

TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE BIBLE

THE HEBREW BIBLE

VOLUME 1C

Writings

THB

General Editor
Armin Lange

Volume Editors
Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov

BRILL

The Hebrew Bible

Volume 1C
Writings

Edited by

Armin Lange
Emanuel Tov

Area Editors

Alessandro Maria Bruni (Georgian Translations, Old Church Slavonic Traditions)
Ignacio Carbajosa Pérez (Syriac Translations [Peshitta, Syro-Hexapla, Jacob of Edessa, Syro-Lucianic])
Claude Cox (Armenian Translations)
Sidnie White Crawford (Samaritan Pentateuch)
Steve Delamarter (Ethiopic Translations)
Beate Ego (Targumim)
Frank Feder (Coptic Translations)
Peter J. Gentry (Pre-Hexaplaric, Post-Hexaplaric Translations and the Hexapla)
Michael Graves (Vulgate)
Armin Lange (Ancient Hebrew/Aramaic Texts)
Meira Polliack (Arabic Translations)
Michael Segal (The Biblical Text as Attested in Ancient Literature)
Pablo Antonio Torijano Morales (Vetus Latina)
Emanuel Tov (Septuagint)
Julio Trebolle Barrera (Vetus Latina)



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON



THB logo design: Lika Tov, Jerusalem

Cover design: Celine van Hoek Leiden, the Netherlands.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Lange, Armin, 1961- editor.

Title: The Hebrew Bible / edited by Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2016- | Series: Textual history of the Bible,
ISSN 2468-3027 | Includes bibliographical references and index. Contents:
Vol. 1C Writings.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016013903 | ISBN 9789004337114 (v. 1C : hardback : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Old Testament--Criticism, Textual.

Classification: LCC BS1136 .H43 2016 | DDC 221.6/7--dc23 LC record available at
<https://lcn.loc.gov/2016013903>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 2468-3027

e-ISSN 2452-4107 (THB online)

ISBN 978-90-04-33711-4 (hardback 1C)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

18.1 Textual History of Daniel

18.1.1 Introduction

The book of Daniel is notorious for its plethora of textual difficulties that, to a greater or lesser extent, have bearings on tracing its textual history. The text has come to us in two languages (i.e., Hebrew [Dan 1:1–2:4a; 8:1–12:13] and Aramaic [Dan 2:4b–7:8]) and scholars have naturally disputed the precedence of either an Aramaic or Hebrew original.¹ However, the oldest witnesses to the MT text from Qumran scrolls (→ 18.2.1) evidences the shift in language both at Dan 2:4 and Dan 8:1 and might point to the bilingual skill of its author.

Furthermore, two divergent traditions are known regarding the placement of the book in the canon (→ 1.1.2.1; → 1.1.2.2). The first tradition is represented by MT (→ 18.2.2), which has included Daniel among the Writings. The second stems from LXX, which has maintained the book among the Prophets, where it is placed after Ezekiel. Whereas the former arrangement would suggest some shared affinities of Daniel with sapiential books, the latter – which accords well with traditions from Qumran and the New Testament² – would affirm its prophetic quality.

¹ Wesseliuss has observed rightly that each model that attempts to solve the problem of bilingualism “describes a possible history of the text (...).” Cf. J.W. Wesseliuss, “The Writing of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83/2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 291–310 (292). The adherents to an Aramaic-original view represent the most numerous group. Among them, see Charles, *The Book of Daniel*, xix–xxvi; H.L. Ginsberg, *Studies in Daniel* (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 14; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948), 41–61; L.F. Hartman and A.A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 23; Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), 14–15. The priority of a Hebrew original text was argued by A.F. von Gall, *Die Einheitlichkeit des Buches Daniel* (Giessen: Ricker, 1895), 122; A.A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892), 27.

² 4QFlor refers to Daniel using a citation formula specific to other prophetic books: “The Book of Daniel the Prophet”

The book of Daniel is evidenced in textual witnesses in both Hebrew and ancient translations. The first category is represented by the findings from Qumran that evidence Daniel with eight Hebrew scrolls (→ 18.2.1). Generally speaking, “the Qumran discoveries provide powerful evidence of the antiquity of the textual tradition of the MT.”³ The second group of witnesses is represented by the ancient versions and includes translations/revisions in Greek (→ 18.3.1; → 18.3.2; → 18.3.4; → 18.3.5), Latin (→ 18.3.6; → 18.4.1), Syriac (→ 18.3.3; → 18.4.8), and Arabic (→ 18.4.8). Similar to Ezra–Nehemiah, with whom it also shares the bilingual feature, Daniel lacks for the Hebrew section an Aramaic Targum. Excepting Old Greek, these versions witness to a text more or less comparable to MT.⁴

Given the fact that most of the prominent disparities over against MT are evidenced by the Old Greek in Daniel 4–6⁵ and since the relationship between the Greek versions – Old Greek (LXX-Dan)

(4QFlor 1–2 ii 3), “The Book of Isaiah the Prophet” (4QFlor 1–2 i 15), “The Book of Ezekiel the Prophet” (4QFlor 1–2 i 16). Similarly, Matt 24:15 reads, “So when you see standing in the holy place ‘the abomination that causes desolation,’ spoken of through the prophet Daniel (...)” NIV.

³ Collins, *Daniel*, 3.

⁴ It goes without saying that by this statement we also acknowledge that often the versions reflect superior readings, e.g. Vulgate (→ 18.3.6.4.1).

⁵ LXX-Daniel 4–6 diverge from MT in many ways. Besides smaller deviations such as pluses (e.g., Dan 4:9[12]; 6:4[3]) and minuses (e.g., Dan 4:17[20]; 5:2; 6:11[10]), which occur repeatedly over against MT, the Old Greek also displays long minuses (e.g., Dan 4:3–6[6–9]; 4:32[35]; 5:13–16, 18–22; 6:16[15]–17[16]), long pluses (e.g., Dan 4:37[34]; 5:0 [the brief abstract of Daniel 5]), differences in layout (the epistolary introduction that precedes Daniel 4 of MT [Dan 3:31–33] is reflected in LXX at the end of the story, cf. Dan 4:34[37b,c]), doublets (e.g., Dan 6:13[12a]; 4:14[17a]), and overall disparity in length (i.e., Daniel 4 is estimated as one-quarter longer than MT whereas Daniel 5 reflects a shorter version of the MT). Note also the intriguing absence in LXX of Daniel’s qualification according to which he purportedly owns “the Spirit of the Holy God” (Dan 4:5–6, 15; 5:11, 14).

and Theodotion (Th-Dan) – to MT has raised many questions, we will proceed to survey the relevant scholarship in light of these issues (see further 18.2.2.3).⁶

18.1.2 History of Research

The textual studies of the book of Daniel in the twentieth century that advanced its investigation were prompted by three important findings:

1. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, among them the fragments of Daniel (→ 18.2.1; → 18.2.3)⁷. Of the biblical manuscripts discovered at Qumran, eight copies have been attributed to Daniel.⁸

⁶ Though a relatively short book, Daniel presents numerous problems. As intimated earlier, the Greek text of Daniel has been transmitted in two versions: Old Greek and Theodotion. Furthermore, in contrast to MT, both Greek texts agree with each other in including additional poems and stories known to us as the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men, Bel and the Dragon, and Susanna. This becomes even more intriguing since Th-Dan, which reflects a text close to MT, is assessed as a literal Greek translation (Cf. Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel* 7–12, 131). As might be expected, this raises the question – with far-reaching implications – whether these Additions are indeed original. Di Lella contends that “The translators of OG-Dan and Th-Dan were consciously at work on a canonical text. These Greek forms with the Additions served as canonical Scripture for the several Greek-speaking Jewish and Christian communities that received (or revised) them. Being Scripture, OG-Dan and Th-Dan deserve the same respect and consideration as the MT.” Cf. Di Lella, “The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83.2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 604. See also C.A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 44; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1977), 134. In a footnote to this analysis, notwithstanding their agreement in including the Additions, Th-Dan and LXX-Dan depart from each other in the layout of their chapters. Papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷, for instance, differs from LXX⁸⁸ and Syro-Hexapla and Th MSS by placing chapters 7 and 8 before chapters 5 and 6. Further, Papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷ in contrast with the other witnesses situates Susanna after Bel and the Dragon.

⁷ This view was stressed by A.S. van der Woude, preface to *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CVI; Leuven: University Press, 1993).

⁸ Two scrolls were discovered in Cave 1 (1QDan^a and

The number of copies as well as the length of the book compared with the number of fragments of other (lengthier) biblical books, ranks Daniel after the Pentateuch, Psalms, and Isaiah, which evidences its popularity within the sectarian group.⁹

2. A further boost for the textual scrutiny of Danielic literature came by way of the groundbreaking study of Barthélemy on the Greek scroll of the Minor Prophets discovered in Naḥal Ḥever.¹⁰ The impact of Barthélemy's monograph, **Devanciers*, on LXX research has been described by Tov as “a book which in many ways has revolutionized scholarship.”¹¹ Barthélemy's theory postulates the existence of a *kaige* group during the textual transmission process, as the name of his work implies, which could be considered the predecessor of Aquila's revision.¹²

1QDan^b) and published by Barthélemy in the *editio princeps*: D. Barthélemy, “71. Daniel (premier exemplaire),” **DJD* 1: 150; D. Barthélemy, “72. Daniel (second exemplaire),” **DJD* 1: 151–52. The five copies from Cave 4 (4QDan^{a–e}) were published by E. Ulrich, “Daniel,” **DJD* XVI: 239–77. One additional copy written on papyrus was discovered in Cave 6 (6QpapDan) and was published by M. Baillet, “7. Daniel,” **DJD* III.1: 114–16. All biblical texts, including those of Daniel, were collected by Ulrich, **BQS*, 755–75.

