HOW DOES A REVISER WORK? INSIGHTS FROM THEODOTION'S RECENSION OF DANIEL[*]

DANIEL OLARIU[1]
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
olariudaniel@yahoo.com

Abstract: La tecnica della traduzione rappresenta l'aspetto principale degli studi attuali sulla Settuaginta, tuttavia le ricerche sulle tecniche di recensione non sono numerose. Il presente studio contribuisce a quest'ultima area di ricerca, cercando di far progredire la conoscenza accademica riguardante gli studi di recensione. Più specificamente, esso mira a dimostrare come lavora un revisore. La discussione si concentra sulla versione greca del libro di Daniele, vale a dire, il Greco Antico (OG-Dan) e Theodotion (Th-Dan). Sarà affermato il fato che OG-Dan e Th-Dan si trovano in una relazione di traduzione-revisione e che alcune pratiche impiegate da Theodotion per realizzare la sua revisione possono essere dimostrate, facendo luce sulle tecniche di recensione in generale.
Keywords: Theodotion, greco antico, Daniele, Recensione di Theodotion, revisione, accordi significativi, tecniche di revisione.

1. Introduction

The various types of problems associated with the Book of Daniel have continued to attract scholars to investigate afresh old questions and new ones as well. In the past decades, for instance, the outcome of such interest manifests in various influential papers, dissertations, or monographs which address various and important issues that figure in the Danielic literature. Their points of departure include mythological, linguistic, canonical, form-and-genre, redactional, structural, sociological, literary (rhetorical and/or narrative), and ideological approaches. This study reflects a text-critical approach to Septuagint Daniel.

Though passing remarks have been made by various scholars, the first systematic studies undertaken to address the question of the relationship between the two Greek versions of Daniel, i.e. the Old Greek (OG-Dan) and Theodotion (Dan-Th), was conducted by McLay (1994). His conclusion that Th-Dan reflects the character of a *de novo* translation has been repeated in different forms in the

---

subsequent literature produced by him (McLay 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 1998a, 1998b, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Furthermore, his verdict has been corroborated by the studies of Obiajunwa (1999) and (partially) Amara (2006). Since both Obiajunwa and Amara adhere to the methodology formulated by McLay (1996b) and, in addition, since McLay is credited with challenging the assumed consensus as well as vigorously defending the quality of Th-Dan as an independent translation, we will primarily refer on his publications. When significant for our discussion, reference will be made to Obiajunwa's and Amara's works as well.

This study addresses the intricate question of which model describes better the character of the relationship between OG-Dan and Th-Dan: do the two versions demonstrably indicate a translation-revision relationship, or are they more adequately described as two separate translations? Since this paper aims to substantiate the former view, we will go on to discuss our methodology briefly and then test it on a biblical verse in which Th-Dan demonstrably shows both dependence on OG-Dan in its lexical choices and revising tendencies.

2. Methodology

This study applies the standard methodology that tests the quality of a text as a revision. The methodology applies two *sine qua non* criteria. In the event that one of the criteria is not met, we naturally have to turn to a different explanation. According to Tov:

> (1) LXX and the revision share a common textual basis. This assumption is based on the recognition of distinctive agreements in vocabulary between the two texts that set them apart from the remainder of the LXX. If such a common basis cannot be recognized, the two sources comprise separate translations rather than a source and its revision.
> (2) The revision corrects LXX in a certain direction, generally towards a more precise reflection of its Hebrew source (Tov 2012, 141).

The employment of this methodology informs the nature of our analysis in two ways. First, the analysis is set out as a comparative study between three textual "sources." Describing these "sources" from the vantage point of a "reviser," we will hereafter refer to them as the "base text," the "source text," and the "generated text." In the present study, the translation-revision hypothesis that is to be demonstrated postulates that the putative "Theodotion" reviser embarked to rework OG-Dan ("base text") to faithfully represent the MT-Dan-like *Vorlage* of his day ("source text"). The outcome of his activity is the revision Th-Dan ("generated text"). Consequently, the "generated text" implies the reviser's attitudes towards his base text and his *Vorlage*.

