ruin" to "confiscation."98 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 ḵun "member, limb" (s. BDB, p. 1089) is found; and רֵעַ occurs elsewhere only in Ez. 6:11. In 3:29 the rare word הָשׁ "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 παραδειγματιζει "you shall be made an example" for יַעֲשֶׂה יִנְשָׁה is based on reading יָנָה. The key to the final phrase is the meaning of יָנָה, at which the translator could only guess from the context. The easiest explanation is that the translator read the hithpe. יָנָה 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." It may be, as McCrystall 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 יָנָה by καὶ ἡ οἰκία σοφοῦ διημελιζεται 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 יָנָה, so the HL διημελίζει "confiscate" appears to be a simplification of ἀναληφθήσεται . . . εἰς τὸ βασιλείον. The major difference between 2:5 and 3:29(96) is that in the latter OG seems to translate יַעֲשֶׂה יִנְשָׁה correctly. However, it is possible that διημελιζει should be emended to read the more common διημερζει, 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 παραδειγματιζει 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 διημερζει, 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 י of יהוה was omitted by haplography with the final י in יהוה (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 διαμελίζω, 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 רביável מיל נלא.

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 deutero-canonical 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 ים מים. There is, however, a possible explanation for Th's translation of ים מים by εἰς ἀπάλειαι ἔσοδε (ἔσονται in 3:29[96]). Th probably read ים מים as if it were a hithpe. derived from בּ and simply omitted ים מים. The choices of the vb. διαρκάδω in 2:5 and the related n. διαρκαγή in 3:29(96), both HL in Daniel, again demonstrate Th independence from OG.

1. 57, 59—Although λαμπάνω is the expected equivalent, the fact that OG and Th both use παραλαμβάνω in the two other occurrences of ליבב indicates there may be Th dependence on OG in these later passages.[101]
bestowal of gifts more explicit.

1. 61, 99-OG and Th reflect two different interpretations of מַלְיָה. OG uses מַלְיָה (+ מִסְמֶר, 1. 99) here for מַלְיָה, while in 4:24(27) מַלְיָה=0. Th's rendering with מַלְיָה in 1. 61 (HL in Daniel) understands מַלְיָה as an adversative and מַלְיָה also 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. הָלִית occurs 5x in total in Dan. OG renders with אָמַר in 2:45; 6:13(12) where Th uses וַיִּלְחָם, and they share the reading of אָמַר in 7:16. OG=0 in 3:24(91) where Th has וַיִּלְחָם. 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 מִן in Dan. הֶזַּנְוֹרָקָּה is a HL in the LXX, so OG and Th have another common reading in this vs.

1. 78, 114-OG translates with קָזַנְפַּר also in 2:41, 45. Although מִלְכָּלִים occurs 13x altogether, OG only has an equivalent elsewhere in 3:29(96)-הָלִית and 6:11(10)-קָזַנְפַּר. Th's translations are very interesting. He uses קָזַנְפַּר also in 3:29(96), while in the three remaining cases in ch. 2 he has וַיִּלָּחְמָה. The situation changes drastically in chs. 4-6 where מִלְכָּלִים is employed 5x!, קָטַנְוֹפֵיָה is used in 5:22, and קָזַנְפַּר in 6:11(10)=OG. As in our investigation of מַלְיָה above, there are indications that Th's translation of מִלְכָּלִים 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 קָזַנְפַּר.

1. 91, 93-OG employs the rare term סְוַנְבָּיו (1-2) for the hithpa. (Q, HL) of מַלְיָה. Th employs another rare word, סְוַנְבָּיו (1-11). Both are

---


105 OG employs אָמַר in 4:24(27) where מַלְיָה=0. אָמַר occurs only 5x elsewhere and not in Th.

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 [זוהז]. 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 [זוהז] and in 6:23(22) for מֵכְרָב, but παράπτωμα is not found in OG.

1. 94-OG employs a dynamic rendering while Th uses an expected formal rendition of מֵכְרָב.

1. 97-The translation of [ֻם] 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.

[ֻם] is found 12x in chs. 2-6 and both OG and Th employ ἄλλοιον as a natural SE. OG translates with ἄλλοιον 6/7. The one difference is ὀφείλει (HL in OG) in 3:28(95), which carries the more appropriate sense of rejecting the command of the king. Th employs ἄλλοιον 10/12 and offers the unique rendering of παρέχομαι in 1. 97 and παραλλάσσει (1-6) in 6:16(15).

In ch. 7 [ֻם] occurs 7x, but here the SE for OG is διαφέρει 5/7. The related adv. διαφόρος appears in 7:7 and ἄλλοιον 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). ἄλλοιον does occur in 4:13(16) but the context is different. Otherwise OG employs ἄλλοιον in similar types of contexts in 4:16(19), 30a, 34(37), 34a(2) where MT=0 and we can retrovert זוהז with confidence. See also J. Barr, "Aramaic-Greek Notes on the Book of Enoch (I)," JSS 23 (1978): 187.
110 It is also in 9:7 of Th.
111 Th employs παρέχομαι 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. ἄλλοιοι 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 ἄλλοιοι because it would agree with the OG choices in 3:19, 27(95); 5:6.

Th employs the expected ἄλλοιοι in 7:25, 28; διαφέρω in 7:3, 7, 19; but ὑπερέξα "will rise above" in 7:23 and ὑπερβέρω "will exceed" in 7:24 are excellent translations of the sense. Th, then, is more consistent with his use of ἄλλοιοι 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 ξηρασις (1/1) in contrast to OG's more common θη is another mark of independence.

1. 114-The add. of συ ἐρωτάζει 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 θερασσεν in l. 113. The vb. in the final "καλλικράτης" 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 συ ἐρωτάζει makes l. 115-121 into an independent clause, which explains the insertion of καὶ 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 ἄφον 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 ἄφον occurs within the same nominal clause: ἄφον (OG=0). In each case Th
supplies a vb. The latter three are identical: οἱ κυριεῖς ὁ ὅψιστος τῆς / 
basileias τῶν ἀνθρώπων, while in 4:14(17) Th transforms ἀνάλυσις into κύριος /
and adds ἐστιν. The remaining passage where ἀνάλυσις is found is 4:23(26) /
where Th employs ἐξοπλισμία as another good translation of the sense of /
MT.

OG only has one other equivalent for ἀνάλυσις (5:29) where it /
employs ἐξοπλισμία, though it may also reflect ἀνάλυσις in his Vorlage of /
4:23(26) where ἐξοπλισμία is found.

l. 118—The shared reading of τοιοῦτο 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 τοιοῦτο τό. /
Now, the reading of 967 can / not be explained as correction toward MT /
because τοιοῦτο 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 τοιοῦτο 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 /
occaision OG employed a hypotactic construction (l. 19) to avoid the /
parataxis of his Vorlage. On other occasions he used postpositive /
conjunctions (δὲ in l. 39, 53, 65, 69; οἷς 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).[11] 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: ἐξαγοράζω in l. 77 and Ἠπ' ἄληθείας 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 (e.g. 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.[114] The same relationship between OG and Th is

---


[114] Another example is 2:1 (see CH 2) where 88-Syh had undergone revision toward MT through Th influence.
apparent throughout ch. 2: there are occasional verbal agreements and infrequent large agreements (e.g. 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 ἐγικῶ in 4-6 is evidence for a different translator. More importantly, we have also found that the translation of μῆνεν ἀμέτρητον and the idiom also support Albertz' view. It is also quite possible that the translation of τὸ τὴν κύριον ἀνάκλινα also corroborates Albertz' thesis. Th's translation pattern of these three elements is also different in 4-6, though only in the case of μῆνεν is there possible influence by OG (or later revision of both?). Th also displays a different pattern of translation for ἐντὸς ἐκ νησίων between chs. 1-2 and 3-10.

The employment of postpositive conjunctions also tends to support the picture that is emerging. ὅπως 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. γὰρ is the exception because 10/19x it is used in chs. 8-12 (but 9/10 for ὅπως). 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 ἀρίτμησις could reflect the ideology of the translator who uses ἄριστος and ἐνυπνίων 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 לְהָבָע. 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 לְהָבָע does appear.

1. 15-The reading of OG is supported by 1QDan: 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=0; 5:7, 11 OG=0. It is more likely that OG and 1QDan 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. ὅσων, which is found elsewhere in this section. If the plus represents a Vorlage, we would most likely reconstruct τὸν ἱλίνιον. It is possible that this was omitted from MT through homoiotel. or homoioarc. with ἱλίνιον. 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 ἐπιγγέναι 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 קָדָשָׁה 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 קָדָשָׁה to render אַדָּם in 4:16(19), so it is possible that OG read אַדָּם. מלך in MT would then be explained as a later correction. It is also possible the OG rendered מלך with קָדָשָׁה and this would also explain the addition of בָּאַסְגָּא. Either of these scenarios suggests that בָּאַסְגָּא is not OG. In favour of the retention of קָדָשָׁה בָּאַסְגָּא 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 1. 40 and OG in 1. 72 of one element of the idiom יַצִּיק אַמֶּר 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. לֹא הַכָּשָׁר ... לֹא הַכָּשָׁר, 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 מַרְצוֹכִי 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 מַרְצוֹכִי 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 παραδείγματιον is based on the reading μηνελεύρων (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 1. 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 οὖν προστείαχα οὖσας ἐσται
Zieg.–καθάπερ οὖν προστείαχα οὖσας ἐσται
967–[ ] καθάπερ οὖν προστείαχα

It will be noticed that while the first portion of 88–Syh reads with MT, καθάπερ οὖν προστείαχα οὖσας ἐσται 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 οὖσας ἐσται. 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 προστείαχα as a striking translation for the γατ at the beginning of vs. 9 and οὖσας ἐσται 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 ἡστη ἀν' ἔμοι in l. 42-43 is OG, but as we have previously noted (s. CH 2 and Lexicology l. 42-43), l. 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 l. 42-43 are the result of later Th influence, our analysis of l. 78-83 changes drastically. Not only is ἡστη ἀν' ἔμοι in l. 80 corrupt because it agrees with Th, but the whole section that agrees with MT becomes suspect (i.e. καθάπερ ἐστι ἡστη ἀν' ἔμοι 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 ἐκ τῶν τῶν ἡστη ἀν', but it is the καθάπερ followed by οὖν προστέταξα and not καθάπερ ἐστι τὸ πράγμα. This view has additional support in that προστέταξα also fits well with OG's pattern of dynamic renderings for λέξει (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 προστέταξα οὗτως ἔστι 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.

l. 86-87-The add. καὶ τὴν τούτου κρισίν would be retroverted as ἀρχὴν as in l. 47 and 54. The use of the demonstrative adj. is a trait of OG (also 2:45) that indicates ἀρχὴ 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 ἀρχὴν καθῆλε; whereas when the magicians speak in 2:4 and 7 the terms are employed in separate clauses. OG’s reading in l. 86-87 would reflect MT’s pattern in 2:5-6.

l. 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.\textsuperscript{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 ὦ οὖν τὴν νοῦτα would be retroverted as Μηδὲν ἀποτόμου (Joseph) and, as in 1. 86-87, it reflects expressions as they are found elsewhere in Daniel (s. 2:26). Ἀλόγως (Joseph) may also have been omitted from MT through parablepsis with either the preceding Μηδὲν or the following Ἠλε. 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 ב 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.

\textsuperscript{119} So also Collins, \textit{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 δ'καί = = μή καὶ δὲ ἄν μή
2 πεσών ἔλη
3 προσκυνήσῃ προσκυνήσῃ
tῇ εἰκόνι τῇ χρυσῇ
tῇ εἰκόνι τῇ χρυσῇ
5 ἐμβληθήσται ἐμβληθήσται
tῇ τήν κάμινον 
tῇ τήν κάμινον
tοῦ πυρός τοῦ πυρός
tῆς καιμένην τῆς καιμένην
6 οὐς ἑκατέστησας εἰς ἑκατέστησας
tῆς ἱχθος τῆς ἱχθος
tῆς ἱχθος τῆς ἱχθος
7 Βαβυλῶνος
8 σεβασμὸν Μισαχ
9 -Ἀβδεναγάω
10 οἱ (- -)
11 οὐς ἐπίκουσαν
12 μετ' Βαβυλῶνος
13 τῷ (δόγματι) σου
14 τοῖς θεοῖς σου
15 σιμώνος ἐκτοσιασ
16 καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι
tῇ χρυσῇ
tῇ χρυσῇ
tῇ χρυσῇ
tῇ χρυσῇ
17 οὐ τῇ προσκυνοῦσιν
18 οἶνος ἐς τοῦ Ναβουχοδ.
19 εἶπεν ὁ γαγαγεῖν
30 τὸν σέδρα Μισαχ
31 Ἀβδεναγὼ
32 Λ(καὶ)
33 —
34 ἠχθησαν
35 ἐνώπιον τοῦ
36 βασιλέως

3:14 καὶ Ἀπεκρίθη Ἡβουσοδονσορ
38 Ἕβουσοδονσορ
39
40 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
41 Εἰ Ἡλήθως
42 Σέδρα Μισαχ
43 Ἀβδεναγὼ
44 τοῖς θεοῖς μου
45 οὐ — —
46 ἦλατρεῦτε
47 καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι
48 τῇ χρυσῇ
49 ἡ ἑστήσα
50 οὐ ἰπροσκυνεῖτε

3:15 οὐν οὐν ἴτι
52 ἕξετε ἐτοίμας
53 ἴνα
54 ὅς ἐν
55 ἀκούσατε
56 τῆς φωνῆς
57 τῆς ἱσάλπιγγος
58 σύριγγος τε
59 καὶ κιθάρας
60 σαμφύλης
61 καὶ ψαλτηρίου
62 — —
63 καὶ παντὸς γένους
64 μουσικῶν

3:14 οὐς καὶ ἵσυνθὸν
3:15 καὶ νῦν ἴτι ἴμεν
3:15 ἕξετε ἐτοίμας

καὶ παντὸς ἴσους
μουσικῶν
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65 πεσόντες τον προσκυνήσασαι
66 προσκυνήσασαι τη εικόνα +τή χρυσή+
67 τη εικόνα +τή χρυσή+
68 ἡ ἑστήσασαι
69 Εἰ δὲ μὴ +γε γινώσκετε στὶ+
70 μὴ προσκυνήσασαι ὑμῶν ἐκθεορί
71 μὴ προσκυνήσασαι ἐμβληθήσασθε
72 ὑμῶν ἐκθεορί ἐμβληθήσασθε
73 ἐν ἐκκομιν
74 τὴν κάμινον τὸν πυρὸς
75 τὸν πυρὸς τὴν καιομένην
76 καὶ τὶς ἑστὶν θεὸς ἐὰν ἐξελείται ὑμᾶς
77 καὶ τὶς ἑστὶν θεὸς εἶναι εἰς τὸν ἑλείρων μου
3:16 καὶ ἑπεκρῆσαν σεδραχ ὁσαχ
78 ἐὰν ἐξελείται ὑμᾶς σεδραχ ὁσαχ ἀβδεναγῳ
79 καὶ τὶς ἑστὶν θεὸς εἶναι εἰπαν τῷ βασίλει
80 καὶ ἑπεκρῆσαν σεδραχ ὁσαχ ἀβδεναγῳ τῷ βασίλει
81 σεδραχ ὁσαχ ἀβδεναγῳ ἑλεύθερον μου
82 σεδραχ ὁσαχ ἀβδεναγῳ ἑλεύθερον μου ἑπεκρῆσαν τῷ βασίλει
83 ἑπεκρῆσαν τῷ βασίλει ναβουχοδονουσσὼρ
84 ἑπεκρῆσαν τῷ βασίλει ναβουχοδονουσσὼρ +βασιλεὺς
85 ἑπεκρῆσαν τῷ βασίλει ναβουχοδονουσσὼρ +βασιλεὺς
86 ἑπεκρῆσαν ναβουχοδονουσσὼρ +βασιλεὺς
87 ἑπεκρῆσαν ναβουχοδονουσσὼρ +βασιλεὺς σὺν τῷ γαρ θεός
88 ἑπεκρῆσαν ναβουχοδονουσσὼρ +βασιλεὺς σὺν τῷ γαρ θεός
89 τῷ γαρ θεός +τὸν κύριον 
90 τῷ γαρ θεός +τὸν κύριον 
3:17 ἑπί τῇ ἑπίταγῇ ταύτην
3:17 ἑπί τῇ ἑπίταγῇ ταύτην
91 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
92 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
93 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
94 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
95 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
96 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
97 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
98 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
99 ἑστὶν +τῇ γαρ θεός
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καὶ εκ τῶν ἔριδων σου