⁹ Statistically, the Book of Daniel ranks the same number of copies with Minor Prophets (8) and is followed by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (6 copies each) and Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Job and Proverbs (4 copies each). Cf. E. Ulrich, “Daniel, Book of: Hebrew and Aramaic Text,” **EDSS* 1:171; “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83.2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 573. According to Flint, there are seventeen scrolls discovered at Qumran that are altogether relevant for the study of the Book of Daniel. See, P.W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83.2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 329–367.

¹⁰ The first publication of the Greek scroll was prepared by Barthélemy, **Devanciers*. Excerpts from his previous study were republished in Barthélemy, **Études*, 66–90. The scroll in its entirety was published by E. Tov with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft and contribution of P.J. Parsons, in **DJD* VIII.

¹¹ Foreword to **DJD* VIII: ix.

¹² Barthélemy begins his analysis (cf. **Devanciers*) by presenting Aquila as having been influenced by the rabbinical hermeneutical principles of Rabbi Akiba.

Expressed differently, the *kaige* group displays intermediary revising techniques that turn the group into a link between Old Greek and the acute literalism of Aquila's revision.¹³ Using the peculiar word equivalence καὶ γὰρ "and also" for καὶ "also," at least as a criterion, Barthélemy has determined that a few Greek witnesses – among them also Th-Dan – belong to the *kaige* revision (→ 1.3.1.2).¹⁴

3. The discovery of papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷ in Aphroditopolis, Egypt in 1931 further advanced the study of Daniel.¹⁵ Papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷ (→ 18.3.1) contains sections from the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Esther.¹⁶ Until 1931, critical assessment of

OG-Dan was based on two manuscripts only, namely, the Hexaplaric witnesses LXX⁸⁸ (Codex Chisianus)¹⁷ and the Syro-Hexapla (→ 18.4.4).¹⁸ With the finding of papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷, it was now possible to access a time (ca. 200 C.E.) that antedates Origen's *magnum opus*, the Hexapla.¹⁹ As a result of this discovery, scholars were in a better position to understand the transmission history of OG-Dan and consequently their appreciation for it grew.

As a result of these circumstances, three directions of analysis have predominated the text-critical

¹³ D. Barthélemy, "Rédécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 (1953): 18–29.

¹⁴ In addition to Th-Dan and the Greek scroll of the Minor Prophets discovered in Naḥal Ḥever, the other LXX books and sections assigned by Barthélemy to the *kaige* group are: Lamentations, Song of Songs, Ruth, the sections βγ [2 Sam 11: 2–1 Kgs 22:1] and γδ [1 Kgs 22–2 Kgs], the extant Theodotonic fragments of Job and Jeremiah, the book of Judges as attested in LXX-manuscripts *i r u a 2* and *B e f s z*, the column attributed to Theodotion in Origen's *Hexapla* and the Quinta of Psalms. Cf. Barthélemy, **Devanciers*, 47.

¹⁵ Several facts and figures about papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷ are worth noting. Papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷ contains fifty-nine manuscript folios (118 pages) that have been preserved in five different locations: twenty-nine folios are now located in the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin, twenty-one folios are found in the Princeton University Library, two folios are kept in Barcelona at Santa Maria de Montserrat Abbey, and the remainder can be found in Cologne at the Cologne University Library and Madrid at Fundación Pastor de Estudios Clásicos. Each page of the codex is numbered and the number of lines per page varies between forty and forty-six. Two scribal hands have been detected: one copied both Daniel and Esther while the other reproduced the text of Ezekiel. In all, it took forty-six years to publish the whole of papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷. See further S. Kreuzer, "Papyrus 967," in Karrer–Kraus, **Septuaginta 2008*, 64–82.

¹⁶ The *editiones principes* of LXX⁹⁶⁷ for the Book of Daniel have been prepared by W. Hamm, *Daniel 1–2: Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel, Kap. 1–2, nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 10; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1969); W. Hamm, *Daniel 3–4: Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel, Kap. 3–4, nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 21; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1977); F.G. Kenyon, *Daniel 3,72–6,18: The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Description and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek*

Bible, Fasc. 7: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther (2 vols.; London: E. Walker, 1938), text (vol. 1) + plates (vol. 2); A. Geißén, *Daniel 5–12; Susanna, Bel et Draco; Esther: Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel, Kap. 5–12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco, sowie Esther Kap. 1,1a–2,15 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 5; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1968); R. Roca-Puig, *Daniel: dos semifolis del códex 967: papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.º. 42 i 43* (Barcelona: Grafos, 1974); R. Roca-Puig, "Daniel: Dos Semifogli del Codex 967," *Aeg* 56 (1976): 3–18. The *editiones principes* of LXX⁹⁶⁷ for the book of Ezekiel were prepared by A.C. Johnson, H.S. Gehman, and E.H. Kase, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel* (Princeton University Studies in Papyrology 3; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938) and L.G. Jahn, *Der griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel, nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 15; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1972).

¹⁷ According to H.B. Swete (*The Old Testament in Greek* [3 vols.; Cambridge: University Press, 1894], 3.xii–xiii), LXX⁸⁸ belonged to Pope Alexander VII who was part of the Chigi family. Alexander entrusted the manuscript to the Vatican librarian Leo Allatius for publication. However, the publication was delayed approximately 100 years until after the death of Bianchini and Regibus who continued the work of Allatius (Montgomery, *Daniel*, 25–26). It was finally published by S. de Magistris, *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus a singulari Chrisiano codice* (Rome: Typis Propagandae Fidei, 1772).

¹⁸ Syro-Hexapla is a translation into Syriac of the fifth column included in Origen's *Hexapla* (→ 1.4.5). The translation was carried out from 615 to 617 C.E. and is attributed to Paul of Tella. Syro-Hexapla has been preserved in Codex Ambrosianus (ca. ninth century), which was published by A.M. Ceriani, *Codex syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus* (Monumenta sacra et profana 7; Milan: Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1874), folios 143^a–151^b.

¹⁹ Di Lella, "The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," 590.

scholarship of the book of Daniel. The first area of research has continued to take advantage of the new findings from Qumran, focusing investigation not only on the biblical copies²⁰ but also on the extra-biblical scrolls that may have an impact on the interpretation of Daniel. As such, the Qumranic literature has proven profitable to those scholars who have endeavored to reconstruct stages in the tradition history of the book as well as the literary dependence of particular passages.²¹

The second area of analysis was inspired by the finding of the pre-Hexaplaric papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷. Due to its various discrepancies with MT in terms of content and layout,²² OG-Dan as it is recorded in the three extant textual witnesses (LXX⁸⁸ and

LXX⁹⁶⁷ LXX and the Syro-Hexapla) inspired the studies of Ashley,²³ McCrystall, Jeansonne, Wenthe, Meadowcroft, and Amara as described below. Before McCrystal, only Bludau's study, which predates the discovery of papyrus LXX⁹⁶⁷, addressed the relationship between MT (→ 18.2.2) and LXX-Dan (→ 18.3.1).²⁴ He suggested that the differences between MT and LXX-Dan should be attributed to the theological approach of the translator. The same view has been maintained in McCrystall's study, which alleges "a deliberate standpoint" on the part of the translator.²⁵ In response to Bludau and McCrystall, Jeansonne has argued convincingly that "the OG translator did not undertake the work with a particular agenda."²⁶ With the studies of Wenthe and Meadowcroft, the attention has shifted to the first part of Daniel. Wenthe had an interest in detecting the textual history behind Daniel 1–6 in light of Second Temple Judaism.²⁷ He concludes that while we have "a very uniform tradition in Daniel 1–3,"²⁸ OG-Dan in Daniel 4–6 has "frozen" an earlier form of the text during its transmission history.²⁹ Meadowcroft's analysis is unique in that it attempts to use the tools of narrative criticism to evaluate the textual differences between MT and LXX in Daniel 2–7.³⁰ Three types of results

²⁰ P.J. Lambach, "A Detailed Comparison of 4QDan^c and the Other Qumran Texts of Daniel with the Masoretic Text of Daniel" (PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Seminary, 1997) represents a new study on the Daniel biblical scroll found at Qumran. Taking 4QDan^c (Dan 10:5–11:29) as his point of departure, Lambach describes its condition and analyzes its script, textual division, and transcription (ch. 2). After comparing the orthography and the other textual features (script, textual division, textual intervention, textual variation) of 4QDan^c with other Qumran copies of Daniel (ch. 3) and MT (ch. 4), Lambach concludes that 4QDan^c, 1QDan^a, 1QDan^b, and pap6QDan display the proto-MT tradition at Qumran (p. 190), that 4QDan^a could be categorized as a "proto-MT text with strong leanings towards LXX" (p. 190), and that 4QDan^b should be classified due to its editorial freedom as "a manuscript of the Qumran practice" (pp. 190–91). Furthermore, based on script, lack of final letters, and lack of paragraphing, Lambach dates 4QDan^c to 150–125 B.C.E. (p. 191). See also E. Ulrich, "Orthography and Text in 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b and in the Received Massoretic Text," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell* (eds. A. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T.H. Tobin; Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), 29–42 and E. Ulrich, "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83/2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 573–85.