Second, the analysis sets out to address both the commonalities and the dissimilarities between OG-Dan and Th-Dan as compared with MT-Dan. The evaluation of the commonalities addresses the important question of whether points of contact between Th-Dan and its "base text" can be recognized. The best way to demonstrate traces of significant OG idiosyncrasies retained by the reviser is by searching for peculiar shared renditions. These are tantamount to "distinctive equivalents" and affirm the first criterion of the common basis.

The evaluation of the dissimilarities addresses the question of whether they are the result of coherent revising techniques. These strategies stem from the reviser's conscious attitude to correct perceived deviations from the "source text" in his "base text." The logical way to demonstrate the presence of such corrections is by contrasting the systematic differences between OG-Dan and MT-Dan with the recurring agreements between Th-Dan and MT-Dan in rendering the same lexemes. Subsequently, recensional tendencies can be deduced approaching the differences phenomenologically. The identification of such tendencies affirms the second criterion of our working hypothesis.

The study adopts the analytical tool of lexical choices as the guiding principle to identify distinctive equivalents and recensional tendencies. The lexical choices represent, hitherto, the finest tool in translational studies to infer conclusions regarding the affiliation between texts and the character of a translation unit (e.g. literal or free, formal or dynamic, etc.). Consequently, the study shows how OG-Dan and MT-Dan simultaneously influenced lexical choices during the generation of Th-Dan's text.[2]

3. Dan. 1:10 as a test case

The standard methodology that tests the quality of a text as a revision will be applied to Dan. 1:10. Specifically, through a comparative analysis of MT, OG, and Th, we will exemplify how a reviser works. The discussion will address the *sine qua non* criteria of shared significant agreements and recensional techniques. First, the significance of the equivalents' agreement will be described, determining their nature, whether they are unique or rare equivalents. Second, our analysis will proceed further to describe the recensional techniques that have been applied by Th-Dan to revise OG-Dan. It will be argued that these corrective techniques are responsible for the extant differences between the Greek versions of *Daniel*.

Before discussing the commonalities and the differences between OG-Dan and Th-Dan, two observations are in place: (1) this study is based on the evidence extant in the textual witnesses as they are collected in the new Göttingen edition of

---

[2] The study follows the methodological guidelines presented by Tov (2015, 1-235) in his textual handbook on the Septuagint.

OG-Dan and Th-Dan;[3] (2) in order to indicate the different types of relationships between the Greek words within Dan. 1:10, we divide the verse into discernable units and employ the following code of markers:

(a) grey indicates the entire stretch in which the significant lexical agreements are located;

(b) double underlines indicate differences in the selection of words between OG-Dan and Th-Dan but where revision activity could be traced;

(c) the unmarked renderings indicate identical readings in both OG and Th.

Item (#)	MT	OG-Dan	Th-Dan
1	וַיֹּאמֶר	καὶ εἶπεν	καὶ εἶπεν
2	שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים	ὁ ἀρχιευνοῦχος	ὁ ἀρχιευνοῦχος
3	לְדָנִיֵּאל	τῷ Δανιηλ	τῷ Δανιηλ
4	יָרֵא	Ἀγωνιῶ	Φοβοῦμαι
5	אֲנִי		ἐγὼ
6	אֶת־אֲדֹנִי	τὸν κύριόν μου	τὸν κύριόν μου
7	הַמֶּלֶךְ	τὸν βασιλέα	τὸν βασιλέα
8	אֲשֶׁר	τὸν	τὸν
9	מִנָּה	ἐκτάξαντα	ἐκτάξαντα
10	אֶת־מַאֲכַלְכֶם	τὴν βρῶσιν ὑμῶν	τὴν βρῶσιν ὑμῶν
11	וְאֶת־מִשְׁתֵּיכֶם	καὶ τὴν πόσιν (ὑμῶν cf. 88-Syh)	καὶ τὴν πόσιν ὑμῶν
12	אֲשֶׁר לָמָה	ἵνα μὴ	μήποτε
13	יִרְאֶה	ἴδη	ἴδη
14	אֶת־פְּנֵיכֶם	τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν	τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν
15	זֹעֲפִים	διατετραμμένα	σκυθρωπὰ
16		καὶ ἀσθενῆ	
17	מִן־	παρὰ	παρὰ
18	הַיְלָדִים	τοὺς [...]	τὰ παιδάρια
19	אֲשֶׁר		τὰ
20	כְּגִילְכֶם	συντρεφομένους ὑμῖν	συνήλικα ὑμῶν
21		[...] νεανίας	
22		τῶν ἀλλογενῶν,	
23	וְחִיַּבְתֶּם	καὶ κινδυνεύσω	καὶ καταδικάσητε
24	אֶת־רֹאשִׁי	τῷ ἰδίῳ τραχήλῳ.	τὴν κεφαλήν μου
25	לַמֶּלֶךְ		τῷ βασιλεῖ.

