

# The Old Latin versions of the Book of Daniel

*By*

Jean-Claude Haelewyck

*Université catholique de Louvain*

To edit the Old Latin versions of the Bible<sup>1</sup>, the editor has three types of sources at his disposal: biblical manuscripts (direct tradition), patristic quotations and liturgical witnesses (indirect tradition). But from one biblical book to another, the proportion between direct and indirect tradition varies considerably.

The book of Esther, for example, is known from twenty Old Latin manuscripts, but only four witnesses transmit the entire book, the others giving mostly only the first three chapters. The patristic citations of Esther based on an Old Latin text are so few that it was possible to analyze them all in the introduction to the 2003 edition<sup>2</sup>.

From the point of view of direct tradition, the case of Judith is exceptional: nineteen of the twenty-seven manuscript witnesses preserve the entire text. On the other hand, the patristic quotations are rare, and P. Bogaert was able to select those which deserved to be taken into account, those which rewrote the story of Judith without quoting it word for word, and those which had to be rejected<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> The edition of the Old Latin versions of the book of Daniel was entrusted to me by the Vetus Latina Institute. It has now been completed: HAELEWYCK 2021-2022. The introduction was written in French. The following pages are intended to provide the English-speaking reader with the essential information contained in this introduction.

<sup>2</sup> HAELEWYCK, 2003-2008, pp. 11-17 and 34-40.

<sup>3</sup> BOGAERT, 2001, pp. 13-29 and 43-46.

For the edition of the Gospel of Mark, seventeen manuscripts were retained, and the editor explained in his introduction why many others, essentially liturgical, were excluded<sup>4</sup>. The patristic quotation file of the *Vetus Latina Institut* contains a considerable number of quotations from Mark, but this mass is misleading. In the case of parallel passages from the synoptic gospels, it is often difficult to specify, which gospel in particular the quotations refer to, and even more so the allusions. To be on the safe side, the authors of the file have composed three cards, one for each of the synoptic gospels. At the end of a delicate work of pruning, the mass of Old Latin quotations was considerably reduced.

Again, in the case of the book of Daniel it is different. Only three biblical manuscripts give us large sections of the Old Latin text of the book, but all three are fragmentary. Fortunately, there are a few passages where they overlap, allowing them to be compared and found to represent much the same type of text. But two Danielic canticles had been better preserved in the liturgical tradition. The Song of Azariah (3:26-45) has been transmitted by six manuscripts. All have been retained for the edition. This could not be the case for the canticle of the Three Young Men (3:57-88[90]), for which Gryson's *répertoire* mentions nearly seventy witnesses. It was necessary to choose. In spite of this, we believe that the quality of the edition will not suffer. For two reasons: the text, repetitive, with its rudimentary syntax and vocabulary, varies very little, but above all we have taken care to retain representatives of each series (Roman, early Gallican, Irish and Milanese; the latter under its different recensions). The indirect tradition is well supplied, but unevenly distributed. The patristic quotations of the hymns are few, but decisive in the case of the hymn of Azariah. For the most part, the Fathers concentrated on four sections of the book: the stone that destroys the statue with clay feet in 3:34-35, the vision of the four beasts and the son of man in chapter 7, the prophecy of the seventy weeks at the end of chapter 9, and the announcement of the resurrection at the beginning of chapter 12. The great prayer of confession of sins (9:4-19) had not really attracted the attention of the Fathers, except for Augustine who quotes it in full. Apart from these passages, there are some, whose Old Latin wordings are irretrievably lost.

The manuscripts which transmit the Old Latin text of Daniel are identified by the numbers of the repertory of GRYSO 1999. The abbreviations of the works of the ecclesiastical authors are those of GRYSO 2007.

### *1. Old Latin manuscripts*

In the presentation of the Old Latin manuscripts of Daniel, it seemed judicious to separate them into two categories. First, the biblical manuscripts proper will be presented. The numerous liturgical manuscripts that bear witness to the Danielic hymns will then be detailed. This way of proceeding keeps the reader from imagining that the entire book of Daniel has come down to us in an abundant manuscript tradition.

#### *Old Latin manuscripts of the Book of Daniel*

The book of Daniel has been transmitted in direct tradition by three fragmentary manuscripts, VL 175 176 and 177, whose fragments overlap in part in the story of Susanna in chapter 13 (176 + 177), as well as in chapters 3 (176 + 177) and 8 to 11 (175 + 176 + 177).

175 = Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek 895; 3140 (olim 896) (2 folios) + Donaueschingen, Hofbibliothek B. I. 3, olim 191 (1 folio) + Fulda, Landesbibliothek Aa

---

<sup>4</sup> HAELEWYCK 2013-2018, pp. 7-8 and 9-15.

1a (16 folios) + Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek s. n. (4 folios) + Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek fragm. 100 (20 folios)<sup>5</sup>.

These fragments are the remains of a dismembered manuscript of the prophets written in uncial in the 5<sup>th</sup> century in northern Italy. Of Daniel, Dan 2:18-33; 9:25-27; 10:1-11; 11:16-23.35-39 have been preserved. The margins contain occasional glosses from the 6<sup>th</sup> century, but none of them concern the book of Daniel. The latest edition is by A. Dold. The fragments of Daniel are edited on pages 105 to 112. We have used Dold's edition, though we are cautious about his rendering of the text (see below about 176).

**176** = Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1397 IV, p. 23-24; 1398b, p. 126-175; 1398a I, p. 16-17 + Zürich, Zentralbibliothek C 184 (389) Fragm. 23 et 24<sup>6</sup>.

Under the various numbers of the St. Gall Library, leaves or fragments of old bindings from a two-volume bible copied in minuscule caroline in St. Gall in the first decades of the 9<sup>th</sup> century have been collected. Two leaves are in Zürich (Ez) and two others in the library of the city of St. Gallen (Is). Only the fragments of Ezekiel, Daniel and the minor prophets are Old Latin. From Daniel the following passages have been preserved: Dan 13:1-64 (Susanna); 1:1-9; 3:36-46.50-60; 4:20.22.30-34; 5:1-31; 6:1-28; 7:1-28; 8:1-17.21-27; 9:1-2.6-7.15-16.22-27; 10:1-11.16-21; 11:6-45; 12:1-13; 14:1-42 (Bel and the dragon). Dold, in 1923 and 1940, edited the fragments found in mss. 1397 IV and 1398b of the St. Gall Foundation Library and in ms. C 184 (389) of the Central Library of Zürich. Recently, Mrs. Andrés Sanz, working within the project *Fragmentarium*, Digital Research Laboratory for Medieval Manuscript Fragments, discovered a previously unidentified fragment of the Story of Susanna (Dan 13:39-50.53-61) in manuscript 1398a of the St. Gallen Library. The edition of Mrs. Andrés Sanz makes it possible to verify the exactitude of Dold's rather numerous and sometimes lengthy restitutions. We have used the editions of Dold and Andrés Sanz.

**177** = Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M. p. Th. f. 64a pages 17-20, 29-46, 49-50, 97-132, 169-268, 277-280, 295-316 (palimpsest, primary text)<sup>7</sup>.