²¹ M. Segal, "From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2," *VT* 59 (2009): 123–49; R.E. Stokes, "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 'Enoch' 14, and the Qumran 'Book of Giants' (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship," *DSD* 15 (2008): 340–58.

²² The next section will exhibit the textual problems related to the book of Daniel with an emphasis on the peculiarity of Daniel 4–6.

²³ Ashley's study is more in the nature of an exegetical enterprise of select passages in Daniel 1–4 and does not address textual questions. T.R. Ashley, "The Book of Daniel, Ch. 1–4: Text, Versions and the Problems of Exegesis" (PhD diss., University of St. Andrews, 1976).

²⁴ Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*.

²⁵ McCrystall, "Studies," 76.

²⁶ Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12*, 133.

²⁷ Wenthe, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6."

²⁸ Wenthe, "Daniel," 247.

²⁹ Wenthe, "Daniel," 248.

³⁰ Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*. This narrative criticism has been heralded by James Muilenburg in his presidential address at the SBL meeting in 1968 and further developed in the second half of the twentieth century by the referential works of R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981); R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985); R. Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature* (New York: Basic Books, 1992). Equally important are the studies of A. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Bible and Literature Series 9; Sheffield:

are advanced by Meadowcroft. First, from a literary perspective, the MT narrator is “covert” while the Old Greek appears to be “overt.” Second, he contends that at a thematic level the symbolic and wisdom topics are differentiated in MT and Old Greek. Finally, his historical conclusions are similar to those of Wenthe’s and concludes that the “Septuagint seems to take us closer to the *Ursprung* and further away from the putative Persian provenance of the Aramaic.”³¹

Amara’s study is structured as a full-scale analysis of OG-Dan.³² This study not only covers the entire book (except the Additions; → 11.3.2), but also deals with the most important questions raised in the previous research. In terms of translation techniques, Amara differs from Wenthe’s and Jeanson’s positive assessment of the Old Greek translator and maintains “The extremely non-literal nature of this translation turns it almost worthless for text-critical purposes, since one can never be certain whether a variant text actually goes back to a different *Vorlage* or originated from the hand of the translator.”³³ Furthermore, she argues persuasively that Daniel 4–6 and the other sections of the book feature signs of a single translator.³⁴ She considers the text un-

derlying OG-Dan to be secondary compared to MT including that of Daniel 4–6.³⁵ Furthermore, Amara contends that the OG-Dan translator is not accountable for the final form of the text, rather “his translation underwent redactional intervention by a Greek redactor whose main contribution is the more substantial additions to the book.”³⁶

The third area of investigation addresses Barthélemy’s hypothesis about the nature of the relationship between Th-Dan and the supposed *kaige* group.³⁷ Two specific claims have been made in Barthélemy’s groundbreaking research that have bearing on the textual studies of Daniel, namely, that Th-Dan should be more appropriately described as a revision, and that, in terms of affiliation, Th-Dan belongs to *kaige*.³⁸ The latter as-

opinion that has been advanced by Albertz and supported by McLay.

³⁵ Amara, “Old Greek,” iv–v.

³⁶ Amara, “Old Greek,” v–vi.

³⁷ Other biblical books investigated for their affiliation to the *kaige* group are: 1–2 Kings (J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Revisional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* [HSM 1; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968]); Exodus (K.G. O’Connell, *The Theodotian Revision of the Book of Exodus* [HSM 3; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972]); Judges (W. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges* [HSM 23; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980]); Joshua (L.J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* [HSM 28; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983]). Greenspoon’s study is valuable not only because it attempts to trace *kaige* marks in LXX-Josh, but also because the monograph contains a comprehensive list of the alleged *kaige* features. The fact that these studies were written in the same university (Harvard) and under the guidance of the same mentor (Frank M. Cross) has prompted R.T. McLay to refer to them as the “Harvard school” (*The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* [Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003], 9–14). See also the work of P.J. Gentry who has analyzed the asterisked fragments of Job in *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), and on the book of Psalms, see O. Munnich’s analysis, “Étude lexicographique du Psautier des Septante” (PhD diss., Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1982) and → 1.3.1.2.

³⁸ For further information about Barthélemy’s hypothesis, see the discussion above. Critical assessment of the *kaige* theory and the problems that it involves can be found, among other works treated below, in Jellicoe, *SMS, 83–94; McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*, 9–14; Fernandez Marcos, *Introduction*, 142–53.

The Almond Press, 1983), Y. Amit, *Reading Biblical Narratives: Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), and S. Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible* (trans. D. Shefer-Vanson; JSOTSup 70; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

³¹ T.J. Meadowcroft, “A Literary Critical Comparison of the Masoretic Text and Septuagint Daniel 2–7,” *TynBul* 45 (1994): 195–99. For the strengths and weaknesses of applying such an approach to textual problems, see the reviews of L.L. Grabbe, review of T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*, *CBQ* 59 (1997): 128–29; R.A. Taylor, review of T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 154 (1997): 501–02; B.A. Taylor, review of T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*, *JBL* 117 (1998): 731–32; C.T.R. Hayward, review of T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*, *VT* 51 (2001): 412–13.

³² Amara, “The Old Greek Version of Daniel.”

³³ Amara, “Old Greek,” ii.

³⁴ Amara, “Old Greek,” iii. Amara’s view goes against of the

sertion resulted in Schmitt's study that searches for an answer as to whether Th-Dan belongs to *kaige*.³⁹ To achieve his purpose, Schmitt first collated fragments ascribed to Theodotion from five biblical books (Proverbs, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel).⁴⁰ In view of methodological considerations, he excluded the sections from 2 Kgs 11:2 to 3 Kgs 2:11 and the Minor Prophets Scroll since they were classified by Barthélemy as part of the *kaige* group. Subsequently, Schmitt engaged in a detailed comparison of translation techniques at the level of lexical choices⁴¹ and syntactical features (agreement in number, the use of cases, syntax of prepositions, adjectives, verbs, the use of particles, the composition of words, and idiomatic Hebrew phrases)⁴² between Th-Dan and the collated passages attributed to the historical Theodotion. In the last chapter of his study, after comparing the translation technique of the deuterocanonical sections extant only in the Greek witnesses (Susanna, Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three, and Bel and Draco),⁴³ Schmitt concluded that the Greek version of Daniel attributed to Theodotion (Th-Dan/"θ"-Text) has no relation to the texts attributed by Barthélemy to the historical Theodotion.⁴⁴

Since the implicit claim of Schmitt's study calls into question the affiliation of Th-Dan to the *kaige* group, it drew Barthélemy's critique,⁴⁵ which in turn prompted a response from Schmitt.⁴⁶ Schmitt's conclusion, however, was recently substantiated by McLay's study in which, after com-

paring ninety-seven features supposedly pertaining to the *kaige* group with Th-Dan, he concluded, "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."⁴⁷

Barthélemy's contention that Th-Dan should be classed as a revision of OG-Dan has been the main focus of McLay's and Obiajunwa's research and, secondarily, that of Amara. Before Barthélemy, given the number of citations from Th-Dan in works that predate the historical Theodotion, scholars postulated the existence of an Ur-/proto-Theodotion version.⁴⁸ Before McLay, Schmitt had referred to the Th-Dan version as a revision, though he disputed Barthélemy's claim regarding its affiliation to *kaige*.⁴⁹ Both Wenthe and Jeansonne expressed the same view.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, credit is due to McLay's challenge of this view, which mentions the absence of any systematic study that substantiated the theory of Th-Dan as a revision.

McLay's study, though conceived originally as a contribution to translation technique,⁵¹ has proved

⁴⁷ McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, 239–40; see also T.R. McLay, "Kaige and the Septuagint Research," *Textus* 19 (1998): 127–39.

⁴⁸ L. Gwynn, "Theodotion," *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (eds. W. Smith and H. Wace; London: John Murrow, 1887), 4:970–79; Thackeray, **The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*; Swete, **Introduction* (rev. by R.R. Ottley; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989), 42–49; Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 46–50.

⁴⁹ See the discussion above. Cf. Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 112, and Schmitt, "Die griechischen Danieltexte ('θ' und ο') und das Theodotionproblem," 1–29.

⁵⁰ Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel* 7–12, 56–57; Wenthe, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6," 251–57. I agree, however, with McLay's criticism of Jeansonne's use of statistics without discussing the adequacy of the sample (cf. McLay, "Translation Technique," 33–34). By the same token, I concur with McLay in his criticism of Wenthe that he "does not evidence any careful analysis of the question [that Th-Dan is a revision]." McLay, "Translation Technique," 35–36 and n. 92.

⁵¹ McLay states the objective of his dissertation at the outset: "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

³⁹ Schmitt, *Theodotion*.

⁴⁰ For the complete list of the scriptural verses used by Schmitt, see *Theodotion*, 112.

⁴¹ Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 26–61.

⁴² Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 61–100.

⁴³ Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 100–12.

⁴⁴ Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 100–12.

⁴⁵ D. Barthélemy, "Notes critiques sur quelques points d'histoire du texte," in *Übersetzung und Deutung: Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt Alexander Reinard Hulst gewidmet von Freunden und Kollegen* (Nijkerk: Uitgeverij G.F. Callenbach b.v., 1977), 9–23; repr. in **Études*, 289–303.