βασιλεῖον

ἐκείνη ἡμᾶς

καὶ ἐὰν μη

γνωστὸν ἔστω σοι

βασιλεῖον

ὅτι τοῖς θεοῖς σου

οὐ ἔτη

λατρεύομεν

καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι

ὁ ἑστήκας

οὐ προσκυνοῦμεν

τὸτε

Ναβουχοδονοσώρ

ἐπλήσθη ὁθυμοῦ

καὶ ἡ ἀνίψις τοῦ

προσώπου αὐτοῦ

Ἡλλοϊώθη

ἐπὶ σεδραξ Μίσαχ

Ἀβδεναγὼ

καὶ ἐπέπνευ

ἐκκαθαίρει

τὴν κάμινον

ἐπιπλασίας

ἐὰς ὅβ

(τοῖς τέλοις) ἑκκαθαίρει

καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔριδων σου

βασιλεῖον

ἐξελείται ἡμᾶς

καὶ τὸ τότε

φανερὸν σοι ἔσται

ὅτι ὦμε τὸ ἐκδόλῳ σου

λατρεύομεν ὦμε τῇ εἰκόνι ἀλλοσον τῇ χρυσῇ

ἂν ἑστήκας

προσκυνοῦμεν

τὸτε

Ναβουχοδονοσώρ

ἐπλήσθη ὁθυμοῦ

καὶ ἡ μορφή τοῦ

προσώπου αὐτοῦ

Ἱλλοϊώθη

ἐπὶ αὐτοῦς

καὶ ἐπέταξε

καὶ ἐπέταξε

τὴν κάμινον

ἐπιπλασίας

πάρα δὲ

ἐδει αὐτὸν ἐκάθαρ

καὶ ἐκ ἀνάρας

ἐπαθοτάτους

τῶν ἐν τῇ δυνάμει

ἐπέταξεν

ἐπιποδίσαντας

τοῖς σεδραξ Μίσαχ

Ἀβδεναγὼ
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 ἡμα, 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 *kaiGeorge*. While these examples are not historical presents, they are more appropriate in the context, and do not exhibit the same formal correspondence to MT as OG.

1. 29—OG avoids the simple coordination of the terms in MT by transforming one n. into the aor.pass.part. θυμοθετησις.

1. 29, 90, 131, 134—In none of these cases does Th (or OG) represent the ἡ 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 τ (s. CH 2.II.8.i.a.), while Th normally follows the number of MT. In fact, only in 1. 100 does Th not follow the number in MT for τ. The change in 1. 100 is probably due to harmonization to the earlier use in 1. 79.

IV.1.ii. **Syntax**

1. 1-4—Th's omission of the clause ἵνα ἴσα ποιήσει 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 1. 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.

1. 2—OG's omission of the part. alters the rhetorical effect, but the
basic sense is the same.

1. 6, 74, 97, 135—MT has the full expression ἀναρρήτως οὐδὲν ἔρρημεν also in 3:6,
21, 23, 26. A formally equivalent translation τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πορὸς τὴν
κακομένην is given by OG and Th in 1. 6, 74, 135; 3:6.121 OG omits τὴν
κακομένην in 1. 99 and 3:21;122 and has differences in 3:23, 26(96).
In 3:23 OG has ἐξελθοῦσα ἡ βλάστη ἀπὸ τῆς καμῖνος and 3:26(96) has τὴς
καμῖνος ἐπὶ κακομένης, but both may reflect a different approach to
translating compared to the earlier portion of ch. 3.

Th only omits τοῦ πορὸς in 3:23.

1. 11—This is the only occurrence of the independent obj. pro. τοῦ in
BA. The relative pro. ὅς is a literal and idiomatic equivalent for
the τοῦ + obj. pro.

1. 17—OG=MT while Th omits "these men" and employs a relative clause
instead.

1.21 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, ὅς only occurs 8x; all in the phrase currently being
discussed. ἦταν is found in 2 additional passages (3:19, 22), and in
each case OG and Th translate with καμῖνος. τὸ 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 τὸ, except where it is omitted. OG omits in 3:21, 22,
24(91), 26(93); 7:9. Th omits τὸ in 3:22, 23, where the context is
different due to the inclusion of the deutero-canonical material.

1.22 Asterisked add. in 88-Syh.
1. 18–Both OG and Th translate the Semitic idiom יָשֵׁב יָשֵׁב "pay regard to" (+ יָשֵׁב 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 יָשֵׁב יָשֵׁב. It is also possible that Th has read יָשֵׁב in both cases.

1. 23, 109–The add. of יָשֵׁב 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), 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 T in 1. 40.

1. 37, 80, 121–For the variation in the translation of the idiom דָּבָּר אֶל, s. Syntax, 2:1-10.

1. 51–66–Here MT leaves the apodosis unstated. OG employs infinitives in 1. 55 and 66, which effectively follow the syntax of MT. בָּא + 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 מֵאָנ/בָּא, 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 מֵאָנ/בָּא in 2:41, 42.

12Delcor, "Un cas de traduction," pp. 30-35; McCrystall, p. 81.
14GBA, §86.
15See Smyth, §2895-2916.
1. 58-62, 119-In 1. 119 (s. 1. 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. 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"). The introduction of 1. 70 also caused 3 changes in the syntax. First, μη was added to 1. 69; second, OG's introduction of γνώσκω required an obj. clause in order to retain the elements in MT; third, OG transforms the finite vb. προσκυνεῖν 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. מלך 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 היער with מנה incorrectly. 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. What is significant for our purposes is that there

---

126 In both instances 88-Syh have an asterisked add.

127 For γέ, see Smyth, §§2821-2829.

128 Noted by Mont., p. 208; but note that the Peshitta has an addition (כִּלָּל) which makes this connection as well.

129 The linguistic difficulty in 3:17 is the separation of the particle כי כָּל from the vb. כָּל. There are two options for translation. The first is offered by Torrey ("Notes," p. 263) and presupposes that the כָּל 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 ἡ ἁμαρτία for ἐπίθεσις, 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 (1. 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 1. 103 with formal equivalents "And if not," (i.e., if God does not save us), and the juss. in 1. 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 τὸτε ἡμεῖς σοι ἐστασθήσεται "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 ἦσαν 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.


11 See also Blud., p. 45.

12 The lines are marked with the obelus in 88-Syh.
1. 125-126-OG employs παρα + acc. for a comparative \(^{133}\) "seven times more than it was (literally: he had seen it) heated." Th reads ἦν for ἦν and employs εἰς τέλος adverbially. \(^{134}\) See Lexicology, 1. 126.

1. 132-967 reads τοις περὶ τῶν Ἀχαρίαν, 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 ἐφη and Ἀραβία are both rendered by SE in OG and Th. OG employs προσκυνεῖ 12/12 for ἐφη, \(^{135}\) and λατρεῖω for Ἀραβία 7/9. \(^{136}\) The choice of equivalents reflects a semantic difference. In the remainder of the LXX λατρεῖω is the SE for Ἐλλάδα where it refers to cultic service. προσκυνεῖω is the SE for Ἐλλάδα in BH and has a more predominant sense of worship. Both OG and Th recognize and maintain that distinction.

OG employs φοβεῖ in 1. 94 as an unusual equivalent for Ἐλλάδα. 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! \(^{137}\) θορύσσεω 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 σοφεῖω in 7:14, 27 is acceptable, there is no semantic difference that would explain why he would not employ the established equivalent λατρεῖω. It would support the suggestion that

\(^{133}\) Smyth, §1073.

\(^{134}\) So Mont., p. 211.

\(^{135}\) 2.46; 3:5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 28. Th omits in 3:10, s. Syntax.

\(^{136}\) 3:12, 14, 18, 28(95); 6:17(16), 21(20); 7:14. In 3:17 OG has φοβεῖ (Th has λατρεῖω) and in 7:14 Th has σοφεῖω. In 7:27 OG has θορύσσεω where Th has σοφεῖω again.

\(^{137}\) 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 ἀνέθη 5/5, but in ch. 6 OG has ἐδίωκε 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 ἀνέθη is in 7:9 where it has a different sense, and both OG and Th have ἔθημι. Once more OG’s vocabulary reveals differences within chs. 4–6.

l. 6, 74-OG omits µη all 10x it appears in Daniel, whereas Th only omits in l. 6, 74 and 3:6. Elsewhere Th has µέμος.

l. 9, 45, 52, 91, 107-Both OG and Th treat ἔτη as a copula. OG has ἔτην (ἐτιν in l. 8) 6/12 and omits it in 2:26; 3:14, 18. In three cases OG offers free renditions. OG employs the f. part. φῶσαν in 2:30 and ἐτε in l. 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 ὀδηγεῖν ἐγενέθη. Besides the agreements with OG in 2:30 and 3:15, Th also omits ἔτη in l. 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 ἔμι 9/14.

l. 9, 17, 33, 34, 127-OG employs ἀνθρώπος (7x) and ἄνω (7x)

---


139 6. 8(7), 13(12), 17(16), 25(24). See 6:18(17) for an equivalent to 17(16).

140 See also Albertz, p. 162.

141 Also in 3:21, 23, 24(91), 25(92), 26(93); 4:7(10); 7:15. 7:15 has the difficult ἔτη ἀνέθη, which Th seems to have attempted to render with a contextual guess ἐπέβαλε.

142 GBA, 895. Muraoka (Emphatic, p. 81) states that ἔτη retains an asseverative force in 2:26 and 3:17, while elsewhere in Daniel it is weakening to a copula.

143 2:11(2), 28; 3:12, 17, 29(96). OG=0 in 4:32(35); 5:11.
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indiscriminately as equivalents for ἀνθρωπος (19x). In contrast, Th never employs ἀνθρωπος. However, Th also omits translating ἀνθρωπος more often than OG and in one case makes it explicit who the men are (οἱ τακτικοὶ in 6:6[5]). The omission in 3:12 is due to Th changing the syntax; and Th also omits ἀνθρωπος 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.

1. 12, 13-ἐπιτρέπω is also collocated with ἔργα 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 ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς βασιλί. Presumably, OG has omitted ἐπιτρέπω in both cases as unnecessary. Th also employs the collective ἔργα for the Hebrew equivalent הָדָרָה (HL in Daniel) in 8:27.

Th employs χώρα (9/9) as a SE for הנרי, 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 χώρα in 3:12 suggests that OG employed the dynamic translation πράγμα in 2:49 because of his earlier choice in vs. 48.

1. 20-OG employs a variety of equivalents for מָלַס: γνώσις 2:14; κρίνε 3:10, 29(96); ἔντολή 3:12. Th favours δόγμα 6/9, but not to the

144 ἀνθρωπος in 2:25; 3:12, 13, 27(94); 5:117; 6:25(24); 8:15. ἁπάντησις in 3:8, 12, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25(92). OG (and Th) omits the second ἀνθρωπος 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.

145 S. the discussion of the relationship between Th and OG in 1:1-10, 1. 48, 94.

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 ἔργα (?)

147 2:48, 49; 3:1, 2, 3, 12, 30(97); 8:2; 11:24.

148 Mont., p. 184, suggests that 2:48 was motivated by 2:49.

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. γνώμη renders the sense of "good judgement" in 2:14, while in 5:2 ἀφιέρωσις has the sense "taste," which Th translates with γεώτρια. 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 ἀφιέρωσις does exhibit significant differences in approach. It should also be noted that OG only employs δόμα in a plus (6:12a), whereas Th's use of δόμα mainly for ἀφιέρωσις and οἴνος (s. Syntax, 2:1-10) represents incomplete lexical levelling.

1. 21, 44, 106—OG's specifies the nature of the gods (εἰδώλα) in l. 21 and 106, whereas in l. 44 it has a literal equivalent to MT. Actually, OG's ideology preserves a nice distinction. To the king the statue represents the "gods" θεοί (l. 44), but to the three it is merely an "idol" εἰδώλον. This distinction explains why OG does not employ εἰδώλον in l. 44.

1. 25, 48, 111—Forms of ἀπόστημι were ideal to render דָּבָר because of the broad semantic range it afforded, as well as its use as both a transitive or an intransitive vb. Of the 35x דָּבָר appears in Daniel the majority are in the Aramaic section and 10 are in ch. 3:1-18. MT has a plus against OG and Th in 3:3, but it is probably a case of dittoigraphy in MT. 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 דָּבָר. 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 ἐξανιστήμην in 3:24(91), which is unique. It is the only occurrence in Th, even though it is a regular equivalent for מְטַמּוּ in the LXX.¹⁵⁴ In 6:4(3) Th renders מְטַמּוּ מְיָע with a simple finite form of καθίστημι, whereas OG employs ἐπουθενατό καταστήματι. Th has probably omitted translating the HL מְיָע.

Finally, we must consider the question of Th’s relationship to OG. The ratio of agreements between Th and OG for the translation of מְטַמּוּ 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 ἄγιονα . . . κατέ. αὐτόν = ἦσσε κεφαλή . . . ἐποίηκεν = "your father appointed him head . . ." Th’s translations in these instances accord well with his renderings of הָיוֹנ 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 בֶּלֶשׁ appears.¹⁵⁵ 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 παρεισθήσειαν 7:10 is most likely a distinctive agreement.

1. 27, 32, 113-MT employs גִּנֹר (ב) 46x in Daniel.¹⁵⁶ There is little point in presenting a comprehensive analysis because τότε is the normal and expected equivalent for גִּנֹר (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 גִּנֹר (ב) 13/13 in

¹⁵⁴ἐξανιστήμης appears in 5:6 in OG where MT=0.

¹⁵⁵OG has καθίστημι in 2:48, but in 2:38 it employs καριέσθω!

¹⁵⁶2:14, 15, 17, 19(2), 25, 35, 46, 48; 3:3, 13(2), 19, 21, 24(91), 26(93)bis, 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.