The Würzburg palimpsest was built up at the expense of two biblical manuscripts: a manuscript of the Pentateuch (numbered 103 in Beuron's list) and a manuscript from the Prophets with the pages mentioned above, which are the remains of a manuscript copied in Italy in uncial script in the 5<sup>th</sup> century. The following passages have been preserved from Daniel: Dan 13:2-10 (Susanna); 1:15-21; 2:1-9; 3:15-50; 8:5-27; 9:1-10; 10:3-21; 11:1-6.20-28.31-33; 14,36-42 (Bel and the dragon). We have used the edition of E. Ranke who edits the fragments of Daniel on pages 125-144 (respecting the layout of the manuscript) and on pages 374-402 (where he compares them with the Greek, the vulgate, the text of one or other patristic witness, all accompanied by critical notes).

### *Old Latin manuscripts of the Danielic Hymns*<sup>8</sup>

The book of Daniel contains two great biblical canticles: the canticle of Azariah (Dan 3:26-45) and the canticle of the Three Young Men (Dan 3:57-88[90]). A third, smaller hymn is sometimes inserted between these two sets: the hymn of Divine Transcendence (Dan 3:52-56)<sup>9</sup>, sometimes linked with the preceding and sometimes with the following. The two great canticles are part of the Greek supplements transmitted by both the Septuagint and Theodotion. One should not add to these pieces the prayer of Daniel (Dan 9:4-19) common to all textual forms

<sup>5</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 267-269; DOLD 1923, pp. 30-112.

<sup>6</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 270-271; DOLD 1923, pp. 250-264; DOLD 1940, pp. 35-59; ANDRÉS SANZ 2019.

<sup>7</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 272-273; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 813-815; RANKE 1871, pp. 47-144.

<sup>8</sup> MEARNS 1914; SCHNEIDER 1938; BERNARD 1993; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 807-890; HARL 2014; HAELEWYCK 2020 (The article was a first draft realized on a still incomplete and not totally verified documentation).

<sup>9</sup> So called by BERNARD 1993, see below.

(Hebrew Massoretic text and Greek texts), although it appears among the eighteen hymns appended to the Sinai Psalter (VL 460, cf. *infra*), because P. Bogaert has shown that this is a liturgical reworking of the vulgate text<sup>10</sup>. As such, the passage does not fit into the framework of a presentation of the Old Latin Danielic canticles.

The Danielic hymns appear in the series of biblical hymns appended to Psalters. They are among the most widely used poetic pieces in the Christian Church, both Greek and Eastern, as well as Latin. In the Latin Church, the first groupings must have been created towards the end of the fourth century, as patristic testimonies indicate<sup>11</sup>. The oldest series attested (the Roman series) dates back to the second half of the 5<sup>th</sup> century. But in fact the hymns already had a long history behind them, as the sometimes archaic character of their Latin formulation attests.

The choice of pieces and their acoluteness varied widely as the different series came into being, namely the Roman, Irish, Milanese, Gallican and Mozarabic series. The canticle of the Three Young Men in Dan 3:57-88[90] is abundantly transmitted in Old Latin form in the Roman, Old Gallican, Irish and Milanese series. It is vulgate in the canticles appended to the Gallican (after the Carolingian reform) and Mozarabic Psalters, as well as in the witnesses of the benedictine monastic night service. The Roman series includes, already in its earliest witnesses, seven canticles sung as the fourth psalm in the office of Lauds on each day of the week: Is 12:1-6; Is 38:10-20; 1 Sam 2:1-10; Ex 15:1-19; Hab 3:2-19; Deut 32:1-43 and, for Sunday, Dan 3:57-88. The song of Azariah (Dan 3:26-45) has a more limited attestation than the song of the Three Young Men. It appears only in the following witnesses: VL 7 182 250 330 408 and 460. All the witnesses to the canticle of Azariah have been taken into consideration in the edition.

This was not the case for the witnesses of the canticle of the Three Young Men. Gryson's répertoire, particularly in the second volume, identifies nearly seventy manuscripts which transmit in Old Latin form the canticle of the Three Young Men. The text of the canticle, with its rudimentary syntax and its all-purpose vocabulary, varies little, especially in the very numerous Roman Psalters; it was thus necessary to make a choice so as not to inflate the number of witnesses unnecessarily. In general, manuscripts from the Carolingian period were selected. On the other hand, with a few exceptions, witnesses from after the 11<sup>th</sup> century were not. In any case, care has been taken to use a significant number of witnesses from the different series or their recensions, especially for the Milanese series.

The manuscripts of the Roman series (single, double, triple or quadruple Psalters) alone account for more than half of the witnesses listed by Gryson. Only thirteen of them were used: 311 (the Roman series is annexed to the Roman Psalter) 316 344 354 361 368 372 376 377 383 393 394 and 395. Among the witnesses of the ancient Gallican series, two witnesses were retained: 7 and 250. Four witnesses of the Irish series of hymns were used: 251 254 255 and 257. The manuscripts of the Milanese series of canticles are divided into three recensions: that of the ancient *Manualia*, that with diacritical signs and that known as 'recension of Simeon'. Of the ancient *Manualia*, three witnesses – 400 401 and 402 – have been retained. The recension with diacritical signs is represented by three manuscripts: 405 406 and 407. Only one witness of the recension of Simeon was taken into account: 408<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> BOGAERT 2004.

<sup>11</sup> SCHNEIDER 1938, pp. 6-17.

<sup>12</sup> Manuscript 311 (Psalter of Solomon III), under the psalter *iuxta Hebraeos*, added the text of a series of hymns in a Milanese recension, namely Is 38, 1 Sam 2, Ex 15, Hab 3 and Deut 32, but not the hymn of the Three Young Men.

There remain four witnesses not specifically attached to the series listed above that were also considered: 182 300 330 and 460. Many of the manuscripts have been digitized and are available on the Internet. We have obtained copies of others by ordering them directly from the relevant libraries. Some have been reliably edited. Gryson's répertoire contains all the information on the origin, writing, content, history and bibliography. This information will not be repeated here.

**7** = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 11553 (*olim* Sangermanensis 15)<sup>13</sup> (on the Internet).

The manuscript was copied in minuscule caroline around 800 or shortly after in Saint-Germain-des Prés. This witness has, for the canticle of the Three Young Men, the majority order of the verses (57.59.58.60-66.71-72.67.70.73-76.78.77.79-88)<sup>14</sup>, with the exception of v. 56, which is put back in its place. The hymn is extended to v. 90 and preceded by the canticle of Azariah (vv. 26-45). In this it corresponds exactly to the presentation of the pieces of the Sedulius Psalter (250, see below); 7 and 250 come from the same archetype.

**182** = Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare IV fol. 6 recto<sup>15</sup>.

The manuscript gathers biblical extracts transcribed by a copyist of the 8<sup>th</sup> century. The recto of fol. 6 contains the complete Old Latin canticle of Azariah (Dan 3:26-45) written in two columns of 33 and 32 lines; the text of the right-hand column sometimes encroaches on the margin. The reverse of the same folio contains the vulgate text of Dan 3:5b-6.8-14.15b-25. The Old Latin section of the folio has never been edited. We have collated the canticle of Azariah from photographs received free of charge from the Verona library.