⁴⁶ Schmitt reiterated these conclusions twenty-five years later in his article, "Die griechischen Danieltexte ('θ' und ο') und das Theodotionproblem," *BZ* 36 (1992): 1–29.

to be of benefit in the discussion of the relationship between OG-Dan and Th-Dan. To my knowledge, it was the first systematic study that was carried out in order to answer this question. As a consequence, his assessment of Th-Dan as a new translation (in contrast to the prevalent view) must no longer be ignored.⁵²

Obiajunwa addressed the question of the relation between the two Greek versions by investigating first the “Semitic interference in θ -Dan by determining how it has rendered Semitic vocabulary, grammar, and syntax into Greek.”⁵³ He then applied his results to test the claim that “ θ -Dan came from a careful and generally consistent revision of the OG to correspond to MT or a text similar to MT.”⁵⁴ Evaluating the data, Obiajunwa supports McLay’s verdict and concludes that “ θ -Dan is the work of a translator who worked for the most part independently of LXX-Dan.”⁵⁵ Lastly, in her study of OG-Dan, Amara briefly analyzed the relation between LXX-Dan and Th-Dan.⁵⁶ After each possible alternative has been exemplified, she concludes that Th-Dan “is not really a revision but another translation which is dependent and influenced by the translation prior to it.”⁵⁷

research” (McLay, “Translation Technique,” 1). A comparison of his dissertation with its published form reveals the fact that significant portions of his original thesis were left out. The dissertation includes two additional chapters that are not included in its published form. The chapters omitted are those that tried to suggest a new model of translation techniques (see ch. 3 [pp. 101–22] and ch. 4 [pp. 123–73]). These chapters, however, are incorporated in McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*, 44–99.

⁵² McLay, though he admits that after ten years of writing his dissertation it appears that “not much has changed regarding the evaluation of Th as a revision,” has further substantiated his claim by producing other studies. Cf. T.R. McLay, “The Relationship between Greek Translations of Daniel 1–3,” *BIOCS* 37 (2004): 29–53; T.R. McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV–VI,” 304–23.

⁵³ Obiajunwa, “Semitic Interference,” iv.

⁵⁴ Obiajunwa, “Semitic Interference.”

⁵⁵ Obiajunwa, “Semitic Interference,” 237.

⁵⁶ Amara, “The Old Greek Version of Daniel,” 13–25.

⁵⁷ Amara, “The Old Greek Version of Daniel,” 25.

As far as the special nature of Daniel 4–6 is concerned, several competing views have been advanced in critical scholarship in order to tackle the diverging materials in LXX-Dan in these chapters. The first view, which held the LXX translator accountable for the differences, is reflected in the recurring opinions expressed in scholarly publications in the nineteenth century.⁵⁸ Accordingly, scholars have viewed the differences mainly as midrashic, paraphrastic, and/or expansionistic interventions by the translator himself.⁵⁹

At the turn of the twentieth century, a second trend in research was heralded by Bludau’s influential study. In spite of the fact that in many instances he holds the LXX translator responsible for a midrashic and theological *Tendenz*,⁶⁰ Bludau deviated from the previous view by his positive appreciation of LXX as well as by his differentiation between Daniel 4–6 and the rest of the book.⁶¹ Regarding these chapters, he suggested that LXX (\rightarrow 18.3.1) reflects a *Vorlage* much different from MT (\rightarrow 18.2.2) in a textual pattern that differed from the other chapters of the book.⁶² This supposedly different *Vorlage* preoccupied scholars much in the twentieth century and different views were expressed regarding whether this text mirrors a superior text to MT-Dan or the

⁵⁸ Among others, see Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 45–46; G. Behrmann, *Das Buch Daniel* (HAT: Die Prophetischen Bücher 3.3.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894), xxviii–xxxviii. For a brief review of the nineteenth-century literature, see Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, 29–33.

⁵⁹ This view is also partly implied by those who emphasize the translator as a interpreter who created readings that are valuable for the history of exegesis and reception of the text. Such an approach was accepted by F.F. Bruce in “The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation,” *OTS* 17 (1972): 37–52; “The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel,” *OTS* 20 (1977): 22–40; and “Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint,” *BIOCS* 12 (1979): 17–26.

⁶⁰ Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, 27. See also Jeansonne’s criticism of Bludau’s view, Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel* 7–12, 24–25.

⁶¹ This view is reflected in the very structure of his study: separate analyses of Daniel 1–3; 7–12 and Daniel 4–6. Cf. Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, 33–143 (Daniel 1–3; 7–12), 143–54 (Daniel 4–6).

⁶² *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, 31–33, 143–154.

opposite. Thus, the priority of LXX's *Vorlage* has been argued by Riessler,⁶³ Jahn,⁶⁴ Charles,⁶⁵ Albertz,⁶⁶ Wills,⁶⁷ Munnich,⁶⁸ Lust,⁶⁹ and Meadow-

croft,⁷⁰ whereas the preferential status of MT has been defended by Montgomery,⁷¹ Grélot,⁷² Satran,⁷³ and Amara.⁷⁴

⁶³ In his work, Riessler argues against that LXX in Dan 2:4–7:28 reflects a “targumic paraphrase” or *Tendenz* in translation; he further contends that the LXX is rather based on a different *Vorlage* – most likely Hebrew – which has precedence over MT. Cf. *Das Buch Daniel*, 33, 44, 52.

⁶⁴ Similarly to Riessler, Jahn assumes an original, Hebrew underlying text older than MT, which he attempted to recover by retroverting LXX-Dan 1–12 into Hebrew. Cf. *Das Buch Daniel: Nach der Septuaginta hergestellt – übersetzt und kritisch erklärt*, iii–iv, vi.

⁶⁵ According to Charles the OG more closely resembled the original text – particularly in Dan 4–6. Implicitly he considers MT to be secondary. He asserts, “A long sustained and minute study of the text and versions has led him [Charles] to conclude that it is just in these chapters that the LXX makes its greatest contribution to the reconstruction of the original text, particularly in chapter iv.” Charles, *The Book of Daniel*, xxx.

⁶⁶ Albertz's study focused particularly on Dan 4–6 and has come to the conclusion that these chapters constituted a separate collection of stories that were translated into Greek before being incorporated into the existing LXX-Dan. Consequently, the LXX translator of chapters 4–6 differs from the translator of the other Aramaic chapters (2–3, 7). Cf. *Der Gott des Daniel*. Albertz reiterates his view in a later article where he contends that the LXX in Dan 4–6 “represent an independent shape of the Daniel stories, which in my view is even older than the Aramaic, perhaps not in all details, but in their basic narrative plot.” See R. Albertz, “The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83.1; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 180.

⁶⁷ Wills, “Jew in the Court of the Foreign King,” 12–87.

⁶⁸ Munnich's study on the literary development of the book determined that LXX-Dan (particularly in LXX⁹⁶⁷) mirrors “a prior condition to the Masoretic text.” See O. Munnich, “Texte massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel,” in *Schenker, *Earliest Text*, 93–120 (120). See also, O. Munnich, “Les versions grecques de Daniel et leur substrats sémitiques,” in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (eds. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich; SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 291–308.

⁶⁹ Against Albertz, Lust argued that the order of chapters in LXX⁹⁶⁷ (Daniel 1–4; 7–8; 5–6; 9; 10–12) is preferable to their preserved arrangement in MT. He sees the differences between MT and LXX in Daniel 4 and 5 that “are connected with the heavily redacted composition of the Semitic text.” In this article, Lust explains, “In the *Vorlage* of the MT the Aramaic materials, without the ‘pluses’ found in the LXX, were collected in a different order. In later stages of the transmission of the text, the LXX was progressively ‘corrected’ towards conformity with

the MT. Notwithstanding these ‘corrections’ the differences proved too important, and the early Greek version was finally discarded and superseded by the so-called Theodotionic translation.” Cf. L. Lust, “The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5,” in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A.S. van der Woude; BETL 56; Leuven: University Press, 1993), 39–53 (52–563). Similarly, this view was presented in the work of his student P.S. David, “The Composition and Structure of the Book of Daniel: A Synchronic and Diachronic Reading” (PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1991).

⁷⁰ Cf. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel* in → 18.1.2.

⁷¹ Montgomery agrees with Bludau that a distinction should be made between the special character of Dan 3–6 and the rest of the book. Cf. Montgomery, *Daniel*, 36. At variance with Bludau, however, he has posited that its Semitic *Vorlage* accounts for the divergent material of these chapters in OG. In this regard, Montgomery writes, “In the Notes the conclusion is reached that there is considerable evidence for translation from a Sem(itic) copy which is responsible for much of the additions, largely midrash, now in LXX” (Montgomery, *Daniel*, 37). Further, after discussing Daniel 4, he contends that “there is some evidence that the midrashic expansion took place in a semitic form of the text before translation” (248). After Daniel 6, however, Montgomery does not maintain his position and agrees with Bludau's assessment, namely, that we have here “a working-over than a translation” (Montgomery, *Daniel*, 280).

⁷² A nuanced position has been advanced by Grélot. Not only has he pointed out that Th-Dan could be characterized in Daniel 4–6 as a “new version,” but he describes the rest of the book in similar terms, as “a new translation entirely reworked.” P. Grélot, “Les versions grecques de Daniel,” *Bib* 47 (1966): 381–402 (394–95). He has elaborated on his view regarding a Semitic underlying text in Dan 4–6 in “La Septante de Daniel 4 et son substrat sémitique,” *RB* 81 (1974): 5–23; “Le Chapitre 5 de Daniel dans la Septante,” *Sem* 24 (1974): 45–66; and “Daniel VI dans la Septante,” in *Κατὰ τοὺς ὁ: Selon les Septante: trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante: en hommage à Marguerite Harl* (eds. G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 103–18. Further, similarly to Montgomery's view, he attributes the variants between OG and Th to their underlying texts that may antedate the fixation of MT. In contrast to Charles, he maintains that a presumably older *Vorlage* is not an indication per se of its superiority over MT. See Grélot, “Les versions grecques de Daniel,” 399.