246
ch. 2-3:21. Th, on the other hand, has δε in 2:15! and και in 2:17, 19, 48; 3:3. Second, the frequent use of και in Th means that the και in l. 32 may be the equivalent for דַּבָּרָם, rather than for a hypothetical ָךְ (ושירי דַּבָּר is omitted in l. 33). Third, OG employs the dynamic equivalents oppon ὑπν only in 3:26(93) and 3:30(97). Fourth, contrary to the stereotyped usage in ch. 2-3:21, OG only employs ὅτε about 12/23 in 3:24(91)-7:19 and the alternative equivalents (also και 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.\textsuperscript{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 l. 28 (זֶרֵע is a HL in Daniel). Although OG transforms the first to a participle, Th has the same order of equivalents: θυμός (θυμῶ OG) then ὀργή. The nature of this agreement is underscored in l. 115 where both OG and Th employ θυμός for מָמָּה instead of ὀργή as in l. 28. The same type of agreement occurs with the cognate Hebrew term מַמָּה. In 11:44 OG and Th both render מַמָּה with θυμός, but in 9:16 they both have ὀ θυμός σου και ὀ ργή σου where MT reads מָמָּה תַּם. The order θυμός, then ὀ ργή is not a fixed collocation in the LXX either, so 3:13 and 9:16 are probably distinctive agreements.\textsuperscript{158}

The specifics of OG and Th's agreement are, however, difficult to discern. For example, in the only other occurrence of מָמָּה in 8:6, OG has the expected θυμός; but, Th has ὀ ργή (1-10)! If we broaden the investigation, we find that OG and Th employ ὀ ργή to render the substantive מָמָּה in 8:19 and 11:36. However, when מָמָּה occurs as a vb.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{158}In fact, ὀ ργή 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 ὀ ργή are employed as overlapping synonyms in the LXX.
in 11:30 OG employs ὄργιζω and Th has θυμόω. 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 ὄργας in the sense of anger in 11:20 (cf. 9:16) OG employs ὄργη, whereas Th renders literally with πρόσωπον. Finally, we should note that OG employs both θυμόω (8:7) and ὄργιζω (11:11) to translate ἔρις in the hithpalpal (ῬΙΝΗ) "to be embittered," but Th has 2 HL in the LXX: ἐξαιραίω and ἄγριάω!!

I. 29, 34-OG and Th have common readings for πάτω throughout Daniel (12x), but the significance is minimal because the equivalents are expected. 159 In 3:26(93) OG simplifies ἔρις ἔρις to ἔξηθετε while Th has a good dynamic translation ἔξηθετε καὶ δεῦτε "Come out and come here!!" 160

I. 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.

I. 41-OG renders the sense of MT, but it is uncertain whether he actually knew the meaning of the inf. νιτράς. 161 Th offers a literal equivalent.

I. 51-The adv. οὐδείς 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 νοῦν οὐν. 162 However, in 5:15 where the conj. ἢ is attached, Th translates with καὶ νοῦν. According to Ziegler, the νοῦν is not part of Th's text in 2:23, but there is some support for its inclusion.

---

159 πάτω 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).


162 3:15; 4:34(37); 5:12, 16; 6:9.
1. 52-The equivalent τοιμώς (1-4) for רָדַע (HL in Dan.) in OG and Th is a common reading in 1. 50.

1. 54-בִּלְדַר also occurs in 3:5 where OG has δοξάω and Th employs ὑπὲρ ὅρχ. Th's rendering is more dynamic in 3:15. S. Syntax, l. 49-64.

1. 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 (κιθαρίς, ψαλτήριον, συμφωνία), and two (דב, כִּנּוֹ) are semitic.163 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.164 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.165 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.166 In the later vss. (7, 10, 15) OG omits συμφωνία as redundant.

1. 68-OG may employ ἱστιμα for ἱστιμα because he expected to read λείπμ (ῥοιμ) in 3:2, 3, 5, 7, 10.


164 Bevan, p. 80; Grelot, "L'Orchestre," pp. 36-37.

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 ἡπιστεύμα in 7:21. The expected equivalent for the verb ἡπιστεύμα in both OG (3/7) and Th (10/12) is θαλέα.\(^{167}\)

1. 72-77 only appears 5x in Daniel: 4x in the temporal expression ἐν τῇ μη (3:6, 15; 4:30[33]; 5:5) and once prefixed with ἦ (4:16). OG has various equivalents. ἐν τῇ μη (1-2) in 3:15 appears to be a neologism (LEH, p. 70), while in 3:6 OG omits translating it. ἦ is in τῇ μη may be an equivalent in 4:30(33), though like 4:16(19) the Vorlage is uncertain. Other than the neologism in 3:15, the only equivalent for ἐν τῇ μη in 5:5 is the most significant equivalent for ἐν τῇ μη because it almost certainly stems from Th! In the other three cases where ἐν τῇ μη appears, Th always has τῇ μη. The only difference in 5:5 is the add. of ἦ, but the literalness of the reading and the consistency with which it is found in Th leads to the conclusion that the reading ἦ τῇ μη of OG in 5:5 is Theodotionic.

1. 78, 96, 102-The main equivalent for ἐπιστεύμα (shaphel, see BDB, p. 1115) in both OG (5/8) and Th (7/9) is ἐκτεινόμενον.\(^{168}\) The other equivalent for OG is ἀντιλαμβάνεται in 3:28(95); 6:21(20), 28(27).\(^{169}\) Th has ἐπιστεύμα in 3:17 and ἀντιλαμβάνεται (HL in Daniel) in 6:28(27). It is possible that Th has followed OG’s equivalent for ἐπιστεύμα, 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.\(^{170}\) Analysis of related vocabulary sharing the sense of deliverance reveals similar findings. For example, other than 3:88 Th only has ἀναπλασμα in 11:41 and 12:1 where the Hebrew equivalent is מֹל (ni.). These are the only appearances of מֹל in Daniel and the reading is shared with OG in 12:1. However, in

---

\(^{167}\) 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).

\(^{168}\) ἐπιστεύμα 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 ἐπιστεύμα appears twice and OG reads quite differently.

\(^{169}\) OG has ἀναπλασμα also in 3:88; 11:42; 12:1.

\(^{170}\) S. the discussion of OG and Th’s relationship.
11:41 OG=0, so we cannot assume Th dependence on OG in 12:1.

Another semitic term for deliverance, לָשׁוֹן (ha. in BA), occurs 5x in Daniel. OG has ἔξαιρέω in 3:29(96); 6:16(15)=15(14) and πῶς in 8:4, 7. Th overlaps in 6:15(14), whereas in 3:29(96); 6:28(OG=0) he has πῶς and in 8:4, 7 ἔξαιρέω.

1. 87-OG and Th employ the common reading χρείαν ἔξομεν for πῶς (HL in MT; BDB, p. 1093). This reading also shares the same feature as the common reading in 1. 52, i.e. both employ εχω.

1. 88, 90-OG and Th have ἀποκρίπω for πῶς. Th has the same equivalence where πῶς has the sense of "answer" in 2:14. There OG has εἶπεν.\

1. 88, 90-MT also has δικλή in 4:14(17) where OG=0 and Th has λόγος.

1. 95-OG and Th only have δῶματος elsewhere in 11:3 for πῶς (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. πυμάλημμα is nowhere else in Th while OG has it again in 12:4.\

1. 116-ἐκών is the SE for ἐλέος for both OG (14/17) and Th (16/17),\

Elsewhere πῶς has the sense of return in 4:31(34), 33(36)bis, and in each case Th renders with τιστρίφω (OG=0).

ῥῆμα=δῶματος is a common equivalent in the LXX.

ῥῆμα appears 4x in MT: 2:35 OG=πατάσσω, Th=πληρέω; 9:2
OG=ἀνακλήρωσις, Th=συμκλήρωσις; 10:3 OG=συντελέω, Th=πλήρωσις. OG's rendering in 2:35 is based on his reading ἔξωτολὶ for ἔλλειψ. ἔλλειψ is found earlier in the vs. as well as in 2:34.

ἐλέος 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 ἐσθή. 175 ὀψις is an equivalent for ἀνάμικτος in 1:4 of Th, whereas OG has it for ἀνάμικτος in 1:13, 15 (Th=ἐξετάζει).

1. 118–The translation of ἀπασιός was discussed in the previous section on 2:1-10. 4x elsewhere MT has ἔτη collocated with ἀπασιός "his appearance was changed" and in each case Th employs ἀλλοιώσει. 176

1. 122, 126–OG employs the simple καίω for ῥήμα while Th has the compound εἰκαίω. The only other occurrence of ῥήμα is in 3:22 (pe.pf.) where both read εἰκαίων. OG exhibits lexical levelling by employing καίω for both ῥήμα and ἔτη (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 εἰς τοῦτον for ὄνομα. Th translated it adverbially (i.e. "utterly"), but it is unlikely that his text differed from MT. 177 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 ὄνομα with a superlative, and a formally equivalent rendition of ὄνομα. Th simplifies to ἔστημον ὑπέρτων "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 ὀψις.

176 5:6, 9, 10; 7:28. OG has ἀλλοιώσει in 5:6; OG=0 in 5:9, 10; διαφέρω in 7:28.

177 Mont., p. 211, suggests that Th read ὄνομα as if it were from the root of ῥήμα.
1. 131-OG has ἑνδοδύο (3/3) for λόγο, whereas Th has πέδαμ 4/4. 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 (e.g. τῇ εἰκόνι τῇ χρυσῇ) 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-συνιδώ; 1. 72-σωματιν; 1. 94-φιλομομένα) and displays some freedom in word order by employing postpositive conjunctions (ὅτι in 1. 9, 69, 80; γάρ 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=0 in 3:24(91) but has an extra appearance of συντοδύο in 3:22. OG has πέδαμ 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 *πίπτε* for Νὰ in chs. 4-6 is distinct from the choice *εμπάλλε* elsewhere. Second, OG employs *τότε* as a SE for *Προ(2)* in ch. 2-3:21, which is distinct from 3:24(91)-7:19. Third, the idiomatic μὲν/καί 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.\(^{179}\) 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 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)

\(^{179}\)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 MT. These are summarized below:

1. OG has εξελθοῦσα ἡ φλόγι ἐκ τῆς καμίνου in 3:23 and τῇς καμίνου ἐκ καταμένης in 3:26(96) where MT has נָדַרְשׁ אָנָחָה לְגוֹרָה (cf. 3:6, 11, etc.).

2. OG has οὐδεμία ἐγενήθη in 3:25(92) for ἤριθαρχή.

3. OG employs οὐκαίς οὖν only in 3:26(93) and 3:30(97) for וַיִּיהְמָה.

4. OG renders καταχρίζεται with ὁμοτέτω (HL in OG) in 3:28(95) instead of the SE ὑπολογοῦ (6/7).

5. A strong piece of evidence that the deuto-canonical material has been inserted into the text is the translation of רָדְמִי הַשֶּׁבֶר and רֶבֶן הַנִּלְיָה in 3:29(96)=2:5. For the latter OG has καὶ ἡ σκόνα σῶτος δημενήσεται "his belongings will be confiscated" in 3:29(96), which seems to be a simplification of καὶ ἀναληθήσεται ψυχά τα ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν 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 רָדְמִי. Instead of an equivalent similar to παραδειγματοθέτησις in 2:5, the translator has διαμελιζομένως. 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 בְּיִשָּׁה and because he did not know the meaning either. On the other hand, the redactor employed his own equivalent for רָדְמִי rather than follow the earlier translator’s lead because in that case he knew the meaning of MT.180

6. The translation τοῖς ἑπὶ τῶν Ἀζαριαν for מֹשֶׁה וּמִשְׁךָ מִשְׁךָ 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 מְנָה רָמָה (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.¹⁸¹

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. γὰρ 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 ἐρῆμος in 1. 6 and 74 (also 3:6) are common readings, but it is difficult to judge their value because Th does translate ἐρῆμος 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 (ὑπερήφανος; ἁγίος; ἀγαθός; ὁ λάθος = εἰκόνα; οὐ μόνον = χρυσός) and are, therefore, insignificant. For the equivalents ἐρημοῦσα = προσκυνεῖν; ΝΑΒ = λατρεῖν, it is possible (but not necessary) that Th followed OG. Second, the consistent use of the attributive adj. (εἰκόνα τῆς χρυσῆς) and phrases like εἰς τὴν κάμην τοῦ πορὸς τὴν κατομένην is

¹⁸¹OG’s choice of ἱππό in 3:10, 29(96) where MT has ἔπη θυρίζει are unique equivalents that link the translator of 3:21–30(97) to the previous chs. Presumably when the redactor spliced the deuto-canonical additions into 3:21–30(97), he had a translation of 3:21–30 from the same translator as ch. 3. On the other hand, the rendering of τοῖς for χρυσός 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,\(^\text{182}\) 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 δῶσατος 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.

\(^\text{182}\)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 τῷ ὄρα in 5:5 stems from Th. It is also possible that the compound vb. ἔξεκατον in 3:22 stems from Th.
1. 6, 74—The omission of מִנָּה 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 וַ'נ, 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 וַּ'רֶסְפֹּנ in OG could be based on an alternative Vorlage reading לִימוֹנָה, but it also looks like harmonization with previous uses (omitted in Th, Peshitta and Vulgate). There are no grounds to emend MT.

1. 70, 92–93—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 בַּשָּׁלֵט in 1. 86 is based on מָלְכָּה in his Vorlage, which was omitted in MT (or added in OG's Vorlage) due to the preceding מָלְכָּה. On the other hand, OG may have inserted בַּשָּׁלֵט as a means to introduce this important section of direct address. In a similar fashion, OG omitted מָלְכָּה 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 מַשָּׁר in OG (cf. 1. 8, 76) falls into this category.

1. 119—The substitution of וּכְ בָּנָוֶי for the list of names is more likely another example of OG abbreviating the monotonous repetition of

\[\text{\textsuperscript{183}}\text{It is marked with the obelus in 88-Syh.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{184}}\text{Collins, Daniel, p. 177, emends based on OG (967).}\]
MT in ch. 3 and is not based on a Vorlage with פליאר. 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. 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.