**250** = Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 8407<sup>16</sup> (on the Internet).

This Greek Psalter with hymns was copied by Sedulius Scottus around the middle of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. The hymns are presented in bilingual form, with the Latin on the verso of the folio and the Greek facing the next folio on the recto. It is a witness to the earliest Gallican series of Old Latin weekly hymns. The canticle of Azariah (whose title is no longer legible) and the canticle of the Three Young Men (*canticum trium puerorum*) are found on fol. 60v-61v of the Sedulius Psalter.

**251** = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 9427 (*olim* suppl. lat. 1444)<sup>17</sup>.

The Luxeuil Lectionary was written in the minuscule of Luxeuil around 700. This witness to the authentic Gallican liturgy contains only three Old Latin pieces: Ex 15:13-19; Jon 2:3-10 and Dan 3:64-88. The text of the canticle of the Three Young Men appears on p. 113-114 of the edition of Salmon which we followed.

**254** = Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C. 5 inf. Antiphony of Bangor.

This Antiphony was copied by several hands in Irish semi-uncial script between 680 and 691 at the Irish monastery of Bangor<sup>18</sup>. The hymn of the Three Young Men appears on fol. 8v-9v with the rather unusual title *benedictio puerorum*. The Antiphony of Bangor was edited by Warren in 1893 and 1895. We have followed the text of the phototypical reproduction on pages 8-9 of the first volume.

---

<sup>13</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 28-30 ; GRYSON 1987-1997, p. 807.

<sup>14</sup> See below.

<sup>15</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, p. 278; HAELEWYCK 2022.

<sup>16</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 349-350, GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 818-819.

<sup>17</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 351-353; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 819-820; SALMON 1944.

<sup>18</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 356-357; WARREN 1893, 1895.

**255** = Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria F. IV. 1 fasc. 9<sup>19</sup>.

The text was copied in Ireland at the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century. We have followed Meyer's edition: the text of the Three Young Men hymn appears on pp. 184-187.

**257** = Killiney, Franciscan Library *sine numero*, today Dublin, University College Archives A2<sup>20</sup>.

Consisting of 23 leaves written in insular minuscule from the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> or beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the manuscript contains various liturgical pieces, including four canticles in Old Latin form: Ex 15:1-19; Dan 3:57-88; Lk 1:46-55 and 68-80. We have followed the edition of Bernard – Atkinson where the text of the canticle of the Three Young Men is noted on p. 195-196.

**300** = Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare I (1)<sup>21</sup>.

The Verona Psalter was written in uncial around 600 in northern Italy<sup>22</sup>. Following the Psalter, it contains a series of canticles: Moses' two canticles (Ex 15 and Deut 32), Hannah's canticle (1 Sam 2), the canticle of the vineyard (Is 5), those of Jonah and Habakkuk (Jon 2; Hab 3), the *Magnificat*, and the canticle of the Three Young Men (Dan 3:51-90 entitled *benedictiones trium puerorum*). The series is not homogeneous. Indeed, the author of the series, who highly likely did not have an Old Latin text at his disposal around 600, borrowed the canticle of Jonah from the version of Jerome and adapted it as best he could to the Greek. For the other hymns, the background layer is African, but certainly not ancient African for the hymn of Habakkuk, as M. Stenzel claimed, and whose arguments we have criticized. We have received free of charge photos of folios 399 to 404 from the Capitular Library of Verona.

**311** = Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek Bibl. 44 (A. I. 14)<sup>23</sup>.

This Psalter was written in minuscule caroline and made under the direction of Solomon III, abbot of St. Gallen and bishop of Constance in 909. This is a fourfold Psalter (Gallican, Roman, *iuxta Hebraeos*, accompanied by a Greek transcription). Following the Gallican and Roman Psalters are the Gallican (Vulgate text) and Roman (Old Latin text) series of biblical hymns, including the hymn of the Three Young Men (fol. 159v-160r). After the Psalter *iuxta Hebraeos*, pieces borrowed from a Milanese series have been added, but the Canticle of the Three Young Men is not included. The fourth column is also reserved for a Greek transcription of these canticles. The canticle of the Three Young Men appears on fol. 159r-160r. We have obtained a copy of these folios from the Bamberg library. These multiple Psalters enjoyed a certain popularity in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries. The following Psalters can be cited: VL 312 313 314 315 327 and 329. They will not be considered because they are direct or indirect copies of 311. In fact, 312 descends from 311 through 314 and probably 315; 313 is a faithful copy of 312; 314 is a direct copy of 311; 315 is a copy of 314; 327 descends from 311 through 312 and possibly 313. Since the archetype is known, these secondary witnesses can be overlooked.

**316** = Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. XXXVIII<sup>24</sup> (on the Internet).

The Reichenau Triple Psalter was written in minuscule caroline in the second quarter of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Following the Roman Psalter are copied the hymns of the Roman series of Old Testament hymns of the Lauds and the three New Testament hymns. The hymn of the Three Young Men is copied on fol. 213r-214v.

<sup>19</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, p. 358; MEYER 1904.

<sup>20</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, p. 360; BERNARD - ATKINSON 1898.

<sup>21</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 29-31; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 827-828; BIANCHINI, 1740; HAELEWYCK 2021; STENZEL 1955.

<sup>22</sup> Probably in Ravenna, cf SAIANI 2018.

<sup>23</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 47-49; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 838-840.

<sup>24</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 57-58.

**330** = Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 11<sup>25</sup> (on the Internet).

The Queen's Psalter was probably copied in Picardy in the second half of the 8<sup>th</sup> century by a single hand alternating capital and uncial. Immediately following the double Psalter (Gallican in capital on the left-hand pages and *iuxta Hebraeos* in uncial on the right-hand pages), there appears, from fol. 213v onwards, a double series of seven hymns comparing the Vulgate and Old Latin texts. The delimitation of the hymns is not identical on either side, however. Thus the first, the hymn of the Three Young Men, is in the Old Latin form of Dan 3:49-88 on the left (fol. 213v and 214v), while the Vulgate part on the right covers only vv. 57-88. Following this double series, from fol. 226r onwards, we read a simple series of five canticles, the last of which is the canticle of Azariah (Dan 3:26-45) in Old Latin (fol. 229r-230r).

**344** = Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Urbin. lat. 585<sup>26</sup> (on the Internet).

This benedictine breviary contains the Psalter followed by the canticles (Roman series). It was written in Beneventan minuscule between 1099 and 1105. The canticle of the Three Young Men appears on fol. 97r.

**354** = Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 13<sup>27</sup> (on the Internet).

The manuscript, which probably comes from a monastery in the region of Benevento or Naples, was copied by several hands at the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. This Psalter is followed by the hymns of the Roman series, the Lucanian hymns and some miscellaneous pieces. The canticle of the Three Young Men is found on fol. 118rv.

**361** = Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Archivio di S. Pietro D. 150<sup>28</sup> (on the Internet).

This mutilated Roman Psalter (acephalous) was copied in an Italian minuscule of the *romanesca* type at the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. The hymns of the Roman series, followed by the Lucanian hymns and some pieces, are appended to the Psalter. The hymn of the Three Young Men occupies part of fol. 182r to 183r.