⁷³ Satran, “Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation.”

⁷⁴ See the review of Amara's study, “The Old Greek Version of Daniel” in → 18.1.2.

A third view that posits the existence of two parallel editions became apparent at the end of the twentieth century. In light of the Qumranic literature, which purportedly suggests a fluid textual milieu in the late Second Temple period, Ulrich,⁷⁵ Wenthe,⁷⁶ Henze,⁷⁷ and Tov,⁷⁸ have argued that the two texts in these chapters represent both original and secondary elements.

18.1.3 Textual History and Exegetical Relevance

In order to reconstruct the textual history of the book of Daniel, it is necessary to assess accurately the relationship between LXX-Dan (→ 18.3.1) and Th-Dan (→ 18.3.2) in general and, in the case of Daniel 4–6, in particular. However, little consensus regarding these relationships has been reached in the course of the textual research of Daniel. In Grabbe's words, "Barthélemy's thesis has been more repeated than examined."⁷⁹ Similarly, McLay,⁸⁰ Obiajunwa,⁸¹ and most recently

Amara⁸² have called for a fresh examination. In response to this need, Olariu addressed the relationship between LXX-Dan and Th-Dan.⁸³ His results call into question the view of Th-Dan as an independent translation. He furthermore contends that it shows traces of revision.⁸⁴ As for Th-Dan's affiliation with the *kaige* group, the connections are too vague to affirm a definite relationship.⁸⁵ He believes that similar uncertainty characterizes the proposed link between Th-Dan and the historical Theodotion.⁸⁶

The textual differences in Daniel 4–6 afford insight into the pre-final stages of the text. This could impact the way we evaluate literary and scribal patterns and practices operative at these early stages. The analysis of differences of this type should be conducted on a broad basis. It seems that LXX-Dan reflects the work of a single translator.⁸⁷ Moreover, the deviations in Daniel 4–6 affirm Jerome's claim that Th-Dan replaced LXX-Dan, based on the fact that "it differs widely from the original, and is rightly rejected."⁸⁸

⁷⁵ Ulrich posits that both MT and LXX are secondary witnesses to the original tradition: "The conclusion to be drawn, but still to be demonstrated in detail, is that the Old Greek translator translated the entire book faithfully from his semitic Vorlage; he simply had a version of the book which contained a variant edition of the text of those three chapters. Furthermore, the variant editions found in the MT and in the Old Greek for Daniel 4–6 appear to be two different later editions of the story, both secondary, both expanding in different ways beyond a single form which lies behind both but which is no longer extant" (Ulrich, "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Later Stages in the Composition of the Bible," 285). This view was defended two years later in the PhD dissertation of his student Wenthe, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6."

⁷⁶ Wenthe, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6" (see the discussion in → 18.1.2).

⁷⁷ After he criticized both Wills and Satran for their "diametrically opposed" views, Henze claims that the relationship between the texts is better described as one of "double literary editions" or "duplicate narratives" (Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar*, 38–49 [38, 40]).

⁷⁸ Tov, "Three Strange Books of the LXX."

⁷⁹ L.L. Grabbe, "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?" in *Manchester Symposium*, 505–56 (506).

⁸⁰ McLay, "Translation Technique," 34, 35, 38–39; *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, 243.

⁸¹ Obiajunwa, "Semitic Interference," 1–2.

⁸² Amara, "The Old Greek Version of Daniel: The Translation, the Vorlage and the Redaction," 316–17.

⁸³ Cf. "The Quest for the Common Basis in the Greek Versions of the Book of Daniel" (M.A. thesis, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2015). This thesis was carried out under the supervision of Emanuel Tov and Michael Segal.

⁸⁴ Pivotal in the discussion of Th-Dan as a revision is the issue relating to the common basis of the Greek versions. In my study quoted in the preceding note, I substantiated this common basis with more than eighty significant agreements shared by LXX-Dan and Th-Dan in Daniel 1–12 and with more than thirty significant agreements in the Additions.

⁸⁵ This view has been defended by McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, 216–40. By the same author, see also "Kaige and the Septuagint Research," *Textus* 19 (1998): 127–39.

⁸⁶ This conclusion is based on Schmitt's analysis, *Stammt der sogenannte "9"-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?*

⁸⁷ Both Alberty and McLay argued that LXX-Dan 4–6 reveal the hand of a different translator from the rest of the book. However, I agree with the results of Amara's thorough analysis, which point to the opposite (Alberty, *Der Gott des Daniel*; Amara, "The Old Greek Version of Daniel"; McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*).

⁸⁸ Jerome comments once in the preface to his translation

- Albertz, R., *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* (SBS 131; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988).
- Amara, D., "The Old Greek Version of Daniel: The Translation, the Vorlage and the Redaction" (PhD diss., Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 2006) [Hebr.].
- Barthélemy, **Devanciers*.
- Bludau, A., *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältnis zum massorethischen Text* (BibS[F] II 2.3; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1897).
- Bogaert, P.-M., "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante Ézékïel et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967," *Bib* 59 (1978): 384–95.
- Bogaert, P.-M., "Relecture et refonte historicisantes du Livre de Daniel attestées par la première version grecque (Papyrus 967)," in *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique* (eds. R. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser; LD 119; Paris: Cerf, 1984), 197–224.
- Braasch, B. "Die LXX-Übersetzung des Danielbuches: Eine Orientierungshilfe für das religiöse und politisch-gesellschaftliche Leben in der ptolemäischen Diaspora: Eine rezeptionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Dan 1–7" (PhD diss., Universität Hamburg, 2003).
- Bruce, F.F., "The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation," in *The Witness of Tradition: Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Woundschoten, 1970* (eds. M.A. Beek et al.; OtSt 17; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 37–52.
- Bruce, F.F., "The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel," in *of Daniel*, *Patrologia Latina* 28, col. 1291 and once in his commentary on Dan 4:6, *Patrologia Latina* 25, col. 514. In his preface, Jerome writes: "The Septuagint version of Daniel the prophet is not read by the Churches of our Lord and Saviour. They use Theodotion's version, but how this came to pass I cannot tell. Whether it be that the Language is Chaldee, which differs in certain peculiarities from our speech, and the Seventy were unwilling to follow those deviations in a translation; or that the book was published in the name of the Seventy, by some one or other not familiar with Chaldee, or if there be some other reason, I know not; this one thing I can affirm – that it differs widely from the original, and is rightly rejected." Translation quoted from *The Principal Works of St. Jerome* (trans. W.H. Fremantle; NPNF 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 492. A similar view is presented by Schmitt, *Theodotion*, 1. By contrast, Bludau's judgment favors Dan 9:24–27 as the background for the decision (Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, 24).
- struction and Interpretation: *Studies in Hebrew Language, Palestinian Archaeology and Biblical Exegesis* (eds. H.A. Brongers et al.; OtSt 20; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 22–40.
- Bruce, F.F., "Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 12 (1979): 17–26.
- Charles, R.H., *The Book of Daniel* (The Century Bible; Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, 1921).
- Charles, R.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929).
- Collins, J.J., *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
- Collins, J.J. and P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (2 vols. VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- David, P.S., "The Composition and Structure of the Book of Daniel: A Synchronic and Diachronic Reading" (PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1991).
- Delcor, M., "Un cas de traduction "Targumique" de la LXX à propos de la statue en or de Dan. 111," *Textus* 7 (1969): 30–35.
- Delcor, M., *Le Livre de Daniel* (SB; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1971).
- Grélot, P., "Les versions grecques de Daniel," *Bib* 47 (1966): 381–402.
- Grélot, P., "La Septante de Daniel 4 et son substrat semitique," *RB* 81 (1974): 5–23.
- Grélot, P., "Le Chapitre 5 de Daniel dans la Septante," *Sem* 24 (1974): 45–66.
- Grélot, P., "Daniel vi dans La Septante," in *Κατὰ τοὺς ο΄: Selon les Septante: Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante en hommage à Marguerite Harl* (eds. G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 103–18.
- Helms, D., *Konfliktfelder der Diaspora und die Löwengrube: Zur Eigenart der Erzählung von Daniel in der Löwengrube in der hebräischen Bibel und der Septuaginta* (BZAW 446; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014).
- Henze, M., *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (JSJSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- Henze, M., "The Narrative Frame of Daniel: A Literary Assessment," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 5–24.
- Jahn, G., *Das Buch Daniel: Nach der Septuaginta hergestellt: Übersetzt und kritisch erklärt* (Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1904).
- Jeansonne, P.S., *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12* (CBQMS 19; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988).
- Lust, L., "The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed.