---

[3] For a comprehensive discussion and evaluation of the manuscripts of both OG-Dan and Th-Dan, see the introduction of Munnich (1999, 9-169) and Montgomery (1964, 24-57). Other works that have briefly discussed these manuscripts are: Di Lella (2001, 586-607), Hartman/Di Lella 1978, 71-75), Collins (1993, 3-12), Moore (1977, 16-18, 31-34, 52-53, 91-92, 129), Jeansonne (1988, 8-11), Obiajunwa (1999, 19-24).

3.1. Significant agreement

As the chart indicates, OG-Dan and Th-Dan verbatim agree to each other in twelve out of twenty-three discernable units (## 1-3, 6-11, 13-14, 16). However, not all of these agreements are of equal value in demonstrating the common basis since many could be explained as expected equivalents, e.g., καὶ εἶπεν (#1), τῷ Δανιηλ (#3), etc. Our assumption, instead, is that only the shared *hapax* and rare Greek words in the Septuagint corpus and the unique and rare equivalents between the Greek texts point to their common basis. We suggest that three agreements out of the twelve qualify as distinctive:

רב/שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים (chief officer) || ἀρχιευνοῦχος (chief eunuch) (#2)

רַב הַסָּרִיסִים		שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים	
OG	Th	OG	Th
Dan. 1:3	Dan. 1:3	Dan. 1:7-11, 18	Dan. 1:7-11, 18
→ and further רב הַסָּרִיסִים was rendered with Ραφις (2Kgs. 18:17); Ναβουσαρις (Jer. 39 [46]:3); LXX = 0: Jer. 39:13		Nowhere else.	

The phrase רַב הַסָּרִיסִים "chief officer" occurs once in Dan. 1:3 and three times in MT (2Kgs. 18:17, Jer. 39 [46]:3, 13). In LXX-Jer, it is interpreted as a proper noun. The other phrase שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים occurs six times and only in *Daniel*. The translator uses the same technique for both phrases, representing two words in the source language with one equivalent, the *hapax* ἀρχιευνοῦχος "chief eunuch." The fact that Th-Dan maintains a *hapax* for two Hebrew phrases and the way in which שַׂר is rendered in both OG and Th-Dan,[4] commend ἀρχιευνοῦχος as a significant agreement.[5]

---

[4] Besides Dan. 1, in which שַׂר occurs within the phrases רַב הַסָּרִיסִים and שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים, the term appears in a similar phrase once more in 8:25, i.e. וְעַל־שַׂר־שָׂרִים יַעֲמֹד. Given that Th-Dan here follows in part the OG's exegetical translation, i.e. καὶ ἐπὶ ἀπωλείας ἀνδρῶν στήσεται (OG) and καὶ ἐπὶ ἀπωλείας πολλῶν στήσεται (Th), to cope with the theological challenge posed by the text, it could hardly be incidental. Presumably, the same could be true in 8:11 where both the OG and Th share ἀρχιστράτηγος for שַׂר־הַצָּבָא. In both cases, driven by theological rational, the OG rules out by means of his translation the improbable and inappropriate scenario in which שַׂר־הַצָּבָא or שַׂר־שָׂרִים could be attacked by the little horn. As for the other places where שַׂר stands alone: while Th has consistently employed the equivalent ἄρχοντας "ruler" (9:6, 8; 10:13, 20, 21; 11:5; 12:1), the OG has used δυνάστης "ruler," "king," "official" (9:6, 8; 11:5), στρατηγός "captain," "commander" (10:13, 20), and ἄγγελος "messenger," "angel" (10:21; 12:1).