**368** = Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vatic. lat. 84<sup>29</sup> (on the Internet).

Written in Nonantola in minuscule caroline, this Roman Psalter dates from the 11<sup>th</sup> century. It contains, after the Psalms, from fol. 232v, the Old Testament canticles of the Roman series followed by the Lucanian canticles and various pieces. The hymn of the Three Young Men is found on fol. 242rv.

**372** = London, British Library Cotton Vespasian A. 1<sup>30</sup> (on the Internet).

This luxurious Roman Psalter, with a later Anglo-Saxon interlinear translation (9<sup>th</sup> century), was copied and illuminated in the second quarter of the 8<sup>th</sup> century in southern England. The oft-repeated link with Canterbury has no solid foundation. It is the oldest witness to the Roman series of biblical hymns. The text of the Three Young Men's hymn is copied on fol. 150r-151r.

**376** = Cambridge, University Library Ff. I. 23<sup>31</sup> (on the Internet).

Like the previous one, it is a Roman Psalter with an Anglo-Saxon translation. It was copied around the year 1000 or shortly thereafter in an English scriptorium (perhaps at St. Augustine's in Canterbury). The Old Testament hymns of the Roman series followed by the Lucanian hymns and other pieces appear after the Psalter, beginning on fol. 251r. The hymn of the Three Young Men (untitled) can be read on fol. 264r-264v.

<sup>25</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 81-83; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 829-830.

<sup>26</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 104-105.

<sup>27</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, p. 116.

<sup>28</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, p. 125.

<sup>29</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 135-136.

<sup>30</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 141-143; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 832-835.

<sup>31</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 149-150; GRYSON 1987-1997, p. 835; WILDHAGEN 1920.

**377** = London, British Library Royal 2. B. 5<sup>32</sup>.

The Regius Psalter is a Roman Psalter with an Anglo-Saxon translation. It was written in square Anglo-Saxon minuscule in the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. Its origin is uncertain (perhaps Winchester). It contains, after the Psalter, the Old Testament hymns of the Roman Lauds, the Lucanian hymns and some pieces. The hymn of the Three Young Men was copied on fol. 180b to 181b. We have used Roeder's edition (pp. 292-294).

**383** = London, British Library Additional 37517<sup>33</sup> (on the Internet).

The Bosworth Psalter, also a Roman Psalter with an Anglo-Saxon translation (early 11<sup>th</sup> century), was copied in insular minuscule in the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century in Canterbury or Winchester. After the Psalter, the seven Old Testament canticles of the Roman series are found, followed by the Lucanian canticles and other pieces. The hymn of the Three Young Men is found on fol. 101r.

**393** = Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Hamilton 553<sup>34</sup>.

The manuscript was written in Anglo-Saxon capital letters (several hands) in Northumbria in the first half of the 8<sup>th</sup> century. It is a Psalter followed by the Old Testament hymns of the Roman Lauds series (incomplete series). In this witness, the hymn of the Three Young Men is noted at the head of the series (fol. 62rv), which is unusual. We have obtained reproductions from the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin.

**394** = Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek Bibl. fol. 12a.b.c<sup>35</sup>.

This Roman Psalter, written in uncial script in the 8<sup>th</sup> century, did not come from Echternach, where it was located at the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, but from an Anglo-Saxon foundation on the continent. In any case, at the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century some pieces were added to the empty parts of the last leaf, beginning on fol. 93r, including the canticle of the Three Young Men (Dan 3:57-88.56) which comes first, followed by the Lucanian canticles. We have used Dold's edition, pp. 275.

**395** = Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Ms. Barth 32 (Ausst. 15)<sup>36</sup> (on the Internet).

This glossed Roman Psalter was written by several hands in different scripts in Fulda in the first third of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. The Psalter and the canticles of the Roman series that follow it were written in Anglo-Saxon semi-uncial. Due to material deficiencies, the central part of the Habakkuk hymnal is missing, as is the end of the second Mosaic hymn and most of the hymn of the Three Young Men, of which only vv. 79-88.56 on fol. 193r remain.

**400** = Milano, Biblioteca Capitolare 4° 6 (D. 2. 30, olim 2102)<sup>37</sup>.

This *Manuale Ambrosianum*, written in pre-gothic Italian minuscule, certainly dates back to the 11<sup>th</sup> century. It comes from the Collegiate Church of Saint Victor in Val Travaglia. In the earliest witnesses of the Milanese cathedral office (400 401 402), which are not earlier than the 11<sup>th</sup> century, the Psalter is followed by a series of ten canticles. The Milanese series includes the following pieces: Dan 3:52-56 (canticle of Divine Transcendence), Is 26:9b-20; 1 Sam 2:1-10; Hab 3:2-19; Jon 2:3-10; Deut 32:1-43; Luke 1:68-79; Ex 15:1-19; Dan 3:57-88; and Luke 1:46-55. The ancient *Manualia* were edited by Magistretti, whose edition we use.

---

<sup>32</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 151-152; ROEDER 1904.

<sup>33</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 162-164; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 835-836.

<sup>34</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 178-179.

<sup>35</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 180-181; DOLD 1936.

<sup>36</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 182-183.

<sup>37</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 188-189; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 836-841; MAGISTRETTI 1905.



**401** = Milano, Biblioteca Capitolare Beroldus Novus<sup>38</sup>.

Traditionally considered the most authoritative witness to the Ambrosian rite, this *Manuale* was copied in minuscule gothic by the priest Giovanni Boffa in 1268; it has always belonged to the library of the chapter of Milan. It contains the same hymns of the Milanese series as 400, with some additional pieces. Magistretti identifies it with the initials M (cf. 400).

**402** = Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana A. 189 inf.<sup>39</sup>.

This *Manuale Ambrosianum*, written in Gothic minuscule, is dated 1188. It belonged to the church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Milan. It contains the same hymns from the Milanese series as 401, interspersed here with other pieces. Magistretti identifies it with the initials W (cf. 400).

**405** = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 343<sup>40</sup> (on the Internet).

This Ambrosian Psalter + Hymnary was written in caroline minuscule in Milan in the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. It is the first witness used here (along with 406 and 407) of the so-called diacritical Milanese recension. The witnesses of the Milanese diacritical recension contain the same hymns as the ancient *Manualia*, but in a slightly different order. This recension is characterized by the use of diacritical marks to indicate where the reviser considered the Latin version to be incorrect in comparison to the Greek.

**406** = Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vatic. lat. 83<sup>41</sup> (on the Internet).

This luxurious Ambrosian Psalter + Hymnary was copied in minuscule caroline in the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. It comes from northern Italy. Like 405, it contains the same hymns of the Milanese diacritical series, and in the same order. The Danielic hymns are found on fol. 204r-205v.

**407** = Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vatic. lat. 82<sup>42</sup> (on the Internet).

Written in caroline minuscule at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, this Ambrosian Psalter + Hymnary comes from northern Italy. It contains the same hymns as 406, but with the difference that a reviser has occasionally restored the ancient form of the Milanese text of the *Manualia* or aligned it with the Greek. The Danielic hymns have been copied to fol. 216r to 217v.