<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 ἔτει τρίτῳ</td>
<td>ἰὴν τὴν ἑβδόμην</td>
<td>ἔτους τρίτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>λαλεῖ</td>
<td>βασιλεύοντος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Βαλτασαρ</td>
<td>ἐπικράτει</td>
<td>Βαλτασαρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 δρασις</td>
<td>δρασις</td>
<td>δρασις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ἐφοθη πρὸς με</td>
<td>ἔρευνα ἐμῆ</td>
<td>ἤν εἶδον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ἐγὼ</td>
<td>ἐγὼ</td>
<td>ἐγὼ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Δανιηλ</td>
<td>ἔρευνα</td>
<td>Δανιηλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 μετὰ</td>
<td>μετὰ</td>
<td>μετὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 τὴν (ἀφθεισάν)</td>
<td>τὸ ἰδεῖν</td>
<td>τὸ ἰδεῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 μοι</td>
<td>με</td>
<td>με</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 τὴν (ἀρχὴν)</td>
<td>τὴν πρῶτην</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></td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ὄρασιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>οἷς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦ ἐνυπνίου μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 καὶ ἡμεν</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐμοῦ δυνατός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 ἐν σοῦσοις</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν σοῦσοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 τῇ βόρει</td>
<td></td>
<td>τῇ πόλει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 ή</td>
<td></td>
<td>ήτις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ἐστίν ἐν χώρᾳ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐστίν ἐν χώρᾳ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{186}\text{Jeans., pp. 32-57.}\]
21 Αιλαμ  Ἔλµµαιδι
22 - -  
23 καὶ  ἔτι
24 ήµην  ὄντος µου
25 ἐκι  πρὸς
26 τοῦ Ουβαλ  τῇ πύλῃ
27 - -  ὸλµµ
8:3  8:3  8:3
28 καὶ ἡρα  ἀναβλέψας
29 τοὺς ὀφθαλµοὺς µου
30 καὶ εἶδον  εἶδον
31 καὶ ιδοῦ  - -
32 κριόν  κριόν
33 εἰς  ἕνα µέγαν
34 ἑτοµηκός  ἑστότα
35 πρὸ  ἀπέναντι
36 τοῦ Ουβαλ  πύλης
37 καὶ αὐτῶ  καὶ εἴπε
38 κέρατα  κέρατα
39 - -  - -
40 ψηλὰ  ψηλὰ
41 καὶ τὸ ἐν  καὶ τὸ ἐν
42 ψηλότερον  ψηλότερον
43 τοῦ ἐτέρου  τὸν κριόν
44 καὶ τὸ ψηλὸν  καὶ τὸ ψηλὸν
45 ἀνέβαινεν  ἀνέβαινε
46 εἰς ἐσχάτων  8:4 µετὰ δὲ ταῦτα
8:4
47 εἶδον  εἶδον
48 τὸν κριόν  τὸν κριόν
49 κερατίζοντα  κερατίζοντα
50 κατὰ θάλασσαν  πρὸς ἀνατολάς
51 καὶ βορράν  καὶ πρὸς βορράν
52 καὶ νότον  καὶ πρὸς δυσµᾶς
53 καὶ πάντα  καὶ µεσηµβρίαν
54 τὰ θηρία  καὶ πάντα
55 τὰ θηρία  τὰ θηρία
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56 oî  
57 στίχωνται  
58 ενώπιον αὐτοῦ  
59 καὶ οὐκ ἂν  
60 ὁ (ἐξαπομένον)  
61 ἐκ χειρῶν αὐτοῦ  
62 καὶ ἐποίησε  
63 κατὰ  
64 τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ  
65 καὶ ἐμεγαλώθη  
8:5  
66 καὶ ἐγὼ  
67 ἡμῖν  
68 (συνίον)  
69 καὶ ίδοὺ  
70 τράγος  
71 σιγῶν  
72 ήρχετο  
73 ἀπὸ  
74 (λιθὸς)  
75 ἐπὶ  
76 πρὸς σοὺν  
77 πάσης  
78 τῆς τῆς  
79 καὶ οὐκ ἂν  
80 ἀπόμενον  
81 τῆς τῆς  
82 καὶ τὸ τράγῳ  
83 κέρας  
84 - -  
85 ἀνὰ μέσον  
86 τῶν ὄφθαλμῶν  
8:6  
87 καὶ ἦλθεν  
88 ἐκ  
89 τοῦ κριοῦ  
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90 τοῦ τὰ κέρατα
εξοντος

91 ὅν

92 εἴδον

93 εὐστῶτος

94 ἐνώπιον

95 τοῦ Οὐραλ

96 καὶ ἑδραμεν

97 πρὸς αὐτὸν

98 ἐν (ἄρμῇ)

99 τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ

8:7

100 καὶ εἴδον αὐτὸν

101 (φθάνοντα)

102 ἦς

103 τοῦ κριῶν

104 καὶ (ἐξηγηριάνθη)

105 πρὸς αὐτὸν

106 καὶ (ἔπαισε)

107 τὸν κριῶν

108 καὶ συνετριψεν

109 —

110 (ἀμφότερα)

111 τὰ κέρατα αὐτοῦ

112 καὶ οὐκ

113 ἂν

114 ἰσχὺς

115 ἐν τῷ κριῶ

116 τοῦ στήναι

117 ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ

118 καὶ ἐρρίψεν αὐτὸν

119 ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν

120 καὶ (συνεπάτησεν) αὐτὸν

121 καὶ οὐκ

τὸν τὰ κέρατα εξοντα
δὲν εἴδον εὐστῶτα ἐν τῇ πύλῃ καὶ ἑδραμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν θυμῷ ὀργῆς
καὶ εἴδον αὐτὸν προσάγοντα πρὸς τὸν κριῶν καὶ ἐθομᾶθη ἐξ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπάταξεν καὶ συνετριψεν τὰ δόσ κέρατα αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκέτι ἂν εὖ τῷ κριῷ ἱσχύς στήναι κατέναντι τοῦ τράγου καὶ ἐσπάραξεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ συνετριψεν αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ
122 ἢν 122 ἢν
123 ὁ ἑξαιρόμενος 123 ὁ ἑξαιρόμενος
124 τὸν κρίτων 124 τὸν κρίτων
125 ἐκ 125 ἐκ
126 χειρὸς αὐτοῦ 126 χειρὸς αὐτοῦ
8:8 8:8
127 καὶ ὁ τράγος 127 καὶ ὁ τράγος
128 τῶν αἰγῶν 128 τῶν αἰγῶν
129 (ἡμεγαλώνθη) 129 (ἡμεγαλώνθη)
130 ἐκς 130 ἐκς
131 σφόδρα 131 σφόδρα
132 καὶ ἐν 132 καὶ ἐν
133 (τῷ ἵσχυσαι αὐτῶν) 133 (τῷ ἵσχυσαι αὐτῶν)
134 συνετρίβη 134 συνετρίβη
135 τὸ κέρας 135 τὸ κέρας
136 τὸ μέγα 136 τὸ μέγα
137 καὶ ἀνέβη 137 καὶ ἀνέβη
138 — — 138 — —
139 κέρατα τέσσαρα 139 κέρατα τέσσαρα
140 ἰποκάτω αὐτοῦ 140 ἰποκάτω αὐτοῦ
141 εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρας 141 εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρας
142 ἀνέμοιος 142 ἀνέμοιος
143 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 143 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
8:9 8:9
144 καὶ ἐκ 144 καὶ ἐκ
145 τοῦ 145 τοῦ
146 ἐνός 146 ἐνός
147 αὐτῶν 147 αὐτῶν
148 ἐξῆλθε 148 ἐξῆλθε
149 κέρας 149 κέρας
150 ἐν 150 ἐν
151 ἰσχυρὸν 151 ἰσχυρὸν
152 καὶ (ἡμεγαλώνθη) 152 καὶ (ἡμεγαλώνθη)
153 (περισσῶς) 153 (περισσῶς)
154 πρὸς 154 πρὸς
155 τὸν νότον 155 τὸν νότον
156 — — 156 — —
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 equivalencies.

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 θυρανοῦ from 1. 168 of Th. 188

---

187 Jeans., p. 57.

188 Another misprint is ἔνδοτος for ἔνδοτος 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 (eg. ὑπάρχει = ἔχει, εἶ = ἔστι) 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 βαλτασσάρ in 1. 3 is good evidence that Th is a recension, because we would expect a more precise transliteration for βαλτασσάρ. 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 (1. 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 ב/ἐν, נושא/ἐποίησε, שן/σπέρμα, למלואκ/τῆς βασιλείας, ἡμῖν/ὑμῶν, etc.?  

Independent Th readings (2x) – None of Th's translation in vs. 1, apart from the possible exception of βαλτασσάρ, 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.\(^{191}\) and by the choice of ἄρχη in 1. 11, but neither of these is particularly distinctive.\(^{192}\)

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 (ἐστιν ἐν ἄρχῃ), but also follow the same word order against MT "which is in the province of Elumaidi/Ailam."\(^{193}\) However, as we saw in the last section, Th employs ἄρχη as a SE for ἱστορία (9/9).\(^{194}\) It is possible that Th is dependent upon OG's word order, but, with the exception of 8:2, ἱστορία always appears as a construct when designating an area (2:48, 49; 3:1, 12, 30[97]). In those cases Th has ἄρχη-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.\(^{195}\) Once again, the conclusion is hardly warranted. Th, like OG, translates the Vorlage, and in the first instance he had to

\(^{191}\) For the use of the article to introduce a relative clause, see GKC §138k.

\(^{192}\) ἱστορία occurs elsewhere in 9:21, 23 where both OG and Th employ ἄρχη. Jeans., p. 49, states that Th "standardizes ἄρχη 'first' for ἱστορία," but she does not note that OG has the same reading in the other two places.

\(^{193}\) The double underline under Αἰλαμ is intended, albeit inadequately, to indicate that Jeans. suggests that Th is dependent on the OG word order.

\(^{194}\) 2:48, 49; 3:1, 2, 3, 12, 30(97); 11:24.

\(^{195}\) Jeans., p. 50, #14.
provide a tense appropriate to the context.

*Independent Th readings (1x)*—The transliterations in l. 21 and 26, and the correct translations in l. 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 l. 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 ὀφάσις in l. 30, κριῶς in l. 32,196 and καὶ σὰς in l. 38.197 The verbal agreement of τῆς θηλᾶς in l. 40, 42, 44 is more significant not only because these are the only places where ἀνάμμελεν appears in Daniel, but also because of the forms in l. 42 and 44. θηλᾶς does not appear elsewhere in Th, but OG has it in 4:7(10) (misreading of ἀνάμμελεν?) and 9:15. This might suggest that since OG employs θηλᾶς elsewhere, then Th has borrowed from OG in 8:3. However, as a survey of HR reveals, although the adj. ἀνάμμελεν is translated sporadically by various equivalents in the LXX, the main equivalent is τῆς θηλᾶς.198 Therefore, we should not be surprised that Th employs τῆς θηλᾶς in 8:3.

Likewise, if we consider the specific forms employed by OG and Th in l. 42 and 44, there is nothing we would not expect to find if Th

---

196 7/8 occurrences of ἀνάμμελεν are in 8:1-10. 8:3, 4, 6, 7(4), 20.

197 τῆς 23x, but 4x it refers to a musical instrument (3:5, 7, 10, 15). Otherwise καὶ σὰς is a SE in OG (18/19) and Th (17/19). OG and Th share an omission in l. 39 which is probably secondary in MT and Th also omits once in 7:20. The remaining passages are 7:7, 8(4), 11, 20, 21, 24; 8:3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 20, 21.

198 For example, the adj. ἀνάμμελεν is rendered by the singular equivalents ἐξίς in I Sam. 16:7; μετάμετρος in Is. 5:15; ὑπερθέτανος in Ps. 101(100):5; ὑπερθεῖα in I Sam. 2:3. Otherwise the adj. ἀνάμμελεν is rendered 27x by τῆς θηλᾶς 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 ἐστώ. 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. ἔτη in 1. 45 only occurs outside of 8:3 in 8:8 and 11:23. In all cases Th reads ἀνασκαίνει because it is the SE throughout the LXX. The substantive in 1. 41 (καὶ τὸ ἐν for ἐν τῷ) 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. ἔλεγε in 1. 45 only occurs outside of 8:3 in 8:8 and 11:23. In all cases Th reads ἀνασκαίνει because it is the SE throughout the LXX. The substantive in 1. 41 (καὶ τὸ ἐν for ἐν τῷ) 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. ἔλεγε in 1. 45 only occurs outside of 8:3 in 8:8 and 11:23. In all cases Th reads ἀνασκαίνει because it is the SE throughout the LXX. The substantive in 1. 41 (καὶ τὸ ἐν for ἐν τῷ) is linked to the verbal agreement in the vbs. in 1. 45 as well as to the agreement of the substantives in 1. 41.

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. 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 ἡ τῆς.

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 κεφαλή (1-11) is a common reading, but κεφαλή is the SE (9/11) for Ἰησοῦ in the

---

199 In 11:23 OG has evidently read the prep. ἦλθεν because it translates with ἐστι.

200 We should note that 4QDan⁴ and 4QDan⁵ read ἔδρα 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 (ἀναπέσω) and 11:12 (λαμβάνω) do OG and Th have verbal agreement.
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LXX. 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 ὅστε + a 3p. form of εἰμι.

Th is dependent upon OG (4x)—In all 4 cases Th provides the expected formal equivalence to MT. For example, יָּרֹב occurs 4x in MT and Th employs יָּרֹב 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 once to MT in this verse. The equivalence μεγαλίνω= λέγει (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 הָאָב.

Vs. 5

Th retains OG (13x)—Each of these verbal agreements is the expected SE.

203 הָאָב also appears in Ex. 21:28, 31(2), 32; Dt. 33:17; I Kings 22:11; Ps. 44(43):5; Ezek. 34:21; Dan. 11:40; II Chr. 18:10. הָאָב is not translated once in Ex. 21:31 where it is redundant, but OG and Th both have ץְּכָּרֹתְּכֶנ in 11:40 which is a distinctive agreement (HL in LXX!).

204 S. 1:4; 8:27; 9:26; 10:21; 11:15, 16, 45. Th usually has ὅστε ἠκούειν. OG often renders similarly to Th, but omits in 1:4, has ὅστε in 8:5, οὕτως ἦν in 8:27 and οὕτως ἦν in 10:21.

205 OG renders with a vb. again in 11:3, while it has θελήμα in 11:16, 36.

206 OG’s main equivalent is τοῦτο (8:4, 10, 25; 11:36, 37). In 8:8, 9 OG employs καταστρεφό as a dynamic equivalent. OG and Th share a distinctive agreement in 8:11 where both have ὁμοιάζω. 8:11-14 is similar to 9:24-27 in that the OG text is significantly different from MT. The difference is that in 8:11-14 Th follows OG very closely. For a detailed discussion and attempt to resolve the problem see, David, pp.357-380. Bogaert ("Relecture," pp. 207-210), also argues for an alternative Vorlage and, based on the TT elsewhere in OG and Th, that conclusion is justified.
employed throughout the LXX. \[1\] \[2\] requires some comment, because O'Connell and Bodine suggest it is a \textit{kaige} characteristic. \[3\] appears 4x in MT and in each case OG and Th employ \textit{ává µízov}. \[4\] This "characteristic" is nothing more than an expected Greek equivalent. \[5\]

**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 \textit{άπω} is a formal equivalent for MT, and \textit{άπω} is the SE for \textit{τιν} throughout the LXX. See the discussion of 1. 101 under \textit{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. \textit{τιν} (usually hi.) in 1. 68. Th employs \textit{σοφήρ} as a SE (16/22), while OG prefers \textit{διανοεόμαι} (11/22). \[6\] In 1. 74 Th employs \textit{λήψ} (HL in Daniel) for \textit{βρέχω} (HL in Daniel), whereas OG exhibits lexical levelling by choosing the same equivalent (διοφή) that he did in vs. 4 for \textit{τόξο}. \[7\]

\[1\] The only exception to this statement is \textit{τράγος}=\textit{τμς} "he-goat," because \textit{τράγος} is not employed for the only other occurrences of \textit{τμς} in II Chr. 29:21; Ezra 8:5. However, \textit{τράγος} is the exact equivalent and the choice is also determined by the fact that \textit{τμς} is collocated with \textit{τδ} whose SE is \textit{σωκ}. \[8\]

\[2\] See also Greenspoon, \textit{Joshua}, pp. 301-302; Gentry, p. 407.

\[3\] 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 \textit{σοφήρ} in 8:16; 9:22; 10:14, \textit{ένωκ} once in 9:23 (s. OG in 11:33) as a stylistic variant and his use of \textit{διανοεόμαι} is in 1:4. In 10:1 Th omits by homoioarc. OG has \textit{σοφής} in 1:17, \textit{προσέχω} 11:37(2), \textit{νοοδέηκ} in 10:14, \textit{σοφήρ} in 11:14 (with Th!), \textit{προσέχω} in 12:10, and \textit{σοφής} in 1:4. In three cases OG has textual differences: omission in 8:16 and 9:23; \textit{προσήλδευ} (reading \textit{πολα}) in 9:22.

\[4\] OG also has \textit{τσή} in 6:15(14) where MT=0.
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Vs. 6

Th retains OG (4x)—The readings in 1. 87, 92, 96, 97 are expected equivalents. For example, יד in 1. 96 is a HL in Daniel, but the SE (57/64) throughout the LXX is τρέχω (the common aor. forms are from ἄρχω).