[5] McLay (1996b, 56-57) admits that the equivalent ἀρχιευνοῦχος is significant. However,

(#9) מנה (to count, appoint) || ἐκτάσσω (to set in battle order)

OG	Th
ἐκτάσσω (ἐκ, τάσσω) *to set in battle order* (Dan. 1:10) → and further מנה was rendered with δίδωμι "to give" (Dan. 1:5) and ἀποδείκνυμι "to designate" (Dan. 1:11)	ἐκτάσσω (ἐκ, τάσσω) *to set in battle order* (Dan. 1:10) → and further מנה was rendered with διατάσσω "to assign" (Dan. 1:5); מנה ‖ καθίστημι "to put in charge" (Dan.1:11)
And further ἐκτάσσω occurs three times and rendered צָבָא "war" (Num. 32:27, 2Kgs. 25:19). MT = 0: 2Macc. 15:20	

Semantically, ἐκτάσσω relates to warfare, as reflected in 2Kgs. 25:19 and Num. 32:27. Accordingly, in 2Macc. 15:20, ἐκτάσσω describes military manoeuvres.[6] However, the shared ἐκτάσσω in Dan. 1:10 with the meaning "to appoint" is unique in LXX and amounts to a significant agreement.

(#11) מִשְׁתֶּה (feast) || πόσις (drink)

OG	Th
πόσις (πίνω) *drink* (Dan. 1:10) → and further מִשְׁתֶּה was rendered with πίνω *to drink* (Dan. 1:5, 8). OG = 0: Dan. 1:16	πόσις (πίνω) *drink* (Dan. 1:10) → and further מִשְׁתֶּה was rendered with πότος "drinking party" (Dan. 1:5, 8); πόμα "drink" (Dan. 1:16)

The shared equivalent πόσις in #11 represents a *hapax legomenon*. Excluding *Daniel*, the noun מִשְׁתֶּה occurs thirty-eight times in MT, which LXX translates by various equivalents.[7] In *Daniel*, מִשְׁתֶּה appears four times (1:5, 8, 10, 16), which OG-

---

his decision to classify ἀρχιευνοῦχος in the category of unclear dependence (ibid., 247) and his explanation that "technical terms and common names are particularly susceptible to harmonization" (ibid., 60), are untenable. In contrast, given how Th has rendered שַׂר, the picture that emerges suggests that Th relied on OG in all cases where שַׂר is part of the phrases שַׂר־שָׂרִים, שַׂר רַב הַסָּרִיסִים, and שַׂר־הַצָּבָא. See note above.

[6] 2Macc. 15:20 (NETS) reads: "When all were already looking forward to the imminent confrontation and the enemy was already coming near with the army drawn up in battle-order (ἐκτάσσω), the animals strategically stationed and the cavalry deployed on the flanks, [...]."

[7] LXX employs no less than ten equivalents for מִשְׁתֶּה: πότος-nineteen times (Gen. 19:3; 40:20, Judg. 14:10, 12, 17, 1Sam. 25:36²ˣ, 2Sam. 3:20, 1Kgs. 3:15, Job 1:4-5, Eccl. 7:2, Esth. 1:5, 9; 2:18; 5:6; 6:14; 7:2, Ezra 3:7); δοχή-eight times (Gen. 21:8, 26:30, Esth. 1:3; 5:4-5, 8, 12, 14); γάμος-four times (Gen. 29:22, Esth. 1:5; 2:18; 9:22); πίνω-three times (Isa. 5:12; 25:6²ˣ); ποτον-once (Jer. 16:8); ποτημα-once (Jer. 51:39); συμπόσιον-once (Esth. 7:7); κώθων-once (Esth. 8:17); χαρά-twice (Esth. 9:17-18); ἡσυχάζω-once (Prov.

Dan renders freely. The OG uses the verb πίνω "to drink" to translate מִשְׁתֶּה in its first two instances (vv. 5, 8), whereas the fourth instance is left untranslated (v. 16).[8] The only example in which OG-Dan employs a noun to translate מִשְׁתֶּה is its third instance (v. 10), namely the *hapax*, πόσις. Significantly, Th-Dan has maintained the *hapax* in this verse.