- A.S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: University Press, 1993), 39–53.
- McCrystall, A., “Studies in the Old Greek Translation of Daniel” (PhD diss., Oxford University, 1980).
- McLay, T.R., “Translation Technique and Textual Studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion Versions of Daniel” (PhD diss., University of Durham, 1994).
- McLay, T.R., *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SBLSCS 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
- McLay, T.R., “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV–VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” *VT* 55 (2005): 304–23.
- Meadowcroft, T.J., *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSup 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
- Meadowcroft, T.J., “Point of View in Storytelling: An Experiment in Narrative Criticism in Daniel 4,” *Did* 8.2 (1997): 30–42.
- Meadowcroft, T.J., “Metaphor, Narrative, Interpretation, and Reader in Daniel 2–5,” *Narrative* 8 (2000): 257–78.
- Montgomery, J.A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1964; 1st impr. 1927).
- Munnich, O., “Les versions grecques de Daniel et leurs substrats sémitiques,” in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (eds. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich; SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 291–308.
- Munnich, O., “Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel,” in Schenker, **Earliest Text*, 93–120.
- Obiajunwa, C.J., “Semitic Interference in Theodotion-Daniel” (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1999).
- Olariu, D., “The Quest for the Common Basis in the Greek Versions of the Book of Daniel” (MA thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2015).
- Riessler, P., *Das Buch Daniel textkritische Untersuchung* (Stuttgart: Roth, 1899).
- Satran, D., “Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the Fourth Chapter of the Book of Daniel” (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1985).
- Schmitt, A., *Stammt der sogenannte “9”-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* (MSU 9; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).
- Tov, E., “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared With Similar Rewritten Compositions From Qumran and Elsewhere,” in Karrer-Kraus, **Septuagint 2008*, 369–93 (repr. in Tov, **HB, GB and Qumran*, 283–309).
- Ulrich, E., “The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Later Stages in the Composition of the Bible,” in *Sha’arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (eds. M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 267–91.
- Ulrich, E., “The Parallel Editions of the Old Greek and Masoretic Text of Daniel 5,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (eds. E.F. Mason eds.; 2 vols; JSJSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 1.201–17.
- Wenthe, D.O., “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1991).
- Wills, L.M., “The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1987).

Daniel Olariu

Contents of THB Volume 1

VOLUME 1A

Preface

Introduction to the Textual History of the Bible

Introduction to Textual History of the Bible, Vol. 1: The Hebrew Bible

1 Overview Articles

VOLUME 1B

2 Pentateuch

3–5 Former Prophets

3 Joshua

4 Judges

5 Samuel–Kings

6–9 Latter Prophets

6 Isaiah

7 Jeremiah

8 Ezekiel

9 Minor Prophets

VOLUME 1C

10–20 Ketuvim (Writings)

10 Psalms

11 Job

12 Proverbs

13–17 Five Scrolls

13 Ruth

14 Canticles

15 Qohelet

16 Lamentations

17 Esther

18 Daniel

19 Ezra–Nehemiah

20 1–2 Chronicles

21 The Biblical Text as Attested in Ancient Literature

Addenda et corrigenda to volumes 1A and 1B

Contents of THB Volume 1A

Preface (Armin Lange)	IX
Introduction to the Textual History of the Bible (Armin Lange)	XI
Introduction to Textual History of the Bible, Vol. 1: The Hebrew Bible (Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov)	XV
Area Editors	XXI
Authors	XXII
Notes to the Reader / Abbreviations	XXIII
Collective Bibliography	XXIX
 1 Overview Articles	
1.1 Introduction	3
1.1.1 Textual History of the Hebrew Bible (Emanuel Tov and Eugene Ulrich)	3
1.1.2 Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible	35
1.1.2.1 The History of the Jewish Canon (Armin Lange)	36
1.1.2.2 The History of the Christian Old Testament Canon (Armin Lange)	48
1.2 Ancient Hebrew-Aramaic Texts	82
1.2.1 History of Research (Armin Lange)	82
1.2.2 Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts (Armin Lange)	112
1.2.3 Samaritan Pentateuch (Sidnie White Crawford)	166
1.3 Primary Translations (Emanuel Tov)	176
1.3.0 Introduction	177
1.3.1 Greek Translations	191
1.3.1.1 Septuagint (Emanuel Tov)	191
1.3.1.2 Pre-Hexaplaric Translations, Hexapla, post-Hexaplaric translations (Peter J. Gentry)	211
1.3.2 Samareitikon (Jan Joosten)	235
1.3.3 Targumim (Beate Ego)	239
1.3.4 Peshitta (Ignacio Carbajosa)	262
1.3.5 Vulgate (Michael Graves)	278
1.3.6 Arabic Translations (Jewish [Rabbanite and Karaite], Samaritan)	289
1.3.6.1 Jewish Arabic Translations (Meira Polliack)	289
1.3.6.2 Samaritan Arabic Translations (Tamar Zewi)	309
1.4 Secondary Translations	316
1.4.0 Introduction (Emanuel Tov)	316
1.4.1 Vetus Latina (Julio Treballe Barrera)	319
1.4.2 Coptic Translations (Frank Feder)	331
1.4.3 Ethiopic Translation(s) (Steve Delamarter, Ralph Lee, and Curt Niccum)	345
1.4.4 Syro-Lucianic Translation (Ignacio Carbajosa)	360
1.4.5 Syro-Hexapla (Ignacio Carbajosa)	362

1.4.6	Jacob of Edessa's Syriac Translation (Ignacio Carbajosa)	368
1.4.7	Armenian Translations (Claude Cox)	370
1.4.8	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	375
1.4.9	Christian Palestinian Aramaic Translation (Christa Müller-Kessler)	385
1.4.10	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	393
1.4.11	Arabic (Christian) Translations (Ronny Vollandt)	408
1.4.12	Gothic Translations (Marcus Sigismund)	416
1.5	Medieval Masoretic Text (Elvira Martín-Contreras)	420
1.6	The Biblical Text as Attested in Ancient Literature (Michael Segal)	430
1.7	The Biblical Text in Light of Its Quotations and Allusions	440
1.7.1	Jewish Quotations and Allusions (Armin Lange)	440
1.7.2	Christian Quotations and Allusions (Martin Meiser)	445

Contents of THB Volume 1B

Area Editors	XII
Authors	XIII
Notes to the Reader / Abbreviations	XIV
Collective Bibliography	XIX
 2 Pentateuch	
 2.1 Textual History of the Pentateuch (Emanuel Tov)	3
 2.2 Ancient Hebrew Texts	22
2.2.1 Ancient, Late Ancient, and Early Medieval Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	22
2.2.2 Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Ronald Hendel)	59
2.2.3 Other Texts (Ronald Hendel)	72
2.2.4 SP and Ancient Texts Close to SP	84
2.2.4.1 Genesis (Ronald Hendel)	84
2.2.4.2 Exodus (Magnar Kartveit)	86
2.2.4.3 Leviticus (Sarianna Metso)	93
2.2.4.4 Numbers (Nathan Jastram)	98
2.2.4.5 Deuteronomy (Sidnie White Crawford)	101
2.2.5 Other Sources (Nathan Jastram)	105
2.2.5.1 Tefillin and Mezuzot	105
2.2.5.2 Nash Papyrus	111
2.2.5.3 Silver Scrolls from Ketef Hinnom	115
2.2.5.4 Severus Scroll	119
 2.3 Medieval Text of MT (Elvira Martín Contreras)	126
 2.4 Primary Translations	131
2.4.1 Septuagint	131
2.4.1.1 Genesis (Martin Rösel)	131
2.4.1.2 Exodus (Larry Perkins)	135
2.4.1.3 Leviticus (Moshe A. Zipor)	142
2.4.1.4 Numbers (Martin Rösel)	145
2.4.1.5 Deuteronomy (Sidnie White Crawford)	148
2.4.2 Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Andrew McClurg)	152
2.4.3 Targumim (Avigdor Shinan)	152
2.4.3.1 4Q ^{tg} Lev	152
2.4.3.2 Targumim – General	153
2.4.3.3 Targum Onqelos	158
2.4.3.4 Palestinian Targumim	161
2.4.4 Samaritan Targum (Abraham Tal)	167
2.4.5 Peshitta (Jerome Lund)	173
2.4.6 Hexaplaric Greek Translations and Hexapla of the Octateuch (Andrew McClurg) ...	180

2.4.7	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	188
2.4.8	Vulgate (Matthew Kraus)	189
2.4.9	Arabic Translations (Ronny Vollandt)	195
2.5	Secondary Translations	207
2.5.1	Vetus Latina (Julio Treballe Barrera)	207
2.5.2	Coptic Translations (P. Nagel)	211
2.5.3	Ethiopic Translation(s) of Octateuch (Steve Delamarter and Curt Niccum)	215
2.5.4	Late Syriac Translations (Alison Salvesen)	219
2.5.5	Armenian Translations (Claude Cox)	225
2.5.6	Georgian Translations (Bernard Outtier)	227
2.5.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	230
2.5.8	Arabic Translations (Ronny Vollandt)	239
3–5	<i>Former Prophets</i>	
3	<i>Joshua</i>	
3.1	Textual History of Joshua (Michaël van der Meer)	251
3.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	257
3.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	257
3.2.2	Masoretic Text and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Karin Finsterbusch)	259
3.2.3	Other Texts (Karin Finsterbusch)	265
3.3	Septuagint (Michaël van der Meer)	269
4	<i>Judges</i>	
4.1	Textual History of Judges (H. Ausloos)	277
4.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	281
4.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	281
4.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Julio Treballe Barrera)	284
4.2.3	Other Texts (Julio Treballe Barrera)	289
4.3	Septuagint (Cécile Dogniez)	294
5	<i>Samuel–Kings</i>	
5.1	Textual History of Samuel (Eugene Ulrich)	301
5.2	Textual History of Kings (Philippe Hugo and Adrian Schenker)	310