**408** = Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz Hamilton 552<sup>43</sup> (on the Internet).

This bilingual Greek-Latin Psalter was copied in caroline minuscule at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. A note in Greek uncial indicates that the Psalter was prepared by the monk-priest Simeon and transcribed by the monk Magnus at the Abbey of St. Ambrose in Milan. This witness attests to a different arrangement of the biblical hymns than that of the *Manualia* and the diacritical recension. It is called the recension of Simeon. The hymns are placed in the order of the biblical text, with the exception of the hymn of Hezekiah followed by the prayer of Manasseh and the *Gloria*. The order is thus: Ex 15; Deut 32; 1 Sam 2; Hab 3; Is 26; Jon 3; Dan 3:26-51; Dan 3:52-56; Dan 3:57-90; *Magnificat*; *Benedictus*; Is 38; Or Man; *Gloria*. The three sections of Dan 3 (fol. 183r-187r) are each titled *hymnum trium puerorum*. Some of these pieces are preceded by an order number, a vestige of an ancient order that has left no other traces. Thus Dan 3:52-56 bears the number 10 and Dan 3:57-90 the number 11; there is no number before the canticle of Azariah (3:26-51). The editor of this series has taken up the division into two

---

<sup>38</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 190-191; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 841-842.

<sup>39</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 192-193; GRYSON 1987-1997, p. 842.

<sup>40</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 196-197; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 837-838, 842.

<sup>41</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 198-199; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 842-843.

<sup>42</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 200-201; GRYSON 1987-1997, p. 843.

<sup>43</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 202-203; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 838, 843-844.

parts of the canticle of the Three Young Men (Dan 3:52-56 + 57-88), each with a particular function in the Milanese liturgy: the first introduces the morning service, the second is sung on Sunday.

**460** = Sinaï, St. Catherine Monastery slavonic 5<sup>44</sup>.

The enigmatic and incomplete Sinai Psalter arrived at Sinai before 1231. Its writing, which does not belong to any known type, is an imperfect, almost archaic precaroline minuscule in some of its ligatures. Its origin and date of composition are unknown. But one might consider North Africa. The Psalter is first followed on fol. 82r by a portion of the Three Young Men's hymn, vv. 70-88<sup>45</sup>, in abbreviated form. Since the text is copied at the head of a quire whose predecessors are lost, it is not known where the hymn began or on what grounds it related to the Psalter. Next comes a series of eighteen biblical hymns: Ex 15:1-19; Deut 32:1-43; 1 Sam 2:1-10; Isa 5:1-7; Jon 2:3-10; Hab 3:1-19; Isa 26:9b-21; Isa 61:1-62:7; Lam 5:1-22; 4 Esr 8:20-36; Or Man 1-15; Dan 3:26-45.52-56; Dan 9:4-19<sup>46</sup>; Tbt 13:1-18; Tbt 3:2-6; Jdt 16:1-17; Luke 1:46-55; Luke 1:68-79. The song of Azariah appears on fol. 98r-99v. The critical edition of Thibaut, from whom we have borrowed the text, surpasses Altbauer's facsimile.

## 2. *The Greek texts*

In direct tradition, the book of Daniel, in its Greek translation, has come down to us in two main forms: the LXX text (o') and the text attributed to Theodotion (θ'). The o' text is known only by a few witnesses: the Papyrus 967, hexaplar manuscripts and some fragments. The version of Theodotion, on the other hand, benefits from a large attestation: uncials, numerous minuscules and patristic commentaries<sup>47</sup>. The intention here is not to present a complete catalog of the questions posed by the Greek tradition of the book of Daniel, even less to propose new solutions. The aim is simply to recall some fundamental data which allow us to grasp the place and importance of the testimony of the Old Latin tradition. The oldest Greek form is that of the LXX. Before the discovery of Papyrus 967, it was known in direct tradition only by two hexaplar witnesses: the Greek ms. *Chisianus* (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Chigi R. VII 45 = ms. Rahlfs 88), the princeps edition which was made by S. de Magistris in 1772<sup>48</sup>, and the Syriac translation of the hexaplar text (Syro-Hexaplar) preserved in the ms. Milano, Bibl. Ambrosiana C. 313 inf. edited in Milan by A.M. Ceriani in 1874 (photolithographic edition)<sup>49</sup>. The relationship between these two witnesses is so close that the Syro-Hexaplar could almost be used as a Greek manuscript. Some fragments were later found: ten lines of Dan 3:23-25 in the ms. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, P. Vindob. G 29255 = ms. Rahlfs 813 (5<sup>th</sup> c.), and excerpts from Dan 1:2-10 in a 3<sup>rd</sup> c. manuscript (Rahlfs 875) belonging to a private collection<sup>50</sup>. Papyrus 967, initially known only by the part preserved in Dublin (Chester Beatty X papyrus)<sup>51</sup> and on which J. Ziegler made his edition in 1954<sup>52</sup>, is now known in its entirety (part preserved in Cologne and fragment of Barcelona), thanks to the editions of A. Geissen,

---

<sup>44</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 2, pp. 296-300; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 856-857; ALTBAUER 1978; THIBAUT, GRYSON 2010.

<sup>45</sup> And not 68-88, as indicated in the edition of Thibaut. It is true that the word *pruina* returns in v. 68 in the vulgate.

<sup>46</sup> On the prayer of Daniel, see what was said above, at the head of the presentation of the manuscripts.

<sup>47</sup> All these witnesses are presented in ZIEGLER, MUNNICH, FRAENKEL 1999.

<sup>48</sup> DE MAGISTRIS 1772.

<sup>49</sup> CERIANI 1874.

<sup>50</sup> SANZ 1946, N° XXX, pp. 52-53; SCHWARTZ 1990. Other fragments, mostly Odes (canticle of the Three Young Men), are reported in BOGAERT 1993b.

<sup>51</sup> KENYON 1937-1938.

<sup>52</sup> ZIEGLER 1954.

W. Hamm and R. Roca-Puig<sup>53</sup>. The third-century date of Papyrus 967 makes it free of any hexaplar influence. With the exception of a few possible alterations to the Massoretic Hebrew-Aramaic, Papyrus 967 is essentially<sup>54</sup> the oldest Greek form of Daniel. This early Greek form is characterized by a great deal of freedom from the Semitic model. Chapters 3-6 are recast; thus, for example, in Dan 4 the LXX omits many narrative elements, but offers a text that is about 20% longer. In addition, the LXX presents the chapters in a different order (1-4, 7-8, 5-6, 9-12, Bel, Susanna) which will be discussed later. These differences are a matter of the translator's freedom; there is no need to assume a different Semitic pattern.

This freedom of the first translator explains why the Christian tradition has transmitted mainly the Greek translation attributed to Theodotion, closer to the Semitic model. This translation cannot be the work of Theodotion, traditionally situated at the end of the second century. Indeed, in the Apocalypse we read quotations and allusions taken from Daniel which presuppose the so-called Theodotion translation. Nor does it contain the characteristics of a Hebrew-Aramaic revision, in particular the identification of additional passages, the addition of missing words and the revision of vocabulary. In fact, the work attributed to Theodotion must be dated to the first half of the first century CE, like the *καίγε* group to which it is closely related (it is called a *καίγε*-Theodotion recension).