Comparison with Th-Dan shows the tendency of the reviser to correct the OG renditions with stereotyped and standard renditions. In the first two instances (vv. 5, 8), where the OG has changed the grammatical category from noun to verb, the Th reviser has corrected this incongruence with the standard equivalent πότος (used nineteen times in LXX). For the third instance (v. 10), he maintains the noun equivalent in the OG. In the fourth instance (v. 16), Th compensates for the lack of an equivalent for מִשְׁתֶּה in the OG with the less attested πόμα.[9]

At variance with our explanation, McLay (1996, 59) has claimed that the common reading of πόσις in v. 10 "is due to revision of OG in the light of Th." Furthermore, to dismiss the possibility that Th-Dan is borrowing from OG-Dan, he bases his argument on Th's "considerable independence in the latter half of v. 10" and on Th's generally "exact formal correspondence" to MT (ibid.). Moreover, in a later article, McLay classifies v. 10 as belonging to those passages "where there is extensive agreement between the OG and Th" (McLay 2004, 38). In his commentary on v. 10, however, McLay points to distinctive disagreements between OG-Dan and Th-Dan. He writes, "Th and OG agree and follow the MT quite closely at the beginning of the verse, yet they are distinct at the end. Note, for example, Th's rare vocabulary choices σκυθρωπὰ (1/3 in the LXX) and καταδικάσητε (1/11 in the LXX) and how the OG does not follow the MT" (McLay 2004, 39). Finally, McLay's overall summary on Dan. 1 is revealing of how he interprets his findings:

---

8   15:15); and LXX = 0 (Esth. 7:8; 9:19). In addition, ποτον also occurs trice and only in the books of Maccabees (1Macc. 16:15, 3Macc. 6:36, 4Macc. 3:14); and κώθων occurs once more in 3Macc. 6:31. The LXX rendering ἡσυχάζω "to remain quiet," "to be at rest," seems to be derived either from the Hebrew root שתק "to grow silent" (cf. "שתק," HALOT 4:1671) or שבת "to rest" (ibid., 1406). As for the equivalent χαρὰ "joy," if metastasis between the letters *mem* and *shin* in the word מִשְׁתֶּה and an interchange between the form-similar consonants *taw* and *chet* occurred, then the outcome would be שמח "to rejoice," "to be merry." Therefore, it appears reasonable to assume that the LXX translator might have presupposed the feminine verbal adjective שְׂמֵחָה through etymological exegesis. See Tov (1997, 172-180).

8   This inconsistency in translation inspired McLay to suspect that "OG actually did not know the meaning of the Hebrew term, although this would be unusual for such a common word" McLay (1996b, 59).

9   Πόμα occurs four times besides Th-Dan: 3Macc. 5:2, 45, 4Macc. 3:16, Ps. 101:10 (שִׁקּוּי "drink").

> There are verses and parts of verses in chapter one where there is virtually no
> evidence that the OG and Th versions are dependent upon one another even though
> a *Vorlage* very similar to the MT seems to be the basis for both. Based on this
> chapter, generally speaking, Th exhibits greater formal equivalence to the Semitic
> syntax of the MT while the OG is characterized by a freer though faithful approach.
> However, there are instances where the OG and Th exhibit extended verbatim
> agreement and this pattern is marked primarily by its faithfulness to the syntactical
> structure of the MT (McLay 2004, 40).

There is a methodological problem in McLay's analysis of v. 10: he is surprisingly
silent concerning the verse's distinctive agreements, namely, the *hapax* πόσις
(discussed above), and the unique equivalents ἀρχιευνοῦχος (#2) and ἐκτάσσω (#9).

3.2. Revising techniques

A sound comparative methodology also includes an analysis of the differences
between the texts presumed as standing in a translation-revision relationship. As
our chart further indicates, the OG-Dan and Th-Dan disagree with each other in
Dan. 1:10 in thirteen out of twenty-five discernable units (##4-5, 12, 15-16, 18-25).
However, from a methodological point of view, a mere quantitative reference to the
disagreements is insufficient; assessment of the nature of these disagreements is
equally important. In the case of v. 10, for instance, some of the principles that
constitute the *modus operandi* of the reviser are discernible:

Standardization. In the first part of the verse in #4, the reviser has replaced
ἀγωνιάω with φοβοῦμαι, presumably due to his tendency to correct rare, free
equivalents with standard ones. Aside from its occurrence in v. 10, ἀγωνιάω "to
struggle," "to be in distress" is attested only twice in Septuagint literature (Esth.
15:8; 2Macc. 3:21). By contrast, Th-Dan here uses φοβέω which is the standard LXX
equivalent for the root ירא "to fear."[10] Moreover, the same revising technique is
discernible in the second part of the verse where Th-Dan has replaced the rare
rendering νεανίας (#21) with παιδάριον (#18) as an equivalent for יֶלֶד.[11]

---

[10] In v. 10, the adjective יָרֵא "fear" appears, which is attested sixty-three times in MT. The
root ירא occurs 439 times in MT. In both cases the main equivalent is φοβέω.

[11] Whereas νεανίσκος renders יֶלֶד only trice (Gen. 4:23, Eccl. 4:15, Ezra 10:1), παιδάριον is
the second main equivalent as the following statistic of the LXX's equivalents for יֶלֶד
show: παιδίον (Gen. 21:8, 14-16; 30:26; 32:23; 33:1-2, 5, 13; 44:20, Ex. 2:3; 6-10; 21:4, 22,
1Sam. 1:2, 2Sam. 6:23; 12:15, 1Kgs. 3:25, Isa. 8:18; 9:5; 11:7, Jer. 31:20, Job 21:11; 39:3,
Ruth 4:16, Lam. 4:10); παιδάριον (Gen. 33:14; 37:30; 42:22, 2Sam. 12:18-19, 21-22, 1Kgs.
12:8, 10, 14; 17:21-22, 2Kgs. 4:18, 26, 34, Joel 4:3, Zech. 8:5, 2Chr. 10:8, 10); τέκνον
(Gen. 33:6-7, Isa. 2:6; 29:23; 57:4-5, Hos. 1:2, Neh. 12:43; ἄρσην (Ex. 1:17-18); αὐτός
(1Kgs. 17:23); παῖς (2Kgs. 2:24, Eccl. 4:13); υἱός (2Kgs. 4:1, Ruth 1:5); νεοσσός (Job
38:41); νέος (2Chr. 10:14); and LXX = 0: 1Kgs. 14:12.

Remote Contextual Exegesis. Furthermore, the second part of v. 10 illustrates what hinders Th-Dan from relying on OG-Dan. Here the OG translator encountered difficulties in understanding and rendering the Hebrew *Vorlage* in the target language. What seems to have caused problems in the translational process are the rare Hebrew terms זֹעֲפִים (#15),[12] the *hapax legomenon* חִיַּבְתֶּם (#23),[13] and the unique use of גִּיל "age," "generation" (#20).[14] The term זֹעֲפִים was translated by OG-Dan freely with the idiomatic construction διατετραμμένα καὶ ἀσθενῆ, which suggests it might have been a contextual guess (##15-16).[15] Since the OG has diverged from a formal representation of the source text, the Th-Dan's reviser had to look for a better rendition. Moreover, it seems most likely that the reviser has used the remote context of Joseph's story to find the rare equivalent σκυθρωπός (#15; cf. Gen. 40:7).[16]

More Precise Equivalents. The occasional use of חִיַּבְתֶּם apparently prompted the OG-Dan translator to render it contextually, which in turn might have caused Th-Dan to implement changes. Thus, Th-Dan had to replace the imprecise OG renderings κινδυνεύω "to be in danger" (#23), and τράχηλος "neck," "throat" (#24) with the more precise καταδικάζω "to condemn" (#23) and κεφαλή "head" (#24).

The unique use of גִּיל probably also discouraged OG-Dan from representing quantitatively and precisely each element in the source language. While the root גִּיל

---

[12] The word זֹעֲפִים comes from the root 2-זעף "to look poor" and, in addition to Dan. 1:10, it is attested once more in MT in Gen. 40:6.

[13] The term חִיַּבְתֶּם comes from the root חוב "to be guilty." HALOT 2:295 conjectures that חוב in *qal* occurs once more in MT in 1Sam. 22:22.

[14] See the discussion below.