5.3 Ancient Hebrew Texts	319
5.3.1 Ancient and Late Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	319
5.3.2 Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Philippe Hugo & Adrian Schenker) .	332
5.3.3 Other Texts (Philippe Hugo & Adrian Schenker)	339
5.4 Septuagint (Samuel) (Siegfried Kreuzer)	349
5.5 Septuagint (Kings) (Siegfried Kreuzer)	362
3-5.1 Primary Translations	367
3-5.1.1 Septuagint (Emanuel Tov)	367
3-5.1.2 Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Andrew McClurg)	367
3-5.1.2.1 Joshua-Judges	367
3-5.1.2.2 Samuel-Kings	367
3-5.1.3 Targum (Willem Smelik)	367
3-5.1.4 Peshitta (Craig E. Morrison)	375
3-5.1.5 Hexapla (Andrew McClurg)	383
3-5.1.5.1 Joshua-Judges	383
3-5.1.5.2 Hexaplaric Greek Translations and the Hexapla: Samuel-Kings	383
3-5.1.6 Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	387
3-5.1.6.1 Joshua-Judges	387
3-5.1.6.2 Samuel-Kings	389
3-5.1.7 Vulgate (David Everson)	391
3-5.1.8 Arabic Translations (Meira Polliack & Meirav Nadler-Akirav)	396
3-5.2 Secondary Translations	397
3-5.2.1 Vetus Latina	397
3-5.2.1.1 Joshua-Judges (Andrés Piquer Otero)	397
3-5.2.1.2 Samuel-Kings (Pablo Torijano Morales)	400
3-5.2.2 Coptic Translations (Alin Suciu)	403
3-5.2.3 Ethiopic Translations	409
3-5.2.3.1 Joshua (Steve Delamarter)	409
3-5.2.3.2 Judges (Michael G. Wechsler)	410
3-5.2.3.3 1-4 Kingdoms (Curt Niccum & James Prather)	412
3-5.2.3.4 1-2 Kings (Curt Niccum)	415
3-5.2.4 Late Syriac Translations (Ignacio Carbajosa)	415
3-5.2.5 Armenian Translations	420
3-5.2.5.1 Joshua (Peter Cowe)	420
3-5.2.5.2 Judges (Peter Cowe)	422
3-5.2.5.3 1-2 Samuel (1-2 Reigns) (Peter Cowe)	424
3-5.2.5.4 1-2 Kings (3-4 Kgdms) (Peter Cowe)	427
3-5.2.6 Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	429
3-5.2.7 Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	436
3-5.2.8 Arabic Translations (Ronny Vollandt)	445
3-5.3 Medieval text of MT (Elvira Martín Contreras)	447

6–9 *Latter Prophets***6 *Isaiah***

6.1	Textual History of Isaiah (Arie van der Kooij)	459
6.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	470
6.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Russell Fuller)	470
6.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Russell Fuller & Peter Flint)	476
6.2.3	Other Texts (Russell Fuller & Peter Flint)	482
6.3	Septuagint (Arie van der Kooij)	489

7 *Jeremiah*

7.1	Textual History of Jeremiah (Richard D. Weis)	495
7.2	Ancient Hebrew-Aramaic Texts	514
7.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	514
7.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Armin Lange)	518
7.2.3	Other Texts (Armin Lange)	536
7.3	Septuagint (Georg Fischer)	543

8 *Ezekiel*

8.1	Textual History of Ezekiel (William A. Tooman)	559
8.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	570
8.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	570
8.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (William A. Tooman)	572
8.2.3	Other Texts (Armin Lange)	579
8.3	Septuagint (Johan Lust)	581

9 *Minor Prophets*

9.1	Textual History of the Minor Prophets (Christopher J. Fresch)	589
9.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	601
9.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Russell Fuller)	601
9.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Russell Fuller)	606
9.2.3	Other Texts (Russell Fuller)	611
9.3	Septuagint (W. Edward Glenny)	614

6–9.1	Primary Translations	623
6–9.1.1	Septuagint (Emanuel Tov)	623
6–9.1.2	Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	623
6–9.1.3	Targum (Gudrun Elisabeth Lier)	623
6–9.1.4	Peshitta (Arie van der Kooij)	630
6–9.1.5	Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	637
6–9.1.6	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	643
6–9.1.7	Vulgate (Michael Graves)	645
6–9.1.8	Arabic Translations (Meira Polliack and Meirav Nadler-Akirav)	652
6–9.2	Secondary Translations	660
6–9.2.1	Vetus Latina (Julio Treballe Barrera)	660
6–9.2.2	Coptic Translations	665
6–9.2.2.1	Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel (Frank Feder)	665
6–9.2.2.2	Minor Prophets (Nathalie Bosson)	671
6–9.2.3	Ethiopic Translation(s)	677
6–9.2.3.1	Isaiah (Curt Niccum)	677
6–9.2.3.2	Jeremiah (Martin Heide)	679
6–9.2.3.3	Ezekiel (Michael Knibb)	681
6–9.2.3.4	Minor Prophets (Jeremy Brown, Steve Delamarter, Anke Dorman, Curt Niccum, and Kipp Swinney)	684
6–9.2.4	Late Syriac Translations (Stephen Ryan)	689
6–9.2.5	Armenian Translations	695
6–9.2.5.1	Isaiah (Peter Cowe)	695
6–9.2.5.2	Jeremiah (Peter Cowe)	699
6–9.2.5.3	Ezekiel (Peter Cowe)	702
6–9.2.5.4	Minor Prophets (Peter Cowe)	703
6–9.2.6	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	707
6–9.2.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	714
6–9.2.8	Arabic Translations (Miriam Lindgren Hjälms)	723
6–9.3	Medieval text of MT (Elvira Martín Contreras)	731

Contents of THB Volume 1C

Area Editors.....	XIV
Authors.....	XV
Notes to the Reader / Abbreviations.....	XVI
Collective Bibliography.....	XXI
 10–20 <i>Ketuvim</i> (Writings)	
 10 <i>Psalms</i>	
10.1 Textual History of Psalms (Brent A. Strawn)	5
10.2 Ancient Hebrew Texts	24
10.2.1 Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	24
10.2.2 (Proto-)Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Brent A. Strawn)	42
10.2.3 Other Texts (Brent A. Strawn)	61
10.3 Primary Translations	82
10.3.1 Septuagint (Jannes Smith)	82
10.3.2 Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	88
10.3.3 Targum (David Stec).....	88
10.3.4 Peshitta (Ignacio Carbajosa)	93
10.3.5 Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	98
10.3.6 Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	103
10.3.7 Vulgate (Justin Rogers)	104
10.3.8 Arabic Translations (Ilana Sasson).....	110
10.4 Secondary Translations	115
10.4.1 Vetus Latina (José Manuel Cañas Reillo)	115
10.4.2 Coptic Translations (P. Nagel)	119
10.4.3 Ethiopic Translation(s) (Steve Delamarter)	122
10.4.4 Late Syriac Translations (Robert Hiebert)	125
10.4.5 Armenian Translations (Claude Cox)	130
10.4.6 Georgian Translations (Bernard Outtier)	132
10.4.7 Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	135
10.4.8 Arabic Translations (Juan Pedro Monferrer Sala)	143
 11 <i>Job</i>	
11.1 Textual History of Job (R. Althann).....	151
11.2 Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew Texts	156
11.2.1 Ancient and Late Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	156
11.2.2 Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Brent A. Strawn)	158

11.2.3	Other Texts (Brent A. Strawn)	169
11.3	Primary Translations	175
11.3.1	Septuagint (Claude Cox)	175
11.3.2	Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	181
11.3.3	Targum and Qumran Aramaic Versions (David Shepherd)	181
11.3.4	Peshitta (Ignacio Carbajosa)	187
11.3.5	Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	190
11.3.6	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	196
11.3.7	Vulgate (Soenksen, Jason)	198
11.3.8	Arabic Translations (Ilana Sasson)	202
11.4	Secondary Translations	207
11.4.1	Vetus Latina (Jean-Claude Haelewyck)	207
11.4.2	Coptic Translations (Frank Feder)	209
11.4.3	Ethiopic Translation(s) (Curt Niccum)	211
11.4.4	Job, Proverbs, Canticles, and Qohelet in Late Syriac Translations (Peter J. Gentry) ..	213
11.4.5	Armenian Translations (Claude Cox)	224
11.4.6	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	227
11.4.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	228
11.4.8	Arabic Translations (Miriam Lindgren Hjälms)	236
12	<i>Proverbs</i>	
12.1	Textual History of Proverbs (Johann Cook)	243
12.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	248
12.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	248
12.2.2	Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Johann Cook)	250
12.3	Primary Translations	253
12.3.1	Septuagint (Forti, Tova)	253
12.3.2	Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	259
12.3.3	Targum (Díez Merino, Luis)	259
12.3.4	Peshitta (Ignacio Carbajosa)	263
12.3.5	Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	267
12.3.6	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	270
12.3.7	Vulgate (Justin Rogers)	271
12.3.8	Arabic Translations (Ilana Sasson)	275
12.4	Secondary Translations	280
12.4.1	Vetus Latina (José Manuel Cañas Reillo)	280
12.4.2	Coptic Translations (Frank Feder)	283
12.4.3	Ethiopic Translation(s) (Curt Niccum)	285
12.4.4	Late Syriac Translations (Peter J. Gentry)	287
12.4.5	Armenian Translations (Claude Cox)	287