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.

The reading in 1. 90 appears to be a distinctive agreement because of the use of the part. from εξώ. Th employs εξώ 8x and in 5 cases he shares a reading with OG. 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 εξώ for יד is a fairly common practice in the LXX. MT also has יד הידכ in 8:20, which OG renders with the same equivalent as 1. 90; whereas Th has δ εξέων τα ξέρατα. Mont., p. 332 notes that the syntagm יד והידכ appears in Ecc. 10:20 and Rahlf’s text reads δ εξέων τας πέρανας 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 יד הידכ. 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 ἐξάκου (1-11) for קור in Th l. 98 is distinctive. It is an excellent idiomatic rendering "in mighty fury."

211 Th employs the pf.part. of ἐρμή 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 εξώ in 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 

\text{συντριβω=רָבַשֶּׁה} is also the SE for the LXX. Th has it 8/8 whereas OG employs it 5/8.\textsuperscript{215}

Th dependent upon OG (2x)—Both l. 103 and 116 are expected equivalents.

Independent Th readings (5x)—The normal SE for \text{יָרְדַּן} is \text{אָסָו}, but Th has \text{אָסָו} in l. 101. Th makes the same equivalence in 12:12, and these must be regarded as distinctive because OG does not employ \text{אָסָו} at all.\textsuperscript{216} In the discussion of vocabulary for wrath/anger in 3:11-20 we noted that \text{ἐξοργιάω} 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 \text{יָרְדַּן} in MT and the equivalents chosen by OG (\text{πατάσσω}) and Th (\text{παῖω}, HL) are both employed as SE in the LXX. However, \text{παῖω} is found only 26x compared with \text{πατάσσω}, which appears about 400x. If Th were revising OG we would expect him to have retained \text{πατάσσω}. The fourth distinctive Th reading is in l. 110 where Th renders \text{רֹּפֶל} more dynamically with \text{ἀμφότερα}, as opposed to OG, which has the formal equivalent \text{δίω}. The same difference in equivalents is found in 11:27 (OG never has \text{ἀμφότερος}). Finally, Th’s choice of \text{συμπλαίω} (6-11, never in OG) for \text{יָרְדַּן} "trample" 2/2 in l. 120 and l. 171 should also be considered distinctive because Th has obviously

\textsuperscript{215}8:7, 8, 22, 25; 11:4, 20, 22, 26. OG has the dynamic rendering \text{ἀποδίδομι} in 8:25; a textual problem in 11:22; and \text{ἀποστρίφω} (reading \text{הָבְשֵׁי} 3s.impf. + 3m.s.pro.suf. from \text{בָּשֶׁה}) in 11:26.

\textsuperscript{216}\text{יָרְדַּן} appears in 8:5, 7, 18; 9:21; 10:10, 16, 18; 12:12. OG has \text{προσάγω} in 8:7; 9:21 and \text{συνάπτω} (\text{συνάγω}) in 12:12. Other than the mentioned differences both OG and Th have \text{אָסָו}.

Th also employs \text{אָסָו} as a SE (8/8) for \text{יָרְדַּן}. S. 4:8(11), 17(20), 19(22), 21(24), 25(28); 6:25(24); 7:13, 22.
employed his own vocabulary.\textsuperscript{211}

Vs. 8

*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.  

\textsuperscript{218} In two instances he employs πολίς (11:28, 44), which is reserved primarily for ἔπος in chs. 2-7 (11/12)\textsuperscript{219} and בַּל in the Hebrew sections.

*Th dependent upon OG (2x)*—The reading in l. 135 is expected. Both OG and Th read a plus, κίρατα in l. 139. It is most likely that OG and Th had רָני in their Vorlage.\textsuperscript{220}

*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 ὑπερ in Daniel. In 8:24 Th has κραταίος where OG employs a dynamic equivalent, and in 11:23 Th employs

---

\textsuperscript{211} The equivalence συμπατέω=ὁμολογοῦμεν is made earlier in 2 Kings 7:17, 20; 9:33; 14:9; Nah. 3:14. Th also has συμπατέω in 7:7, 19 (סהל); 7:23 (שתור); 8:13 (מרומ).  

\textsuperscript{218} 8:8, 21; 9:4, 12; 10:1, 4, 7, 8; 11:2, 13, 25(2), 28, 44; 12:1. OG has ἀγγελός in 10:1, 7; 11:25, 44; πολίς in 11:13, 25, 28; 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 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 ἵσυρος. The reading in l. 129 is also a possible distinctive disagreement (s. the discussion in 8:4). καὶ ἐν in l. 132 is not mentioned as a distinctive reading because Th has probably read כְּ for כָּל. 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 ἐν for ἀνά is expected. However, as Jeansonne (p. 55) points out, OG and Th appear to be translating a form of דֵּת "mighty" in l. 151 for דַּיְי "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 בָּע in l. 153. Th's use of the adv. correctly interprets the adv. use of MT. περισσα in Th should also be considered distinctive. Th has περισσα 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 (רֶשֶׁם) presented problems for both OG and Th. OG reads בָּרֶשֶׁם 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 \( \text{הָדָא} \) (s. 1. 163), but it should be considered a distinctive reading because he has also omitted 1. 156-157.\(^{224}\) 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 \( \text{συμματίῳ} \) in 1. 171 has already been discussed in vs. 7. OG identifies \( \text{נַבָּה} \) with the "heavenly host" in 1. 163, 168, whereas Th renders with \( \text{δύναμις} \). Although OG and Th have a shared reading in 8:11 (\( \text{ἀρχιστράτηγος=} \text{נַבָּה} \)), OG seems to offer guesses also in 8:13 and 10:1 (\( \text{ἐρμόω}, \text{πλῆθος} \) confusion from Aramaic \( \text{נַבָּה} \)). Except for 8:11 Th translates consistently with \( \text{δύναμις} \).\(^{225}\) The reading in 1. 161 is possibly distinctive as well (s. 8:4). The addition of \( \text{τοῦ υἱοῦ} \) 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 \( \text{לָא} \) in MT. Th transliterates in 11:16, 41, 45 whereas OG omits in 11:41 and has \( \text{ἠλπίσις} \) 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 (ἰσχυρός = Ἰλίμπ 1. 151; 1. 39-44; τοῦ τά κέρατα ἡγοντος 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; ἐστιν ἐν χριστ 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 ἱσχυρός = Ἰλίμπ in 1. 151. As Jeansonne states, it is possible that OG and Th had ἱσχυρός 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 ἁρμ in l. 84, 138; the transliterations in l. 21, 95; and the attempt to translate ἰδεά in l. 160. If ἰδεά 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 l. 40-45 and l. 90, but in neither case is it certain. Regarding l. 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 l. 90 could indicate that Th has been corrected toward OG. Finally, there is
extensive agreement in l. 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
along with another 4 possible distinctive readings (l. 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.
VI. Daniel 12:1-13

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 καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἑδραν
2 ἐκείνῳ ἑκείνην
3 ἀναστήσεται Σαμαὴ λεγελος ὁ μέγας
4 ὁ ἐστιν ὁ ἑστηκός
5 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἅπαν
6 τοῦ λαοῦ σου τοῦ λαοῦ σου
7 καὶ ἔσται ἑκείνη
8 καὶ ἐσται ἡ ἡμέρα θλίψεως
9 ὁ λαός σοι ἡ ἡμέρα ἡθλίψεως
10 οὐκ ὄλο γέγονεν οὐκ ὃν ἐγέννηθη
11 ἰδοὺ ὃ γεγένηται ἃ ὃν ἐγέννηθεν
12 ἐδνος ἐως
13 ἔως συν
14 καὶ ἐν τῷ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα εὐθυγραμμένος
15 καὶ ἐν τῷ τῆς ἡμέρας εὐθυγραμμένος
16 ἐκείνῳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ
17 καὶ ἐκείνῳ λειψάνωσται καὶ ἐκείνῃ
18 ὁ λαός σοι δὲ ὁ λαὸς
19 πᾶς ὁ συν
20 εὐγενερθέντας ἐγεγενερθένται
21 ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ
22 καὶ πολλοὶ καὶ πολλοὶ
23 τῶν καθευδοῦντων τῶν καθευδοῦντων
24 ἐν τῇ τῆς καθευδοῦνταν ἐν τῇ τῆς καθευδοῦνταν
25 ἐν τῇ τῇ ἐν τῇ
26 ὁ μὲν εἰς ἡν ὁ μὲν εἰς ἡν
27 ἐτῶν ὁ ἐτῶν ἐτῶν
28 καὶ εἰς ἐν τῇ καὶ εἰς ἐν τῇ
29 εἰς ἀνείδισμόν εἰς ἀνείδισμόν
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καὶ εἰς αἰσχύνην

αἰώνιον

12:3

καὶ οἱ συνιέντες

(ἐκλάμψουσιν)

οὐκ ἦν λαμπρότητις

τοῦ στερεώματος

καὶ ἀπὸ τὸν δικαιών

tῶν πολλῶν

ὡς οἱ ἀστήρες

eἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

καὶ (ἐτί)

12:4

καὶ σῷ Δανιήλ

ἐμφάδιον

tοῖς ἁλόγους

καὶ σφραγίσον

tῷ βιβλίῳ

ὡς καιροῦ

(συντελειάς)

ὡς (διδαχθέσιν)

πολλοὶ

καὶ ἀληθεύη

ἡ γνῶσις

12:5

καὶ εἴδον ἐγὼ Δανιήλ

καὶ ἵδον

dῶο ἐτεροί

(ἐιστήκεισαν)

eἰς ἐνετεῖδεν

tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

cαὶ εἰς (ἐνετεῖδεν)

tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

12:6

οἱ δὲ εἰς ἱδιασποράν

καὶ ἱασχύνην] αἰώνιον

καὶ οἱ συνιέντες

φανοῦσιν

ὡς οἱ ἕφωστήρες

tοῦ ὀφρανόν

καὶ οἱ κατάσχοντες
tοὺς λόγους μοῦ

αὐτὶ τὰ ἄστρα

καὶ οἱ συντελείας

ὡς ἂν ἑἰμομανάσιν

πολλοὶ

καὶ ἀληθῆ

+ἡ γῆς +ἀδικίας

καὶ εἶδον ἐγὼ Δανιήλ

καὶ ἱδοῦ

dῶο ἐτεροί

(ἐιστήκεισαν)

eἰς ἐνετεῖδεν
tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

cαὶ εἰς ἐνετεῖδεν
tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

12:6

καὶ σῷ Δανιήλ

ἐκλάμψων

tὰ προστάγματα

καὶ σφραγίσων

tῷ βιβλίῳ

ὡς καιροῦ

(συντελείας)

ὡς ἂν ἑἰμομανάσιν

πολλοὶ

καὶ ἀληθῆ

+ἡ γῆς +ἀδικίας

καὶ εἶδον ἐγὼ Δανιήλ

καὶ ἱδοῦ

dῶο ἐτεροί

(ἐιστήκεισαν)

eἰς ἐνετεῖδεν
tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

cαὶ εἰς ἐνετεῖδεν
tοῦ χείλους

tοῦ ποταμοῦ

12:6
καὶ εἶπεν τῷ ἁνδρὶ τῷ ἐνεδεψεμένῳ τῷ ἐνδήπετε ἡ δὲ ἦν ἐπάνω τοῦ ὀδότος τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἦς πότε τῷ πέρας δὲν εἴρηκας τὸν ἵθαμπας ὁ θεοί πάντα ταῦτα

καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐνερῷ ἡ δὲ ἦν ἐπάνω τοῦ ἀδάτος τοῦ ποταμοῦ τῆς δεξιάς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρίστερᾶς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οἴρανον καὶ ὅμοσεν ἐν τῷ ζωτινὶ τὸν αἰῶνα ὅπως καὶ καὶρὸν καὶ ἠμισοὶ +καὶροῦ ἐν τῷ συντελεσθῆναι διασκορπίσμων (γνώσονται πάντα ταῦτα

καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐνερῷ τῷ βασιλείῳ τῷ βάσινα τῷ ἐπάνω τῷ θεοῖς καὶ ο ἀκαθαρσίμος +τοῦ τῶν ὑποκαρτιῶν +δὲν καὶ ἦν καταλέπτης καὶ καὶρὸν καὶ θαυμαστῶν +δὲν εἴρηκας μοι +δὲν εἴρηκας καὶ +δὲν καὶρὸν συντελείας καὶ +δέν omega συντελείας καὶ +δεξιάν καὶ τῆς ἀρίστερᾶς καὶ τῆς ἀρίστερᾶς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν ὀφρανὸν καὶ +δόμος +θεὸν +διασκορπίσμων οἰκοποιεῖται πάντα ταῦτα
και έγω ἥκουσα
και οὗ ἔσκοικα
και εἶπα Κύριε
ti tâ ἐσχατα
toû tôn
και εἶπεν Ἀναπτεν
1(Δεύρο) Δανιήλ
8τι ἑπεφυσάμενοι
cai ἑσφαγισμένοι
οἱ ἰόγοι
ἐκ ἱαρῴ
πέρας
ἐκλεγόμενον
και ἕκλεινκανθώσειν
και ἐπεισθάνειν και
και ἀγιασθάνειν
πολλοί
και ἄνομήσειν
και ἀμάρτωσιν
οἱ ἰαμαρτλοί
cαι νηυ συνήσουσιν
cαι νήσους οἱ
cαι ἄνομοι
και οὐ συνήσουσιν
και 9(νοσιμονες)
cαι ἃνομοι
cαι ὁ διανοηθεῖς
και 7(νοσιμονες)
cαι οἱ διανοηθησθοι
πολλοί
cαι ἀν 1(καιροὶ)
cαι ἀπὸ ἱαρῴ
και (παραλλάξεως)
toû ἐνδελεχισμοῦ
cαι (δοδησεται)
βδέλυμα
cαι ἔργοσεως
ἡμέρας χιλια
διακόσιαι ἑνενήκοντα
VI.1. Analysis of 12:1-13

VI.1.1. Morphology

1. 11-OG has a 3.pl. vb., which could mean that he understood ὦν (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 ὦν. 227

In any case, OG's change of subject required the omission of ὦν.

---

227We 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. (הֵנָא) 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 ש 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 לַמְּסָרְתּוֹ מִמֵּית (gen.cons. from מָלַשׁ).
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 מָשָּׁת הָעַד for מָשָּׁת שָׁהָר. 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. הָוא "such as" makes it appear that one is dependent on the other. However, OG and Th also employ הָוא for מָשָּׁת 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 מַמֵּס before לָאָו "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部副部长 "whomever is found" for מַמֵּס.

1. 26-30-OG renders the repetition of מַמֵּס in 1. 26, 28 idiomatically with the art. יָנִי/בֵּט/בֵּט while Th corresponds to MT. OG's add. of the second בֵּט makes three groups to be raised whereas MT has two. It is
possible that מַּעֲרֹחַת was an early explanatory gloss on מַעֲרָךְ, but the versions support its inclusion. Th adds אָשֶׁר in 1. 30 to smooth the syntax.