[15] In this case, by lack of other textual evidences, the graphically similar words διατετραμμένα (1:10) with τεταραγμένοι (Gen. 40:6) is counted as pure coincidence. Διατετραμμένα is the participle form of the verb διατρέπω "to twist," "to pervert," while τεταραγμένοι is the participle form of ταράσσω "to trouble." In addition, the use of διατρέπω as a plus in OG-Dan. 1:13 supports the suggestion that the term was used freely.

[16] In contrast to McLay (2004, 39), who deems σκυθρωπός as a distinct disagreement, the data suggest rather that the reviser employed the remote exegesis technique. Several indices point to the fact that the reviser might have made use of Joseph's story. First, the rare word σκυθρωπός is found in both Dan. 1:10 and Gen. 40:7. In addition to Dan. 1 and Gen. 40, σκυθρωπός occurs once more in Sir. 25:23. Second, a strong connection between Dan. 1:10 and Gen. 40:6-7 is equally marked in the Semitic *Vorlagen* by the rare word זֹעֲפִים. The term occurs in Gen. 40:6 which precedes the verse in which σκυθρωπός appears. Third, the presence of the term פָּנֶה "before," "face" in both passages (Dan. 1:10, Gen. 40:7) could have prompted the reviser to choose the adjective σκυθρωπός. See further Segal (2009).

meaning "to rejoice," is common in MT,[17] its use as a noun meaning "generation,"[18] is confined to v. 10. Consequently, the elaborative plus ἀλλογενής "stranger," "foreigner," "alien" (#21)[19] and the imprecise verb συντρέφω "to bring up together" (#19) (instead of a noun equivalent to represent the unique use of the word גִּיל) indicate the OG translator's struggle with the source text. In contrast and true to his goals, the Th reviser successfully corrected towards MT the incongruences of OG-Dan (#19).

Finally, in #10, אֲשֶׁר לָמָה (as well as its similar construction שַׁלָּמָה in Song 1:7) is an Aramaism, which reflects דִּי־לְמָה (as in Ezra 7:23).[20] In both Song 1:7 and Ezra 7:23, the Greek equivalent is μήποτε. These two instances suggest that Th-Dan represents a revision of the contextually-rendered ἵνα μὴ in favour of the standard μήποτε.[21] In doing so, Th-Dan demonstrates considerable linguistic knowledge.

Quantitative Representation. The reviser has further paid attention to align word-for-word the base text toward MT. To do so, he has trice supplemented minuses in OG-Dan (##5, 19, 25) and twice eliminated expansionistic plusses (##16, 21).

Word Order. Lastly, in one instance, Th-Dan's reviser has reorganized the order of equivalents in the OG. The case in question regards νεανίας which was postponed after the verb in #21.

4. Conclusions

This study aimed to apply the standard methodology that tests the quality of text as a revision to Dan. 1:10. Accordingly, a recension must meet to criteria: to demonstrate a common textual basis with the source text and to display revising tendencies towards a more accurate representation of the Hebrew text. In light of our analysis, the high number of the significant agreements extant in a single verse demonstrates the existence of a common textual basis between the Greek versions of Daniel. As such, the next logical step which is intrinsic to such a conclusion was to address the question of whether there is significant evidence of revision in Th-Dan. In other words, to fully demonstrate a translation-revision relationship

---

[17] As a verb, the root גיל occurs forty-seven times distributed as follows: Isa. 9:2; 25:9; 29:19; 35:1-2; 41:16; 49:13; 61:10; 65:18-19; 66:10, Hos. 10:5, Joel 2:21, 23, Hab. 1:15; 3:18, Zeph. 3:17, Zech. 9:9; 10:7, Ps. 2:11; 9:15; 13:5-6; 14:7; 16:9; 21:2; 31:8; 32:11; 35:9; 48:12; 51:10; 53:7; 89:17; 96:11; 97:1, 8; 118:24; 149:2, Prov. 2:14; 23:24-25; 24:17, Song 1:4, 1Chr. 16:31.

[18] HALOT 1:190 lists two such conjectural cases, namely, Ps. 43:4 and 139:16.

[19] Similarly, Collins (1993, 128).

[20] Ibid. See also Montgomery (1964, 133).