In the indirect tradition, things are not so clear-cut<sup>55</sup>. Indeed, we find an occasional use of the *o'* text in some witnesses of the Greek indirect tradition<sup>56</sup>. The oft-cited case of the Greek translator of 1 Mcc is not as conclusive as has been said<sup>57</sup>. Certainly we read in 1 Mcc 1:54 the expression *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως* which *o'* uses consistently in 9:27; 11:31 and 12:11, but *θ'* also uses it: exactly in 12:11 and in a slightly different form in 9:27 (*βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων*); only in 11:31 does he use the expression *βδέλυγμα ἠφανισμένον*. The kinship between Daniel *o'* and Ezra A or the book of Judith has also been noted. Rev 1:13 knows Dan 7:13 according to the *o'* text which identifies the son of Man with the Ancient of Days (*ὡς παλαιός* 967 88-syh, instead of *ἕως παλαιοῦ*). Some expressions in Flavius Josephus clearly assume the *o'* text, but others are explained by *θ'*. The Apostolic Fathers - Barnabas, Clement of Rome, and the *Pastor of Hermas* - contain some allusions that clearly point to the *o'* text. In the *Dialogue with Tryphon* (31:2-7), Justin quotes Dan 7:9-28 in a form that assumes the *o'* text, but there are also a few connections with *θ'*. Origen usually quotes *θ'*, but in several places he follows *o'*. Eusebius of Caesarea quotes passages sometimes according to the *o'* text and sometimes according to that of *θ'*. However, in these passages which he takes up, the manuscript tradition is not free of contamination between the two forms of the Greek text. Epiphanius follows twice the *o'* text.

In the schemas of the edition, the first line will be occupied by the so-called Theodotion text (*θ'*). When it explains the particular wording of certain witnesses of the Old Latin tradition, the Septuagint text (*o'*) will be noted afterwards, either as a variant under the *θ'* text if it concerns only a few words, or as a second line in the case of longer quotations. The *o'* text will not be noted systematically, and the fact that it will be noted after *θ'* does not mean that it is considered chronologically posterior.

---

<sup>53</sup> GEISSEN 1968; HAMM 1969; HAMM 1977; ROCA-PUIG 1974.

<sup>54</sup> It is not out of the question to prefer a lesson from 88 from time to time, especially if it is not explained as a review of the Massoretic text.

<sup>55</sup> See ZIEGLER, MUNNICH, FRAENKEL, 1999, pp. 93-100, where the precise references can be found.

<sup>56</sup> What relates to the Latin tradition will be pointed out later in the presentation of Latin text types.

<sup>57</sup> Following BLUDAU 1897.

### 3. *The division into visions*

Greek and Old Latin traditions have preserved a division of the book of Daniel into visions (ὁράσεις - *visiones*), a division that does not completely overlap with the traditional chapter division<sup>58</sup>.

The majority system of the Theodotion text is that represented by the Alexandrinus. The story of Susanna is considered the first vision. Then come visions 2 to 10 corresponding to our chapters 1 to 9. The 11<sup>th</sup> vision corresponds to the material of our chapters 10 to 12 grouped together. Bel and the dragon is the 12<sup>th</sup> vision.

Vision	Content	Theodotion	Chronological landmarks
I	Story of Susanna	ΣΟΥΣΑΝΝΑ	Exile to Babylon
II	Food	Dan 1	Nebuchadnezzar
III	Statue	Dan 2	2 <sup>nd</sup> year of Nebuchadnezzar
IV	Golden statue and furnace	Dan 3	Nebuchadnezzar
V	Big tree	Dan 4	Nebuchadnezzar
VI	Feast and inscription	Dan 5	Balthasar (mention of his death)
VII	Daniel in the pit	Dan 6	Darius
VIII	Four beasts	Dan 7	1 <sup>st</sup> year of Balthasar
IX	Ram and goat	Dan 8	3 <sup>rd</sup> year of Balthasar
X	70 weeks	Dan 9	1 <sup>st</sup> year of Darius
XI	Man of linen	Dan 10	3 <sup>rd</sup> year of Cyrus
	Alexander and successors	Dan 11	
	Michael distress, resurrection	Dan 12	
XII	Bel and the dragon	ΒΗΛ ΚΑΙ ΔΡΑΚΩΝ	Cyrus

*Table 1: Division into visions*

The Old Latin manuscript VL 176 follows this majority system<sup>59</sup>. Indeed, although it is incomplete, it is possible to reconstruct his distribution of visions. It adds *I explicit* at the end of the story of Susanna and *incipit II* at the beginning of chapter 1. We read at the beginning of chapter 5 *incipit VI* with the corresponding *VI explicit* after 5:29. At the beginning of 5:30 appears *incipit VII* to which corresponds *VII explicit* in 6:28. Chapter 7 begins with *incipit VIII* and ends with *VIII explicit*. At the beginning of chapter 8<sup>60</sup> one reads *incipit VIII*. The explicit of chapter 8 and the incipit of chapter 9 have not been preserved, but Alban Dold is right to have restored them since at the end of chapter 9 the manuscript does bear the indication *X expl<icit>* which makes it possible to reconstitute the *incipit <XI>* at the beginning of chapter 10; that is confirmed by the *XI explicit* at the end of chapter 12. This clearly indicates that chapters 10-12 were grouped together as in the majority system. The story of Bel and the dragon concludes the book with the notice *incipit XII*.

Only one Greek witness to the text of Theodotion, ms. 106 (Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea, 187 II) from the 14<sup>th</sup> century, presents a different organization of the visions. The story of Susanna is numbered 12. Chapters 1 and 2 form the first vision. Chapters 3 to 12 form

<sup>58</sup> The division into chapters dates back to the 13th century.

<sup>59</sup> The division assumed by Jerome's commentary will be presented later.

<sup>60</sup> And not from chapter 9, as incorrectly stated by DOLD 1940, p. 48.

visions 2 to 11 (chapters 10 to 12 are no longer grouped together, but form visions 9, 10 and 11). The story of Bel and the dragon closes the book as vision 13.

Among the versions, which for the most part follow the majority system, the Ethiopian version has its own distribution. The story of Susanna is vision 1. Chapters 1 to 4 constitute visions 2 to 5. Chapters 5 and 6 are grouped as vision 6; chapters 7 and 8 are also grouped as vision 7. Chapters 9 to 12 + Bel form visions 8 to 12.

	<i>Alexandrinus</i>	<i>Rahlfs 106</i>	<i>Ethiopian</i>	<i>VL 176</i>
Susanna	1	12	1	1
Dan 1	2	1	2	2
Dan 2	3		3	<3>
Dan 3	4	2	4	<4>
Dan 4	5	3	5	<5>
Dan 5	6	4	6	6
Dan 6	7	5		7
Dan 7	8	6	7	8
Dan 8	9	7		9
Dan 9	10	8	8	10
Dan 10	11	9	9	11
Dan 11		10	10	
Dan 12		11	11	
Bel	12	13	12	12

Table 2: Different systems of divisions

The publication of the first part of Papyrus 967 in 1937, followed by the publication of all the other fragments from 1968 on, has considerably renewed our knowledge of the LXX text of Daniel. The most visible feature of Papyrus 967 is the inversion of chapters 6-7 and 8-9. A. Geissen has explained it by a concern for historical coherence which aims at placing the death of Balthasar (mentioned in 5:30) after the events which took place during his reign (chapters 5 and 7-8), and at bringing together those which are dated to the reign of Darius<sup>61</sup>. We thus obtain a coherent succession, although inaccurate, since in reality Darius is later than Cyrus:

Pap. 967	chronological landmarks
Dan 1-4	under Nebuchadnezzar
Dan 7-8.5	under his son Balthasar, the 1 <sup>st</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> and last year of his reign
Dan 6.9	under Darius
Dan 10-12	under Cyrus

Table 3: Chronological landmarks in Papyrus 967

In Pap. 967, the two supplements are placed at the end of the book: Dn 1-12 + Bel + Susanna. Similarly in the two hexaplar witnesses (88-Syh), but the order of the supplements is reversed: Dn 1-12 + Susanna + Bel (the latter with a title of its own: ἐκ προφητείας Αμβακουμ υιοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευι).