1. 36-37—According to Mont., p. 473, OG has translated מַעֲרָךְ רָבָּה as if it were מַעֲרֹחַת רָבָּה. This judgment is based on accepting the reading of 88-Syh and 967 (κατισχοντες) as OG. Zieg. reads the part. from κατισχω 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 κατισχοντες that is similar to מַעֲרֹחַת. 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 "the righteous of the many."

1. 39—OG adds 1. 39 in harmonization with 1. 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 ἐν τῇ ἐκ τῆς 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 1. 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 ἐν ὑπὲρ + part. OG omits ἑαυτόν as redundant in 1. 75.

1. 66, 78—Th employs the same formal rendering for the relative clause ἡμῖν μεταλλην. The agreement between OG and Th in 1. 78 is either insignificant or the OG has been corrupted by Th (s. Text-Critical, 1. 67-68).

---

1. 67–68–OG may have omitted לְיִסָּמֵל הַדִּימוּמָה by parablepsis (… לְיִסָּמֵל הַדִּימוּמָה), 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 εἰκόνιστοι also appears in 8:13 where Th employs a formal rendering. ἐκκυλλόμενον is a distinctive agreement.

1. 70–OG and Th have a common add. ὅν εἰρήκας (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.229 is based on 11:35 where OG twice reads the vb. καθαρίζω (for ἡτοίμασθαι, q.inf. cons.; ἐκκυλλόμενον, hi.inf. cons.).230 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 ἀνάμιμα "wondrous events" in 1. 70 as an allusion to the ἀναφορέηθαι "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."

---

229 καὶ ὁ καθαρισμός is marked with the obelus in 88–Syh.

230 Both 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 καθαρίζω elsewhere in 8:14 where it is once more a singular equivalent for ἀνάμιμα (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 θεῶν in apposition to the preceding substantive, though θεῶν could have originated as a marginal note that was later incorporated into the text.

1. 92-OG and Th share a common add. of καρποῦ, which is implicit in MT, though the agreement might be because ἡμῶν was in their Vorlage (s. Text-Critical).

1. 93-96—Both 00 and Th had difficulties with this text. Evidently 00 transposed μετά of μετάλειψιν, which would explain 1. 93 (s. Text-Critical). However, the translation of ἐλεοῦς for ἐλπὶ is unique. McCrystall argues that 00 engaged in deliberate theological Tendenz by reading τὸ ἔλεος (which can express "deliverance") for τὴν. 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 00's theology did not play any role in this rendering, but the type of programmatic theological manipulation of MT by 00 envisaged by McCrystall is extreme. 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 00 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. 00 may have understood the same referents in 12:7. The context is the time of the

287

287 McCrystall, p. 84.

287 McCrystall argues that the rendering in 12:7 is theologically motivated based on the 00 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 00 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 00 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 1. 72-73 than in the translation of 1. 94.

Th had his own problems with 1. 94-96. He translates ἀρχὴ correctly with διασκορπισμός, but γνώσοντα in 1. 93 suggests that he read ἑαυτῶν (τοις) (3.pl.pf.cons.[?] from διὰ) and he or his Vorlage omitted κρίνει τοις. 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 ἤδη "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 δτι when γαρ would have been a more appropriate rendering of "<\>.

Other shared examples of this Hebraism are 9:16, 19, 23; 11:4, 37, while OG employs γαρ properly against Th's δτι in 9:18; 10:11, 14; 11:27, 35.

1. 111-112-The omission by OG results in a redication of the sentence and cuts across the verse division.

1. 123-OG renders μν in 1. 123 with the relative δε 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 βδέλυγμα των ἐρημώσεων. In 11:31 OG again has βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, while Th has βδέλυγμα πανασιμνόνον. Th has the cognate n. ἀφανισμός in 9:18, 26 (not in OG), so the agreement of ἐρημώσες in 9:27 and 12:11 is

Aejmelaeus, "OTI," pp. 118-126. Aejmelaeus notes that the usage of δτι for γαρ in such instances is particularly Septuagintal and "frequently occur[s] in connection with commands or prohibitions," (p. 118, s. 1. 107).

The complete listing for the occurrences of "<\> (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.

Cf. Jeans., p. 18, who states in error, "When 8' revised o' the expression [βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως] was retained in all three occurrences (Dan 9:27, 11:31, 12:11)."

However occurs also in 4:16(19) OG=0; 8:13, 27; 9:17, 18, 26, 27. βδέλυγμα=ΤΑΠΟΣ is a SE in the LXX, so it is only ἐρημώσεως that could be used as evidence that Th has borrowed from OG.
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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.

1. 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 1. 143-147 are a later correction toward MT. In favour of this possibility is the conclusion of the verse has a high degree of verbal agreement with Th and it corresponds to MT. The main difference is in 1. 145 where OG has δόξαν for κληρόν, but this could based on a corrector reading נרל for נוכל; or it may just be a dynamic rendering.

The suggestion that 1. 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 1. 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 1. 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 1. 138-142 as OG and 143-147 as a later doublet is that 1. 138-140 are not equivalent in meaning to MT. In 1. 143-147 MT has "and rest and you will rise to

216 Mont., p. 478; Collins, Daniel, p. 370; Lacoque, p. 247. Plöger, p. 170, argues that 1. 138-142 are an equivalent for נרל. The add. is marked with the obelus in 88-Syh.

217 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 דוד for דוד and possibly רמ for רמ, 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 ἀνάθεων has been accepted in CH 2 as OG against ἀναλείψακεν 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 καιρός as a SE for ἡμέρα (15/16), while OG displays more variety using ἄρα 5x, καιρός 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 ηδὸς in 1. 9 with ηδός ημι, which is found 20x in the Hebrew Bible. ηδός 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 ηδός 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 ἔλαχις.

1. 4-The translation of ἡμέρα might be regarded as a distinctive reading in Th. Apart from its uses in compounds (6x) Th renders ἡμέρα with ἄρα τοῦ ἄρα τοῦ ἄρα 9/11. Once again OG demonstrates variety by employing στρατηγός (10:13, 20[2], 21), δυνάμεις (9:6, 8; 11:5), and ἥγητός (1. 4). OG shares a reading with Th in 10:13 εἰς τῶν ἄρχοντων τῶν πρῶτων, and we have to suspect Th influence on OG. OG employs ἄρα only 4x elsewhere, and only in 2:48 is there an equivalent in MT (πρῶτον, but even there it may be a doublet translation with ἡγούμενον).

1. 17-Zieg.'s text reads συμβαίνειν for OG (with Th) against the reading.
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of 88-Syh, which is accepted here.\textsuperscript{241} שִׁם only appears elsewhere in 11:41 where OG=0 and Th has the expected סִים. 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,\textsuperscript{244} and given the context ὑψηλότατος "will be raised/exalted" renders the sense rather well. ὑψηλότατος should be accepted as OG.

1. 19-Th omits ΜΣΩ against OG as redundant.
1. 23-OG and Th share a HL καθένα for the HL ἐπὶ. It is possible that this is a distinctive agreement, but the euphemism of sleep for death may have been arrived at independently.\textsuperscript{245}
1. 24-OG employs πάνω (also in 9:27, not in Th) "breadth" as a dynamic equivalent for the construct πᾶρον, while Th’s rendering with χῶμα (1-15) might be considered distinctive.\textsuperscript{246}

1. 25-Th employs the compound ἡξεγείρω elsewhere in 7:4 and 11:25. Although either OG or Th’s rendering is appropriate for the HL ἔφη (hi.) and Th’s choice is not particularly distinctive, it does demonstrate his independence from OG.

1. 29-ἀνειδισμός is the expected SE for πῶς (4/4) in OG and Th,\textsuperscript{247} though it may have originated as a gloss to πῶς (s. Syntax, Text-Critical).
1. 30-31-OG renders ἡμᾶς (1-2, Is. 66:24) "abhorrence" with a

\textsuperscript{241} Mont. has a lacuna for this portion of text. Mont., p. 473 simply refers to 88-Syh’s reading as an error.

\textsuperscript{244} See Collins, Daniel, pp. 394-398.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{246} Talmon suggests that ὑψηλότατος 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.

\textsuperscript{247} 9:16; 11:18(2); 12:2.
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contextual guess διασπορά, while άσχόνη is a later gloss from Th. 248

l. 32, 99, 119, 121, 122-OG and Th's vocabulary for אב was discussed previously in 8:1-10 (though it should be noted that OG's προσέχει "give attention to" in l. 122 is a good dynamic rendering). מֵבָלִילוּ was discussed in 1:1-10, and Th's translation of מִבָלִילו was treated in CH 4.III.1.iii. Neither OG or Th's translation indicates that they discerned any special significance in the מֵבָלִילו.

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 σωτός in 11:33 and νομίμος (1-10) in 12:10, because in both cases מֵבָלִילו is collocated with מִבָלִילו. 249 The fact that Th clearly favoured σωσίμι for מֵבָלִילו 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 l. 32. OG has τικότιμον in 1:4; τενέω in 11:33; διανοέομαι in 12:10; but σωσίμι in 11:35 (gen.pl.m.part.=Th) and 12:3 (nominative pl.m.part.=Th)! 250 Given OG's other choices for מֵבָלִילו and the fact that σωσίμι 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. σωσίμι is not collocated with any other term for knowing in 12:3, so it is particularly doubtful that we have OG in l. 32.

1. 33-34, 117-118—Phonological motivation is evident in the choices of OG and Th for the translation of יֵשָׁה לִבִי in l. 33-34. OG employs the rare φαστήρ (1-6) with φαίνω, which retains at least some of the consonance in MT. Th's choices ξύλιμω and λαμπροτής are even closer in sound (λαμμ). ξύλιμω (1-8) and λαμπροτής (1-6) are also rare in the LXX; therefore, they are excellent examples of Th's distinctive vocabulary.

248 So also Zieg., p. 17.

249 The particular choice of νομίμο in 12:10 may also be explained by phonological motivation. In the preceding lines, Th employs νόμομος 3x (l. 117, 118, 120) to render νόμο.

250 σωσίμι only appears one other time in OG (11:33) where OG again agrees with Th (σωσίσσωσαν).
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 ἀμαρτωλός is the main SE for וֹשֶׁר in the LXX. Although Th's דָּוִמְוֹ is also employed for וֹשֶׁר, it is not used as frequently or as consistently as ἀμαρτωλός.

1. 34-OG exhibits lexical levelling by employing σφαυνός for לִיך (unique in LXX) and סְפָּר (1. 84). στερέωμα is the expected equivalent.

1. 41-Th has read דָּוִש for וֹשֶׁר. 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 בּוֹר 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. The only exceptions are 10:6, 9 where λαλιά "speaking" is a better idiomatic rendering, and 10:12(2) where OG has ρήμα. 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 (בִּשְׁם בֹּדֶנ pass. part.) in 12:9. The SE for בִּשְׁם in the LXX is φραγιζε so it is not surprising to find agreement in OG and Th. However, there are differences in the rendering of בִּשְׁם. There are only two points worthy of note. First, κατακαλίπτει by OG in 1. 107 is a HL in Daniel. Second, בִּשְׁם also occurs in 8:26. In 8:26 Th employs φραγιζε as the common term meaning "to seal," while OG has φράσσε (1-8). The

2511:5, 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 בּוֹר 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 φράσσε for בּוֹר in 1:14 and λόγος in 1:20, both of which are unique equivalents for OG (1:5 is an idiom).

2524QDan has a singular (בּוֹר) in 10:6 (lacuna for 10:9), but OG's equivalent implies the pl. of MT.

253See also 6:18(17); 9:24(2). OG has φράσσε and συντελέω in 9:24.
differing vocabulary indicates independent translations.

1. 47, 69, 111, 141, 146-As in the previous two paragraphs, \( \text{\text{pp}} \) is found in both 12:4 and 12:9. The Th reading in 12:4 is most likely OG. \( \text{\text{pp}} \) appears with a preceding prep. 5x and in every case except 12:4 Th renders \( \text{\text{pp}} \) with \( \text{\text{παρας}} \) (s. 8:17; 11:35, 40). Th also employs \( \text{\text{παρας}} \) to render \( \text{\text{pp}} \) by itself in 8:17; 11:27 and 12:6, while 12:4 and 13 are the only instances where Th employs \( \text{\text{συντελεσ}} \). Besides 12:4, OG renders \( \text{\text{pp}} \) with \( \text{\text{συντελεσ}} \) 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 (\( \text{\text{απομεινωμαι}} \) "to rage violently" HL in LXX) and Th (\( \text{\text{διδασκεω}} \) "to teach") for the HL \( \text{\text{ἐρευ}} \) "to rove about" (BDB, p. 1002) reveal that both had difficulties with the text. OG has read a homonym \( \text{\text{ἐρευ}} \) "treat with contempt." Charles, p. 332, suggests that Th's reading is a corruption from \( \text{\text{διαχθοσ}} \), but \( \text{\text{διαχθοσ}} \) 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. \( \text{\text{κνε}} \) only appears elsewhere in the Hebrew portion of Daniel in 11:39 where both OG and Th have \( \text{\text{πληθυσω}} \).

1. 52-Th provides an equivalent for MT. OG is reading \( \text{\text{ταπανα}} \) and has added \( η \gamma η \) to produce, "the earth be filled with iniquity" (s. Text-

---

234 S. 9:26; 11:6, 13, 27, 35, 40, 45; 12:6, 13. \( \text{\text{pp}} \) is also found in 8:17, 19; 9:26; 12:9, 13. OG=0 in 9:26; 12:9 (error), 13. Th=0 in 12:13; \( \text{\text{τελος}} \) in 9:26; 11:13; \( \text{\text{ἐκκοπω}} ? \) in 9:26; \( \text{\text{μερος}} \) in 11:45; and \( \text{\text{μετα}} \) in 11:6 (reading \( \text{\text{γραφ}} \), s. 1:5, 15, 18; 4:26[29], 31[34]). OG also has an add. in 12:13 (1. 141) which includes \( \text{\text{συντελεσ}} \), or was the text that corresponds to MT a later correction?

235 Charles, p. 332, emends to \( \text{\text{ταπανα}} \) (based on Aramaic \( \text{\text{ταπανα}} \) from \( \text{\text{γραφ}} \) "till the many become apostates."
1. *στημι* is the expected equivalent for ἔφη, 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 *στημι* and its compounds consistently for ἔφη; whereas OG uses variety (eg. 1. 3; 1:4, 19).

1. 64, 75, 76—OG uses a variety of equivalents for ἔλαιον (στολικόν 5:7, 16; ἐνδόχω 5:29; 10:5; περιβάλλω 12:6, 7), while Th employs ἐνδόχω as a SE (6/6).

1. 65, 77—The same equivalents are found in the other occurrence of ἔλαιον "linen" in 10:5. Th transliterates.

1. 71—OG and Th employ different and adequate renderings for ὑπερ. The same root is employed as a ni.part. in 8:24 (OG-θαυμαστός, 1-4; Th-θαυμαστός) 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. ἁλίμη appears 8x in Daniel and ὑποέω is the expected equivalent. OG has ὑποέω 3/4 and Th 6/8. 257

1. 87—ὅνακος is a HL in Daniel. OG and Th both employ ὤνομι, which is the SE for ὅνακος in the LXX.