12.4.6	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	289
12.4.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	291
12.4.8	Arabic Translations (Miriam Lindgren Hjälms)	295
 13–17 <i>Five Scrolls</i>		
 13 <i>Ruth</i>		
13.1	Textual History of Ruth (Melanie Köhlmoos)	303
13.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	306
13.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	306
13.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Veronika Bachmann)	307
13.2.3	Other Texts (Armin Lange)	315
 14 <i>Canticles</i>		
14.1	Textual History of Canticles (Bénédicte Lemmelijn)	321
14.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	327
14.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	327
14.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Armin Lange)	329
14.2.3	Other Texts (Armin Lange)	332
 15 <i>Qohelet</i>		
15.1	Textual History of Qohelet (Michael V. Fox)	339
15.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts (Armin Lange)	345
15.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	345
15.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Armin Lange)	346
15.2.3	Other Texts (Armin Lange)	350
 16 <i>Lamentations</i>		
16.1	Textual History of Lamentations (Gideon Kotzé)	357
16.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	361
16.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	361
16.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Rolf Schäfer)	362
16.2.3	Other Texts (Rolf Schäfer)	367
 17 <i>Esther</i>		
17.1	Textual History of Esther (Kristin De Troyer)	377

17.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	385
17.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	385
17.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Veronika Bachmann)	385
13–17.1	Primary Translations	389
13–17.1.1	Septuagint	389
13–17.1.1.1	Ruth (Cécile Dogniez)	389
13–17.1.1.2	Canticles (Cécile Dogniez)	391
13–17.1.1.3	Qohelet (Cécile Dogniez)	392
13–17.1.1.4	Lamentations (Cécile Dogniez)	394
13–17.1.1.5	Esther (Kristin De Troyer)	396
13–17.1.2	Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations	402
13–17.1.2.1	Lamentations (John D. Meade)	402
13–17.1.2.2	Ruth (John D. Meade)	402
13–17.1.2.3	Qoheleth (Peter J. Gentry)	402
13–17.1.2.4	Canticles (John D. Meade)	402
13–17.1.2.5	Esther (Peter J. Gentry)	402
13–17.1.3	Targumim (Christian Brady)	402
13–17.1.4	Peshitta	409
13–17.1.4.1	Ruth (Michael G. Wechsler)	409
13–17.1.4.2	Canticles (Ignacio Carbajosa)	413
13–17.1.4.3	Qoheleth (Maya Goldberg)	415
13–17.1.4.4	Lamentations (Claudio Balzaretto)	418
13–17.1.4.5	Esther (Michael G. Wechsler)	419
13–17.1.5	Hexapla	424
13–17.1.5.1	Lamentations (John D. Meade)	424
13–17.1.5.2	Ruth (McClurg, Andrew)	425
13–17.1.5.3	Qoheleth (Peter J. Gentry)	425
13–17.1.5.4	Canticles (John D. Meade)	433
13–17.1.5.5	Esther (McClurg, Andrew)	437
13–17.1.6	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	439
13–17.1.7	Vulgate (Vincent Skemp)	441
13–17.1.8	Arabic Translations (Ilana Sasson)	446
13–17.2	Secondary Translations	452
13–17.2.1	Vetus Latina	452
13–17.2.1.1	Ruth (Bonifatia Gesche)	452
13–17.2.1.2	Canticles (José Manuel Cañas Reillo)	454
13–17.2.1.3	Ecclesiastes (José Manuel Cañas Reillo)	456
13–17.2.1.4	Lamentations (José Manuel Cañas Reillo)	457
13–17.2.1.5	Esther (Jean-Claude Haelewyck)	459
13–17.2.2	Coptic Translations (Alin Suci)	461
13–17.2.3	Ethiopic Translation(s)	466
13–17.2.3.1	Ruth (Meley Mulugetta)	466
13–17.2.3.2	Canticles (Steve Delamarter, Ralph Lee, Curt Niccum & Melaku Terefe)	467

13-17.2.3.3	Qoheleth (Curt Niccum)	470
13-17.2.3.4	Lamentations (Curt Niccum)	472
13-17.2.3.5	Esther (Veronika Bachmann)	474
13-17.2.4	Late Syriac Translations	475
13-17.2.4.1	Ruth (Michael G. Wechsler)	475
13-17.2.4.2	Canticles (Peter J. Gentry)	477
13-17.2.4.3	Qoheleth (Peter J. Gentry)	477
13-17.2.4.4	Lamentations (Claudio Balzaretto)	477
13-17.2.4.5	Esther (Michael G. Wechsler)	478
13-17.2.5	Armenian Translations	478
13-17.2.5.1	Ruth (Peter Cowe)	478
13-17.2.5.2	Canticles (Peter Cowe)	480
13-17.2.5.3	Qoheleth (Peter Cowe)	484
13-17.2.5.4	Lamentations (Peter Cowe)	486
13-17.2.5.5	Esther (Peter Cowe)	489
13-17.2.6	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	490
13-17.2.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	497
13-17.2.8	Arabic Translations (Ronny Vollandt & Miriam Lindgren Hjälms)	506
13-17.3	Medieval Text of MT (Elvira Martín-Contreras)	512
18	<i>Daniel</i>	
18.1	Textual History of Daniel (Daniel Olariu)	517
18.2	Ancient Hebrew-Aramaic Texts	528
18.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	528
18.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Michael Segal)	532
18.2.3	Other Texts (Michael Segal)	537
18.3	Primary Translations	542
18.3.1	Septuagint (D. Amara)	542
18.3.2	Other Greek Versions Prior to the Hexapla (Jason T. Parry)	554
18.3.3	Peshitta (Richard A. Taylor)	558
18.3.4	Hexapla (Jason T. Parry)	561
18.3.5	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Jason T. Parry)	565
18.3.6	Vulgate (Michael Graves)	568
18.3.7	Arabic Translations (Miriam Lindgren Hjälms)	571
18.4	Secondary Translations	575
18.4.1	Vetus Latina (José Manuel Cañas Reillo)	575
18.4.2	Coptic Translations (Sofia Torallas Tovar)	579
18.4.3	Ethiopic Translation(s) (Curt Niccum)	582
18.4.4	Late Syriac Translations (Richard A. Taylor)	584
18.4.5	Armenian Translations (Peter Cowe)	586
18.4.6	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	589

18.4.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	591
18.4.8	Arabic Translations (Miriam Lindgren Hjälms)	595
19	<i>Ezra–Nehemiah</i>	
19.1	Textual History of Ezra–Nehemiah (Lisbeth Fried)	603
19.2	Ancient Hebrew-Aramaic Texts	610
19.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	610
19.2.2	Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (David Marcus)	611
19.3	Primary Translations	615
19.3.1	Septuagint (Zipora Talshir)	615
19.3.2	Other Greek Versions Prior to the Hexapla (Jason T. Parry)	620
19.3.3	Peshitta (Claudio Balzaretto)	623
19.3.4	Hexapla (Jason T. Parry)	626
19.3.5	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	629
19.3.6	Vulgate (Edmon L. Gallagher)	630
19.3.7	Arabic Translations (Meira Polliack, Meirav Nadler-Akirav & Yair Zoran)	634
19.4	Secondary Translations	638
19.4.1	Vetus Latina (Bonifatia Gesche)	638
19.4.2	Coptic Translations (Frank Feder)	639
19.4.3	Ethiopic Translation(s) (Curt Niccum)	640
19.4.4	Late Syriac Translations (Claudio Balzaretto)	643
19.4.5	Armenian Translations (Peter Cowe)	645
19.4.6	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	648
19.4.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	651
19.4.8	Arabic Translations (Ronny Vollandt)	653
20	<i>1–2 Chronicles</i>	
20.1	Textual History of Chronicles (Andrés Piquer Otero)	659
20.2	Ancient Hebrew Texts	665
20.2.1	Ancient Manuscript Evidence (Armin Lange)	665
20.2.2	(Proto-)Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT (Mika Pajunen)	665
20.3	Primary Translations	670
20.3.1	Septuagint (Gary N. Knoppers)	670
20.3.2	Pre-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	676
20.3.3	Targum (Leeor Gottlieb)	676
20.3.4	Peshitta (David Phillips)	681
20.3.5	Hexaplaric Greek Translations (John D. Meade)	684
20.3.6	Post-Hexaplaric Greek Translations (Matthew M. Dickie)	687
20.3.7	Vulgate (Edmon L. Gallagher)	688
20.3.8	Arabic Translations (Polliack, Meira)	692

20.4	Secondary Translations	693
20.4.1	Vetus Latina (José Manuel Cañas Reillo)	693
20.4.2	Coptic Translations (Frank Feder)	695
20.4.3	Ethiopic Translation(s) (Steve Delamarter)	696
20.4.4	Late Syriac Translations (David Phillips)	699
20.4.5	Armenian Translations (Peter Cowe)	701
20.4.6	Georgian Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	704
20.4.7	Old Church Slavonic Translations (Alessandro Maria Bruni)	708
20.4.8	Arabic Translations (Miriam Lindgren Hjälms)	710
10–20.1	Ketuvim: The Medieval text of MT (Elvira Martín-Contreras)	714
21	<i>The Biblical Text as Attested in Ancient Literature</i>	
21.1	Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Michael Segal)	721
21.1.1	Jubilees (Michael Segal)	721
21.1.2	Pseudo-Philo (Howard Jacobson)	724
21.2	Qumran Literature	726
21.2.1	Exegetical Compositions (Alex P. Jassen)	726
21.2.2	Rewritten Bible/Parabiblical texts (Molly Zahn)	731
21.3	Josephus (Paul Spilsbury)	737
21.4	Philo (James R. Royse)	741
21.5	New Testament (Peter Rodgers)	747
21.6	Rabbinic Literature (Assaf Rosen-Zvi)	751
21.7	Greek Church Fathers (Reinhart Ceulemans)	755
21.8	Latin Church Fathers (Michael Graves)	759
21.9	Syriac Church Fathers (Yifat Monnickendam)	764
21.10	Coptic Church Fathers (Anne Boud'hors)	768
	Addenda & Corrigenda to Volumes 1A and 1B	771