<sup>61</sup> GEISSEN 1968, pp. 31-33. There is a similar inversion in the Syriac version revised by Jacob of Edessa, with the additional displacement of chapter 9 at the end of the book, between Bel and Susanna, see MARSH 2019.

The inversion of chapters 6-7 and 8-9 is also attested by a Latin witness, which allows 967 to be partly removed from its isolation. The bishop of Carthage, Quodvultdeus, driven out by the Vandals and refugee from 439 in Campania, in his *Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei* (composed between 445 and 451), reviews many biblical books and in particular that of Daniel (QU pro 2,73) of which he gives details of the visions<sup>62</sup>.

	Summary	
in prima	<i>contra impudicos seniores castitatem Susannae defendit</i>	Susanna
in secunda	<i>Danihel sui que amici statuerunt...ex cibis mensae regis...non contaminari</i>	Dan 1
in tertia	<i>quattuor regna in quattuor metallis e quibus statua</i>	Dan 2
in quarta	<i>amici Danihelis...camino detrusi</i>	Dan 3
quinta visio	<i>somnium...regis quod Danihel ita interpretatus est: arborem magnificam...</i>	Dan 4
in sexta	<i>quattuor sibi apparentibus bestiis</i>	Dan 7
in septima	<i>ex ariete et hirco Persarum atque Graecorum...proelia</i>	Dan 8
in octava	<i>Baltasar rex cenam faciens principibus suis</i>	Dan 5
in nona	<i>Darius Medus...(Danihel) missus leonibus</i>	Dan 6
in decima	<i>propinquante fine temporis LXX annorum</i>	Dan 9
in undecima	<i>facta Antichristi angustiaeque ultimi temporis resurrectio...mortuorum</i>	Dan 10-12
in duodecima	<i>Bel...idolum</i>	Bel-Dragon

Table 4: *Quodvultdeus*

However, the order of the visions is not identical to that of Papyrus 967, since Quodvultdeus divides the two Greek supplements on either side of chapters 1-12. In this he follows the order of Theodotion (as well as his text; it is sufficient to compare the quotation of 9:24-27 in QU pro 2,78 with the text of Theodotion, which differs considerably from that of the LXX).

We have some traces of the majority division into visions in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries. The Gallican ascetic Bacharius, in his *epistle 2* (perhaps not by him, but certainly by those around him), written at the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, to justify the practice of fasting, argues about the visions and in particular about the fasting that follows the prayer of chapter 9: *sicut ille inter decimam et undecimam visionem orasse et tribus ebdomadis ieiunasse describitur* (BACH ep 2 [300,9]). The prayer of Daniel is designated as the 10<sup>th</sup> vision and chapters 10ff as the 11<sup>th</sup> vision. Two North African bishops, Hilarius, in his *De cursu temporum* (HILn curs 10, dated 397) and Primasius (d. 560) in his commentary on Revelation (PRIM 4 [208,364]), identify the prayer of Daniel as the 10<sup>th</sup> vision as well.

Sulpicius Severus, in 403, in the second book of his *Chronicles* (SUL chr 2,1-7), presents the events that took place in the book of Daniel. From the very first words, he evokes Daniel's observance of the Law (*egregia ad conservandam legem perseverantia*), his deliverance of Susanna (*in absolute Susannae*), and other actions which he will present in their order (*ce-terisque ab eo gestis, quae iam ordine persequemur*). Does this mean that he will follow the order of the biblical narrative? In reality, he is only interested in history and therefore he will really only deal with the first six chapters, the others being devoted to prophecies. In accordance with what he has just stated, Sulpicius first mentions chapter 1 (Daniel scrupulously observes

<sup>62</sup> BOGAERT 1978.

the Law), then the story of Susanna (Dan 13), and then chapters 2 to 6. For the rest, he mentions only the prophecy dealing with the series of future centuries, the number of years before the coming of Christ, and the Antichrist (SUL 2,7 [62,21]: *extant etiam visiones eius, quibus consequentium saeculorum ordinem revelavit, annorum etiam numerum complexus, intra quem Christum, sicut factum est, descensurum ad terras pronuntiavit venturumque Antichristum manifeste exposuit*). The order Dn 1 + Susanna is explained, not by a particular arrangement of the chapters of the book, but by the fact that Sulpicius Severus respects chronology. Indeed, chapter 1 is supposed to take place when Daniel is still a small child (SUL chr 2,1 [56,4]: *hic sub rege Ioachim captus deductusque Babylonam parvus admodum puer*), while in the story of Susanna, Daniel is twelve years old (SUL chr 2,2 [57,8]: *Daniel tum annos natus XII*).

#### 4. The danielic canticles

##### *The Song of the Three Young Men*

As said above, the canticle of the Three Young Men (Dan 3:52-88[90]) has been abundantly transmitted in manuscript tradition, but the indirect tradition is rather poor: there are only a few quotations in Augustine, Fulgentius or in the *De trinitate* of the pseudo-Vigilius of Thapsus. There are two ways of identifying the types of text: the vocabulary and the overall structure of the hymn.

The literary quality of the passage is relatively poor. All the verses are built on the same rudimentary syntactical scheme: *benedicite x dominum, hymnum dicite et superexaltate eum in saecula*. Only the element *x* varies, and it usually corresponds to all-purpose words (heavens, angels, waters, sun, moon, stars, etc.) which do not give rise to many variations in the translation. There are, however, some rare differences, especially for a few key words (*claritas, solidamentum, volatilia*), which make it possible to highlight the existence of two types of Old Latin text: a recent African text (C) attested by the Verona Psalter (VL 300) and a European text to which the rest of the manuscript tradition bears witness. Studies of the Canticles of the Vineyard (Is 5) and Habakkuk (Hab 3) show the African roots of the Verona Psalter text<sup>63</sup>.

The vocabulary of the Three Young Men's hymn confirms this conclusion (the sign ≠ separates the reading of 300 and that of the European witnesses).