1. 102—OG employs ἄνευς (1-3) as a dynamic equivalent for πνεῦμα while Th has the expected SE ἐσχάτος. 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 ὑποέω does occur. In 8:11 OG and Th have the common reading ἐρρόχηθαι. Th also has ἅπαντι in 4:34(37).

258 S. also 8:19, 23; 10:14; 11:4. OG has ἀλήθη in 11:4, which may be an adjustment according to the sense of the context or based on an alternative Vorlage (BHS, ἀλήθη, Collins, Daniel, p. 363, ἀληθεύω).
1. 103—OG adds λόγος "matter," which is implicit in MT.
1. 107, 137—OG employs καταλαγέω (HL in Daniel) in 1. 107 and a common SE (βαδίζω) for δεῦρο in 1. 137. Th's renderings with δεῦρο are unique in the prophetic corpus of the LXX and must be considered distinctive.

1. 113—McCrystall argues that the omission of ἡμῖν in 12:10(9) is probably due to the translator's desire to reserve ἦς in 11:35 for an elite group within the maskilim. Though McCrystall admits that the omission in 12:10(9) could be due to the fact that the verb is translated by περιπατεῖν (in which case ἦς 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 ἐκλέγειν for ἠλέειν in 11:35 that constitutes his proof that ἦς 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.

To be fair, McCrystall does note with Mont., p. 460, that OG apparently reads ἐκπλήξις for ἐπλήξις 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 ἐκπλήξις "to consider/have in mind" for ἐπλήξις "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." It does not reflect a variant Vorlage; neither does it reflect Tendenz. Furthermore, we have already seen that OG

259 On the use of δεῦρο, s. Eynikel and Lust, pp. 59-62. Other occurrences of τῆς are 3:25(92); 4:26(29), 34(37)—OG=0; 9:10. OG and Th share the reading περιπατεῖν in the first two instances and OG has κατακαλοῦσθαι 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 TCC, pp. 236-240.
and Th betray no special significance in the vocabulary employed for translating משלס (s. Lexicology, I. 32, 99, 119, 121, 122). The variant in 11:35 resulted from a simple metathesis in the verb משלס.

McCrystall’s argument for an elite group within the maskilim is based on the intended restriction of the term יבש 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 יבש from 12:10(9) McCrystall fails to consider still another possibility: one of the first two verbs may have been omitted due to homoiarc. (תלדה החלופות), 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, οἰκεῖον is also a HL in the LXX! Th’s distinctiveness is also demonstrated by the translation of ול in its other occurrence in 11:35. OG has καθαρίζω, while Th might have ἀκολουθοῦν (HL in LXX).263

1. 115—The only other occurrence of משלס in Daniel is in 11:35 where OG has καθαρίζω and Th again has πορεύεται.
1. 120—Th’s omission of משלס appears to be an example of one of his occasional omissions, because it is rendered by OG.
1. 124—OG employs ἔστιν as a SE 4/4 for משלס. In this case Th shows variety and complete independence from OG. Th employs ἀκολουθοῦν (not in OG) in 9:5, 11; μεθίστημι in 11:31; παράλλαξις (1-2, s. Morphology) in 12:11.

1. 125—MT has משלס collocated with משלס in 11:31. OG and Th employ the same equivalents there.264 Th’s use of ἐνδελεχησμὸς “daily sacrifice” (2-11) in 1. 125 indicates his independence. Zieg., p. 17, regards

263 Zieg. reads ἀποκαλυφθήσεται in 11:35, but Mont., p. 460 suggests that Th’s text is a corruption from ἀπολευκάσθησιν. ἀποκαλύπτω 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 ἀποκαλυφθήσεται for the rare ἀπολευκάσθησιν. Th’s reading is still distinct from OG.

264 Otherwise משלס appears in 8:11, 12, 13, and both OG and Th employ משלס. As previously mentioned, 8:11-13 has similar textual difficulties to 9:24-27.
διὰ παντός in OG as a doublet and elsewhere OG does employ θυσία 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 θυσίαν διὰ παντός for ἡμέρ.

1. 132-OG and Th employ appropriate equivalents for ἡμέρ (HL in Daniel), though Th's ἐκκλησία is more common.
1. 133-The SE for ἐρίων in the LXX is ἐρίων so both OG and Th employ unique renderings.²⁶³
1. 143-ἀνακάθω is a common equivalent for Ἔλεγος (HL in Daniel) in the LXX.
1. 145-OG has the dynamic rendering δέωσα for Ἑλέγος, though it could be based on reading Ὑλέγος (s. Syntax, 1. 138-142). Th has κλήρος (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. ἐκ in 1. 28 (in 1. 30 ἐκ is an add.) and ὅλων 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)

²⁶³S. the discussion of vs. 7 in 8:1-10 above. Th’s use of ἐκκλησία is distinctive not only because of the equivalence he makes, but also because OG does not use the vb. at all.
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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 ἀλογίαν 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 ὡς θάνατον and has added ἔτη γῆ to produce, "the earth be filled with iniquity," (s. I Macc. 1:9 for a possible allusion). The difference is the interchange of θ/θ. 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.\textsuperscript{266}

1. 58, 61-62-Both OG and Peshitta omit these lines, but the fact that the Peshitta also omits l. 58 suggests dependence of Peshitta on OG rather than an independent witness to an omission. Although l. 61-62 could be a later harmonization in MT, such repetition is certainly characteristic of Daniel and Hebrew narrative in general.\textsuperscript{267} The fact that OG also omits l. 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 ωτά τήματος in l. 66 from 88-Syh and regards l. 66-68 as a later add. in MT to harmonize with l. 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 l. 78-80 is due to corruption of the OG by Th (s. Syntax, l. 66, 78), and we do not know what OG read! Perhaps OG omitted l. 78-80. It is also possible that the omission of l. 67-68 was simply a scribal error due to parablepsis (s. Syntax, l. 67-68). For these reasons, the text of 88-Syh is accepted as OG in l. 66, and MT is not to be emended.

1. 70-The attestation by both OG and Th is strong evidence that they read רַבֵּן רִשָּׁם 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.

\textsuperscript{266}So also Charles, p. 333; Collins, p. 369; Bevan, p. 203; Hartman and DiLella, p. 274.

\textsuperscript{267}Collins, p. 369, wants to omit l. 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.
The common reading in OG and Th is probably due to textual corruption.

1. 72-73-The add. of καὶ ὁ καθαρισμὸς 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 הַיְּשׁוֹב, but it probably resulted from harmonization.

1. 92-We would not expect both OG and Th to have the add. of καιρόθ 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 קָפָל, 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 קָפָל.
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

*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 € and οβω in the later chs. requires some explanation.*
an alternative structure in chs. 4-6 ever existed as a complete book. 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 deuterocanonical 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 β of the infinitive construct with an article and Th often omits a preposition that would be redundant in Greek (eg. partitive ἀ). 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. 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. 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.

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

---

270 Contrast Ulrich’s conclusion ("Canonical Process," p. 285) that the Greek of chs. 1-12 "is of one piece."

271 For additional examples, see Schmitt, "Stammt," pp. 29-33.

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 ἠμῶν=αις/δουλος (p. 214), ἐρώτημα/λόγος (p. 215), and ἠμῶν=λατρευο/δουλεύο (p. 239).

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, ὁσοῦμενα in 3:17 is a dynamic equivalent motivated by a previous use of the verb in 3:12. Yet, in 3:15 OG employs ὅπου for ἔκρυβε because throughout ch. 3 ἔκρυβε is usually collocated with ἔλθε; 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

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

\[275\] 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 (e.g. 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 (e.g. 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 ' 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.
OG. 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.
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

---

1A list is provided by Greenspoon, Joshua, pp. 270-273; Gentry, pp. 400-405. See also the comments in CH 1.11.

2He has restated his position in "Danieltexte," pp. 1-15. However, Schmitt, pp. 8-9, only examines one of the kaige characteristics, מ/כ=כַּיֵּגֶה.

delineates characteristics of *kaige* that are probably OG.\(^4\) 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.\(^5\) 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.\(^6\) *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, Ποταμίας, ἄνωθεν, and διὰ ἐκείνου 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


\(^5\)See, for example, the discussion of יֶבֶןmercial וֹצֶא below and CH 1.II.

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.

---

7 See 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 Barthelemy, Gentry concludes that only four (36, 58, 67, 94) are of any value as kaige characteristics.

8 Munnich argues that kaige employed the Psalter as a glossary or lexicon for the work of translation in "Contribution," pp. 190-220.

9 Gentry, p. 488.
I. List of Kaige Characteristics

Following is the list of 97 kaige characteristics that have been produced by Thackeray (1907, 1921), Barthelemy (1963), Smith (1967), Shenkel (1968), Grindel (1969), O'Connell (1972), Tov (1973), Bodine (1980), 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
- Barthelemy=B
- Smith=Sm
- Shenkel=Sh
- Grindel=G
- O'Connell=O
- Tov=To
- Ulrich=U
- Bodine=Bod
- Greenspoon=Gr
- Gentry=Gen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Bod</th>
<th>Gr</th>
<th>Gen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\alpha S^3/viK0^\tau$</td>
<td>KoiYe</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bod</td>
<td>Gr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2</td>
<td>$\tau^\pi=\pi\lambda$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Barthelemy'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.


13 Bodine 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.

14 Greenspoon, Joshua, p. 277, actually only suggests that "in some tradition, perhaps the kaige recension, $\pi\lambda$ was the preferred translation," of $\tau^\pi$. Given the vagueness of the evidence, it is
3. ἀνήρ = ἀνήρ
4. ἐπάνωθεν (ἀπάνωθεν) + gen.
5. ἐπιθέλω + gen.
6. σαλπιχεῖσθαι = κερατίνη
7. Elimination of Historical Present
8. οὐκ έστιν (in a series of aor. vbs.)
9. έμεθ = ἐμεθ εἰμὶ
10. τον = τόν συνάντησιν έλεος προς άπαντην
11. μιας = μονόμοιος
12. κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων
13. έλεος = ἔλεος
14. μοι = μοι τῶν έναντι
15. ενόπλος
16. τῆς = τῆς μή τοῦ τῷ τούτῳ
17. εἰς τῶν αἰώνα
18. οὐκ = οὐκ
19. συνάγω
20. αἵματος
21. σοφία = σοφία, γνώσεως
22. έξοδος

surprising that he includes it in his list of kaige characteristics. έπί does not appear in MT in Daniel, but Th has έπί 4x independently: 2:6 for πάντα; 4:12(15) for πάντα, 4:20(23) for πάντα; 11:18 for άπαντην. OG never has πάντα.

15 The Aramaic בּ י is employed in 7:19 (OG = אַכְרֵבְדֹ ל; Th = ἀκριβῶς) and the n. רָבָּן appears in 2:41 (OG and Th have a distinctive agreement μία).

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 ἐγάγη ἑπιγινώσκει in 8:5 (Ἐν αὐτῷ = OG). In 8:5 Th employs a periphrastic part, where OG has an impf.

18 In 11:20, 21, 38 MT has γνῶσιν, which OG and Th recognize and translate correctly.
23. Ἐλπις/ἐλπίς = εἰσπέπτεια  B Gen
*24. τοῖς-τοῖς  B Sh Bod Gr
*25. Ἀγνοεῖται  Sm Bod Gen
*26. νῦν=ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς  Sh O Bod\textsuperscript{19} Gr
*27. ἕστειλεν  Gr\textsuperscript{20} Gen
*28. ἔδωκεν=θυσιάκω  Sh O Bod\textsuperscript{21} Gr
*29. φησίν=διώκει  Sh Bod Gr
30. καβά(7) ἑστηκεν (τῆς) δυνάμεως  Sh Bod Gr
31. ἱστάτω=σοφ−  Sh Bod Gen
*32. ἔγγισε=κατέκυψεν/ἐγένετο=σινώσκει  Sh Bod Gr Gen
33. ἤστε=ανωμα  Sh Gr
*34. ἐλπίς=ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει οὐ λαμβάνει  Sh Bod
*35. ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς=(ἐ)θέλω  Sh Bod Gr
*36. καταθέτα=νίκος  Grin Gen
*37. θάνατορ(πρ. part.)=πεπιρ(ρ)αμένος  O
*38. ἔστηκεν=σκέπη/ἐσκήλεσε=σκηνή  O Gr Gen
*39. ἐσόμεν=φωτισμοί  O
*40. ἔλεγεν=κέρκιον  O
41. βιβλίον=μογιλάλον  O
*42. ἔργον=πορ(ρ)όν  O Gr
43. ἕνα=άνα μέσον  O Bod Gr Gen
*44. ὅμοιον=ἐν μέσῳ  O Bod Gr
*45. ἔργον=ἐν μέσῃ  Gr Gen
*46. ἐμβαθύνα=ἀρώματα  O

\textsuperscript{19} There are no occurrences of this semi-preposition in MT. OG (8/9) and Th both employ ὀφθαλμοί for ἐπί. 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.

\textsuperscript{20} Greenspoon, Joshua, pp. 293-294 suggests that ἕστειλεν might have been chosen as a more literal translation of ἔπι in expressions like πᾶν ὑπό. It should be noted that Greenspoon does not produce any supporting evidence from Joshua that this is a characteristic of καίγε, 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.

*οστά occurs twice in MT (10:3, 16) but both times it is in the literal sense of "mouth." Both OG and Th employ ἕστειλεν.

\textsuperscript{21} Both OG and Th employ the expected θυσία for the n. ἔργον in 9:27.
*47. ἔρχομαι 0
*48. ἔρχομαι 0
49. πρέπει (πρ.) =enisχύω O Bod Gr
50. ἄνεμος = ὄμοιος 0 Bod Gr
*51. ὄνομα (n.) = μηχανώματος, μηχανημάτως 0
*52. ὁ = λόγιον 0
*53. ἄνοια = γαμβρός/πρόνοια 0 Bod Gr
54. παιδί = παιδάρια, παιδία 0 Gr
*55. ἔρχομαι = τοξοθομαί 0 Gr
*56. ἑπετής = περιττόν 0
*57. ἔξηλασμός 0
*58. ἐκφαντάση = ἐκφάντωσε, ἐκφάντωσα 0 Gen
*59. ἐκφάντωσε = συνεσφιγμένοι, συνεσφαγμένοι 0
60. ἐκφάντωσα = τριφώτητας 0
61. ἀπό = δοκλ- O Bod Gr Gen
*62. ἀποθέωσαι = ἀλογιστά and/or ἀλογείς 0
*63. ἀποθέω (vb.) = νοτοκοπέω 0 Gr
*64. διασκεδάζω, διασκέδασο 0
*65. περάνθεν 0
*66. ὧν = σανίς 0
*67. ἀποστολή 0
*68. πρὸς πόδαν 0
*69. πολλά (πρ.) = ἀποτιννέω 0 Gen
*70. ἐξέρχομαι 0
*71. ἐξέρχομαι/ἐξέρχομαι = χαλαστά 0
*72. τελεσίτητας 0 Gen
*73. ἐπιρρόη = ἐπιρρήξη 0
*74. ἐπηρρόη ἔνθα ὁ δα ὁ δα 0 T Bod Gr
75. Various = ἰνίκα 0 T Bod Gr
*76. κράτος 0 Bod Gr Gen
*77. ἀμετοικίζω 0 Bod
78. ἀγαθός (cognates) 0 Bod Gr Gen
79. ἀποτιννέω 0 Bod Gr
*80. ἀποτιννέω = ἀγαθός 0 Bod Gr Ul Gen

---
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---

22 ἀποθέω 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 ἀποκαλύπτω 8/8, whereas OG employs various equivalents, but never ἀποκαλύπτω.
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. δο/δο=καιγέ

There are only two cases of δο: 11:8, 22. Th has καιγέ in 11:8, but only και in 11:22. The evidence is mixed.