[21] Note further that while μήποτε does not occur anymore in either OG-Dan or Th-Dan, the LXX equivalent ἵνα μὴ occurs in the immediate context, translating אֲשֶׁר לֹא in Dan. 1:8 (OG-Dan) and, further, דִּי לָא in Dan. 3:28[95].

between the two texts, we have to inquire about the *modus operandi* of the postulated reviser: did he employ a specific methodology the patterns of which could be discerned through a phenomenological investigation of his work? Even for such an answer, our analysis offers positive results. In light of the extended discussions on each of the diverging readings between OG-Dan and Th-Dan 1:10, Th-Dan translator tends to maximally represent its MT-like *Vorlage* – both quantitatively and qualitatively. To produce a revised translation that would more closely represent his *Vorlage*, the reviser prioritized standard equivalents and stereotyping. His techniques also included correcting towards his *Vorlage* instances of free and imprecise OG renditions. However, further substantiation of the relevance of these techniques and many others is the topic of a doctoral dissertation in progress as of my own, at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Bibliography

A. Reference Works

HALOT = Ludwig, Koehler/Baumgartner, Walter/Stamm, Johann J., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 4 vols., Mervyn E. J. Richardson (trans.), Leiden, Brill, 1994-1999.

NETS = *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Albert Pietersma, Benjamin G. Wright (eds.), New York, Oxford University Press, 2007.

B. Secondary Literature

Amara, Dalia, *The Old Greek Version of Daniel: The Translation, the Vorlage and the Redaction/*דניאל *התרגום, המצע והעריכה: תרגום השבעים לספר*, PhD diss., Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 2006.

Collins, John J., *Daniel, Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1993.

Di Lella, A. Alexander, *The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel*, in), John J. Collins, Peter W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 83, 2, Leiden, Brill, 2001, 586-607.

Hartman, Louis F./Di Lella, A. Alexander, *The Book of Daniel* (The Anchor Yale Bible, 23), Garden City, NY, Doubleday, 1978.

Jeansonne, Pace Sharon, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 19), Washington, The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988.

McLay, Timothy Robert, *Translation Technique and Textual Studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion Versions of Daniel*, PhD diss., University of Durham, 1994.

McLay, Tim, *A Collation of Variants from 967 to Ziegler's Critical Edition of Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, "Text," 18, 1995, 1, 121-134.

McLay, Tim, *Syntactic Profiles and the Characteristics of Revision: A Response to Karen Jobes*, "Bulletin of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies," 29, 1996, 15-21 (= 1996a).

McLay, Tim, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 43), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1996 (= 1996b).

McLay, Timothy R., *It's a Question of Influence: The Theodotion and the Old Greek Texts of Daniel*, in Alison Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 58), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1998, 231-254 (= 1998a).

McLay, Timo, *Kaige and the Septuagint Research*, "Text," 19, 1998, 1, 127-139 (= 1998b).

McLay, Timothy R., *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2003.

McLay, Timothy R., *The Relationship Between Greek Translations of Daniel 1-3*, "Bulletin of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies," 37, 2004, 29-53.

McLay, Timothy R., *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV-VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel*, "Vetus Testamentum," 55, 2005, 3, 304-323.

McLay, Timothy R., *Bel and the Dragon, To the Reader*, in NETS, 2007, 1023-1025 (= 2007a).

McLay, Timothy R., *Daniel, To the Reader*, in NETS, 2007, 991-994 (= 2007b).

McLay, Timothy R., *Sousanna, To the Reader*, in NETS, 2007, 896-987 (= 2007c).

Montgomery, James A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (International Critical Commentary Series), Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1964.

Moore, Carey A., *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Yale Bible, 44), Garden City, NY, Doubleday 1977.

Munnich, Olivier, *Introduction*, in Joseph Ziegler, Olivier Munnich, Detlef Fraenkel (eds.), *Susanna. Daniel. Bel et Draco. Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum*, 16.2, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999, 9-169.

Obiajunwa, Chukwudi J., *Semitic Interference in Theodotion-Daniel*, PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 1999.

Segal, Michael, *From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2*, "Vetus Testamentum," 59, 2009, 1, 123-149.

Tov, Emanuel, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 2nd edition, revised and enlarged (Jerusalem Biblical Studies, 8), Jerusalem, Simor LTD, 1997.

Tov, Emanuel, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd edition, revised and enlarged, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2012.

Tov, Emanuel, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3rd edition, revised and enlarged, Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns, 2015.