3. άνερ=άνίφο

Th employs άνίφο as a SE 8/8 while OG prefers άνθρωπος 5/8. However, Barthélemy argues that the main trait of kaige for this characteristic is that it even employs άνίφο for the distributive sense of άνερ, but there are no cases of άνερ as a distributive in Daniel.

---

The use of ἀνήρ may indicate a kaige characteristic, or it may just be the SE chosen by Th. ²⁴

4. ἐπηκάιγοντο (ἀπαίνοντεν) + gen.

Th employs ἐπάνει in 12:6, 7 (s. CH 5.VI.1.iii.).

8. ἔστιν (in a series of aor. vbs.)

MT has ἔστιν 9x and in each case Th employs an equivalent which is contextually appropriate. ²⁵ Th has ὅσκ ἔστιν in 1:4; 9:26; 10:21; 11:16; 45; ὅσκ ἄν ἐστιν in 8:4, 5, 27; ὅσκ ἐσται in 11:15. In three instances Th renders ἔστιν where the context has a series of aorist verbs (1:4; 8:4, 5), ²⁶ but ὅσκ ἔστιν is appropriate in 1:4 to describe the type of youths the king desired for training, "youths in whom there is no blemish."

13. ἐναντιοσ (in a series of aor. vbs.)

MT appears 4x in MT: 9:4; 11:36(3). OG and Th both employ ἐτοξ as SE, though Th omits 2x in 11:36 by parablepsis.

14. ἐναντιοσ = forms of ἐναντιοσ

Barthélemy suggests that this equivalence was developed in order to avoid confusion with the established equivalence ἐναντιοσ = ἐναντιοσ (see below). ²⁷ The LXX translators employed a variety of equivalents for ἐναντιοσ and that is what we find in OG and Th. Both have ἐναντιοσ in 6:11(10, Hebraism); ἐναντιοσ in 8:15; while in 10:13 OG=ἐναντιοσ, Th=ἐναντιοσ and in 10:16 OG=ἀναντιοσ, Th=ἐναντιοσ. At best this

²⁴ Barthélemy (p. 54) argues that kaige also replaced ἀνθρωπός with ἀνήρ as a SE, but that is difficult to prove in Daniel when there is no other supporting evidence.

²⁵ OG and Th have common readings in 8:4; 11:15, 16, 45. OG has a dynamic equivalent in 1:4.

²⁶ Bodine, 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 ἔστιν, 10:21 begins with the fut. and the present tense is applicable in the context.

²⁷ In DA, p. 84, Barthélemy discusses these under the one precursor pattern: ἔστιν = forms of ἐναντιοσ.
characteristic exhibits mixed findings, but there is no real
distinction from common Old Greek renderings.

15. \( \tau \nu \alpha \mu \nu \theta \)\( \zeta \nu \alpha \nu o \nu \)

Th does prefer to restrict \( \tau \nu \alpha \mu \nu \theta \) to \( \tau \alpha \nu \eta \) (9/15), while OG only
has it 3x and employs a greater variety of equivalents.\(^{28}\) However, as
Sollamo notes, \( \tau \nu \alpha \mu \nu \theta \) is the most common equivalent for \( \tau \alpha \nu \eta \) in the
LXX.\(^{29}\) Therefore, Th's tendency to employ \( \tau \nu \alpha \mu \nu \theta \) may be evidence of
a \( kai \) \( \gamma e \) 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 \( kai \) \( \gamma e \).

17. \( \epsilon i \zeta t \tau o v \ \alpha \iota \omega \nu a \)

\( \eta \chi \lambda \) does appear in 12:3, but it is OG who has the \( kai \) \( \gamma e \)
equivalent while Th has \( \epsilon i \zeta t \tau o v \ \alpha \iota \omega \nu a \).\(^{30}\) MT also has \( \eta \chi \lambda \) 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. \( \chi \rho \kappa \kappa \zeta = \sigma \nu \nu \gamma \omega \)

Barthélemy, p. 86, argues that \( \chi \rho \kappa \kappa \zeta = \sigma \nu \nu \gamma \omega \) is a precursor to
Aquila who employs \( \sigma \nu \nu \gamma \omega \). \( \chi \rho \kappa \kappa \zeta \) does occur in 11:10 and both OG and
Th employ \( \sigma \nu \nu \gamma \omega \). Both also read \( \chi \rho \kappa \kappa \zeta \) in error and employ \( \sigma \nu \nu \gamma \omega \) at
8:25 (see the discussion in CH 4.II.2). Furthermore, \( \sigma \nu \nu \gamma \omega \) is the
most common equivalent for the vb. \( \chi \rho \kappa \kappa \zeta \) in the LXX (121/200; 24x in the
Pent.), so it is questionable whether there is any significance to
Th's readings.

23. \( \pi \mu \nu \eta \gamma \kappa \eta \gamma \zeta = \zeta \iota \nu \rho \pi \pi \nu \sigma \iota \zeta \nu \iota \zeta \nu \iota \zeta \)

The nominal form appears 4x and Th has \( \delta \zeta \kappa \zeta \) in 4:27(30)=OG; 5:18
OG=0; 11:20=OG. In 4:33(36) Th has \( \eta \lambda \lambda \sigma \nu \zeta \)?\(^{31}\) The verbal form appears
3x in the Aramaic and each time Th employs \( \delta \zeta \kappa \zeta \) 4:31(34), 34(37);

See CH 5.II.1.iii. for a breakdown of the equivalents.

Sollamo, Renderings, p. 18.

\( \eta \chi \lambda \) is rendered by \( \alpha \iota \omega \nu o \nu \) in 9:24; 12:2(2); \( \alpha \iota \omega \nu a \) in 12:7.

\(^{31}\) Collins, Daniel, p. 212, inexplicably states that Th omits.
5:23.11

30. ἀραχεν (τίς) δυνάμεως

This title only appears in 8:11 where both OG and Th have ἀρχιστράτηγος.13

31. σοφ- = σοφ-

Th employs σοφία as a SE for ἀραχεν 8/9, while OG has it 5/7.14
As Gentry notes, the equivalence is already found 139/171 in the LXX.15 ἀραχεν appears 14x in the Aramaic section.16 Th’s SE is σοφίς (14/14), while OG’s SE is σοφιστίκ (7/10). OG has πάντας in 2:13; σοφίς in 2:21; and spells out who the wisemen are in 5:8.

It is obvious that forms of ἀραχεν = σοφ- is stereotyped throughout the LXX; therefore, it should be discarded as a kaige characteristic.

33. ἀνομία

In all 3x Th has ἀνομία (9:13, 16, 24).17

38. σκηνή/κάσαλον = σκηνή

σκηνή appears in 11:45 and OG and Th employ σκηνή.

41. μογιλανόν(dumb)

μογιλανόν is only in 10:15 and Th has καταγώγω where OG renders with

11OG=0 in 4:31(34), 34(37); εὐλογέω? in 5.23.

13Th does employ διναμίς as a SE for ἀραχεν and ἄραχεν for ἀραχεν when they appear separately. S. CH 5.IV. for renderings of ἀραχεν and CH 5.VI.1.i.iii. for renderings of ἀραχεν.

14S. 1:4, 17, 20; 2:20, 21, 23, 30; 5:11(2), 14. OG=0 in 5:11(2), 14. Th has σώσθης 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.


162:12, 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.

17OG has ἀμαρτία in 9:13, 16; ἀνομία in 9.24.
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43. \( \gamma '\nu \alpha \mu \varepsilon \varsigma \sigma \nu \)  

Both OG and Th employ \( \gamma '\nu \alpha \mu \varepsilon \varsigma \sigma \nu \) 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 \( kai\ge \).  

49. \( \pi \tau (\pi . )=\tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \)  

Forms of the vb. \( \pi \tau \) occur 13x in Daniel and compounds of \( \iota \sigma \chi \nu \) are the most common equivalents in OG and Th. The pi. is only in 10:18 and once in 10:19. In both places Th employs \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \). OG has \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \) in 10:19, but \( \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \chi \nu \varepsilon \) in 10:18. However, OG does have \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \) in 11:1 where Th employs \( \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \o \zeta \) and in 11:5 Th employs \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \) twice for the q. 

The pi. of \( \pi \tau \) appears a total of 64x in MT, and 10x outside of Daniel it is translated by \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \). 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). However, in two other cases of Judges all witnesses agree in reading \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \) (3:12; 16:28). O'Connell suggested that \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu =\pi \tau \) "may be part of a concerted effort at reinterpretation" since Reider-Turner lists 12 instances in which Aquila has \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \) for some form of \( \pi \tau \). Though Aquila might have made the equation between \( \tau \nu \iota \sigma \chi \nu \) and forms of \( \pi \tau \), it is anachronistic to read it back into \( kai\ge \) on the basis of the scanty textual evidence. Th does not make the equation in any case.

50. \( \delta \mu \tau =\rho \mu \varepsilon \alpha \iota \)  

Both OG and Th employ \( \rho \mu \varepsilon \alpha \iota \) 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.
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kaige cannot be considered as evidence that Th belongs to kaige.

54. μηδερίλατι=παδῶρια, παδία
   Th employs παδῶρια 4/6 against OG which prefers νεανίσκος 5/5.\(^{42}\)
   The pl. of μηδερίλατι 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. μηδερίλατι does not occur or the pl.
   is not rendered in Theodotion Joshua, Judges, or Job.\(^{43}\) Furthermore,
   the equivalence μηδερίλατι=παδῶρια is made 3x in the γγ' section of reigns
   (I Ki. 12:8, 10, 14 + 15x in the sing.) and Zech. 8:5, while γδ' employs
   παδῆς (II Ki. 2:24) and νι'ς (II Ki. 4:1; also Ruth 1:5). Gen.
   has μηδερίλατι=παδιών 8/10 and all forms of μηδερίλατι=παδιών 13x (s. HR).
   Clearly, there is no basis here to establish any kaige characteristic.

60. μηδερίλατι=εὐαφείστησις
   The only reading is 2:46 where OG has σπονδη and Th employs εὐωδία.\(^{44}\)

61. μηδερίλατι=δούλη
   Th employs παίς 6x and δούλος 6x for the n. μηδερίλατι, while OG prefers
   παίς (11/12).\(^{45}\) In 7:14, 27 Th employs δούλευσα for μηδερίλατι.\(^{46}\) The
   criterion is a weak one in any case since μηδερίλατι=δούλη is common
   throughout the LXX.\(^{47}\)

---

\(^{42}\)S. CH 5.II.1.iii. for references.

\(^{43}\)μηδερίλατι 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. μηδερίλα occurs 12x, but is not
counted because it is most naturally rendered by ποιέω.

\(^{46}\)Th normally employs λατρευω for μηδερίλα (7/9). S. CH 5.IV.1.iii.

\(^{47}\)Though μηδερίλα=δούλη 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=ηνικα

ηνικα appears in 6:11(10) for מ, but Bodine (p. 19) has already rejected its use as a kaige characteristic.

78. דב=דראחוכ/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. However, Th employs דראחוכ only in 1:15 but קול in 1:4. Therefore, Th cannot be judged to exhibit this kaige characteristic.

79. לשון=דעת

Once again, Bodine argues that it is the consistency of the usage that marks this equivalence, but the evidence is hardly compelling. In any case, Th only has one reading in 11:17 (דעת), which is not enough to prove a relationship to kaige.

81. יבר=הומai

Th has הָעֲרָא 3/5 and הומai 2/5, so he does not support the equivalence.

82. בַּשָּׁה (q.)=paniesφω

Forms of בַּשָּׁה appear 16x in Daniel of which 12/13 are q. 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 pientesφω independently 2x as well (11:9, 10), plus once for the hi. in 11:18. The equivalence pientesφω=בַּשָּׁה 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 γδ.

---

49 Bodine, p. 52.
50 S. CH 5.IV.1.iii. for a discussion.
519:13, 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 γγ'. 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. ῬNOWLED = διαφαίνεται
   In 9:17 OG=ἐπιβλέπω; Th=ἐπισταίνω.

84. νιβαν = φέρει, εἰσφέρει
   νιβαν is found 10x in Daniel.52 OG and Th share a common reading only in 9:12, 14 (ἐπάγω). Th has good renditions with forms of φέρει or εἰσφέρει only in 1:2(2); 11:6, 8, so it does not support Bodine’s proposed characteristic.

85. ἔπαι/πράπ = βοᾶς
   ἔπαι only appears in 6:21(20) and Th does employ βοᾶς (OG=κλασθμός). However, the equivalence is common throughout the LXX,53 and βοᾶς is employed by Th also in 3:4 and 5:7 for ἱπ.

87. διήλεξε = παρατάσσωαι
   διήλεξε appears in 10:20; 11:11 and in both cases Th employs πολέμω. OG=Th in 11:11 and has διαμάχομαι in 10:20.

88. παραταχύς = παράγεις

92. ἀρχηγός = ἀρχηγός
   Th has ἀρχηγός in 11:18 (OG=ὁργή).

93. πανηγία

---

52 S. CH 5.II.1.iii.

53 Bodine, p. 71, notes this as well.
OG has the common LXX equivalent κακὰ 3/3 (9:12, 13, 14), while Th has κακὰ 2/3 and a more dynamic rendering with the per.pro. αὐτὰ 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 form 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 γ 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 σηματάριον=φορθομμένη 1:3; (τ) ῥοῦνας=4:10(13), 14(17), 20(23); θαλάσσα=οὐδεθάλη 8:2, 3, 6; θαλασσή=φηλμονι 8:13; θαλάσσα=βαδίνων 10:5; 12:6, 7; στίγμα=μαζίν 11:38; μάνη=εφακάνω 11:45.

However, Tov omits the transliteration of ἱππάκτερα(τα) 11:16, 41, 45 (δεναρίν, reading Μυθ 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 נסנה 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 ממשל." Th could easily have understood the Hebrew as some type of royal title or technical term (Tov's category 2). שיר 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 שיר, since it adorned heavenly beings. Similarly, שיר was probably understood as a title, though Schmitt notes that שיר is also transliterated in Jud. 6:26 (A μιν , B Μαονέω). The remaining transliteration (נוקא) 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 מיכ and in 2:22 Th employs a contextual guess for מיכ. 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 שפ and בּוֹס 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, שפ 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 מיכ 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 δοξάων for נב in 8:9 could be equated with translations attributed to Theodotion in Is. 28:1; Ez. 20:6, 15 (δοξά). However, the connection is unlikely given the use of transliteration in ch. 11 and the fact that נב 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." 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. ( iov) לְדוֹרֵךְ

Th employs μέγας as a SE (13/15) and πολὺς in 11:28, 44.

96. תְנַכֶּשׁ=καὶ μάλα

In both instances of this reading Th employs ἀλλὰ, whereas OG has καὶ in 10:7 and καὶ μάλα in 10:21.

97. דְּוָנַטְוָס

Both OG and Th employ δυνατός 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. דְּוָנַטְוָס appears twice in the Aramaic section (2:20, 23) and Th employs δυναμίς 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 deuterocanonical 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.
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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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