52. αἰνετός] *admirabilis* (with M-M [297A]) ≠ *laudabilis* τῆς δόξης] *claritatis* ≠ *gloriae* τὸ ἅγιον] *illud sanctum* ≠ *quod est sanctum* (the article is rendered by a demonstrative pronoun)

53. τῆς δόξης] *claritatis* ≠ *gloriae*

56. ἐν τῷ στερεώματι] *in solidamento* (with AU s 377 et M-M [297A]) ≠ *in firmamento*

76. πάντα τὰ φύομενα] *omnia quae nascimini* ≠ *omnia nascentia*

79. πάντα τὰ κινούμενα] *omnia quae movemini* ≠ *omnia quae moventur*

80. τὰ πετεινά] *volatilia* (with 460) ≠ *volucres*

The order of the creatures listed in the Song of the Three Young Men, from v. 57 to v. 88, according to the current numbering of the verses, has varied considerably in the traditions that have been preserved. The variations already appear in the two main forms of the Greek biblical text. It is worthwhile presenting them in the form of a table.

<sup>63</sup> HAELEWYCK 1989, in part. pp. 259-260 and 266-269; HAELEWYCK 2021.

	Theodotion (ms. A)		LXX
57	works	57	works
59	heaven	58	angels
58	angels	59	heaven
60	upper waters	60	upper waters
61	power	61	powers
62	sun-moon	62	sun-moon
63	stars	63	stars
64	rain (ὄμβρος) - rosy (δρόσος)	64	rain (ὄμβρος) - rosy (δρόσος)
65	wind (πνεύματα)	65	winds (πνεύματα)
66	fire (πῦρ) – heat (καῦμα)	66	fire (πῦρ) – heat (καῦμα)
67	cold (ψῦχος) – hot (καύσων)	67	cold (ῥίγος) – winter (ψῦχος)
68	dews (δρόσοι) – frozen (νιφετοί)	68	dews (δρόσοι) – frozen (νιφετοί)
71	nights - days	69	frost (πάγη) – wind (ψύχη)
72	light - darkness	70	snows (χιόνες) – frost (πάχλαι)
69	frost (πάγος) – cold (ψῦχος)	71	nights - days
70	frost (πάχλαι) – snows (χιόνες)	72	darkness - light
73	lightning - clouds	73	lightning - clouds
74	earth	74	earth
75	montains - hills	75	montains - hills
76	products of the earth	76	products of the earth
78	seas - rivers	77	rain (ὄμβροι) - springs
77	springs	78	seas - rivers
79	whales (κῆτη) - fish	79	whales (κῆτη) - fish
80	birds	80	birds
81	wild beasts (θηρία) - cattle (κτήνη)	81	quadrupeds (τετράποδα) - wild beasts (θηρία)
82	men	82	men
83	israhel	83	israhel
84	priests	84	priests - servants
85	servants	85	-
86	spirit - souls of the righteous	86	spirit - souls
87	holy - umbles of heart	87	holy - umbles of heart
88	Ananias Azarias Misael	88	Ananias Azarias Misael

Table 5: Order of the creatures (Theodotion – LXX)

The LXX lists them in arithmetical order (or rather, it is the arithmetical order that was chosen by the first authors of the distribution of verses, beginning with the Vulgate), but it brings together 84-85, speaking of servant-priests (except in the witnesses of the hexaplar recension, 88 and Syh, where the text is conformed to that of Theodotion) (above it omits v. 53). The order of the verses in the manuscript witnesses of Theodotion<sup>64</sup> and in the versions which depend on it is characterized by two constants: the order 57.59.58 at the beginning and the inversion of

<sup>64</sup> Leaving aside those that have been reviewed on the LXX text, namely V-62 L' c. An attempt to explain the discrepancies in Dan 3 in the different forms of the Greek texts (LXX, Theodotion, Papyrus 967) has been proposed BOGAERT 1993a.



verses 78.77<sup>65</sup>. Between these two fixed points there are many variations, as the following table shows.

Order	Witnesses	Observation
60-68.71-72.69-70.73-76	A 106 130 233 407 534 Bo Arab	
60-66.71-72.69-70.73-76	B-26 Q	omission of 67-68
60-70.73.72.71.74-76	147	
60-66.68.71-72.69-70.73-76	C	omission of 67
60-65.71.66.68-69.72.67.70.73-76	46'	
60-66.68.71-72.67.73-76	239	omission of 69-70
60-66.68.67.71-72.70.73-76	410	omission of 69
60-68.71-72.70.73-76	541 Sah	omission of 69
60-66.71.68-69.72.67.70.73-76	Eth	
60-67.70-76	Arm	omission of 68-69
61.60.62-66.86.71-72.67.(addition summer-winter).70.73-76	Syr	transposition of 61.62, omission of 68-69 and addition
60-65.67.66.68-70.73.71-72.74.76	Theodoret	

Table 6: Order of the creatures (other witnesses)

If we leave aside the isolated witnesses, we are faced with two main orders: that of the Alexandrinus (chosen by the Göttingen edition) and that of the Vaticanus (B). The two differ only in the omission of vv. 67-68 in the latter. In view of this data, it is not surprising that the variation also appears in the Old Latin witnesses.

The oldest witness to the Roman hymn series comes from England. It is the Vespasian Psalter (VL 372) copied in the second quarter of the 8<sup>th</sup> century. It contains the verses of the hymn in the following order: 57.59.58.60-66.71-72.67.70.73-76.78.77.79-88.56. The inversion of vv. 57.59.58 corresponds to the order of the verses in the Greek version of Theodotion, as does that of vv. 78-77. On the other hand, the order 71-72.67 is peculiar, as is the omission of vv. 68-69. Equally remarkable is the addition of v. 56 at the end of the hymn. This arrangement has no corresponding Greek equivalent (see table above). In England, this order of the Roman Psalter is also attested in the following witnesses: VL 393 (8<sup>th</sup> c.), 394 (8<sup>th</sup> c.), 377 (middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> c.), 383 (2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 10<sup>th</sup> c.), 376 (c. 1000) and 308 (c. 1140, this witness was not retained for the edition because of its late date). This order is also found in Germany, as indicated by ms. 311 (dated 909) and 395 (1<sup>st</sup> third of the 9<sup>th</sup> c.); 395 is incomplete (vv. 79-88.56), but it too ends on v. 56. Italian witnesses to the Roman Psalter with this arrangement appear only from the 11<sup>th</sup> c. onwards: 368 (11<sup>th</sup> c.), 344 (between 1099 and 1105), 347 (between 1099 and 1105, Monte Cassino), 354 (late 11<sup>th</sup> c.), 343 (2<sup>nd</sup> half of 12<sup>th</sup> c.), 360 (c. 1150, Tivoli; it omits v. 82, however, probably by accident), 370 (12<sup>th</sup> c., perhaps Piedmont) and 359 (14<sup>th</sup> c., Latium) (we have only retained for the edition 368 344 354). It is almost the same disposition in Milan, in the witnesses of the recension with diacritical signs that are 405 (2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 9<sup>th</sup> c.), 406 (2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 9<sup>th</sup> c.), and 407 (end of the 9<sup>th</sup> c.). They show two differences: vv. 78+77 are grouped together, but keep this order, and v. 56 is absent. The same will happen later with the ancient

<sup>65</sup> In the block formed by vv. 79-88, two minor variations are attested in Greek: the omission of v. 85 in ms. 410, and the inversion 84.83.82 in ms. 130. They can be left out here. Ms. 541 has the order 70-73-74.78.77.75.76.79.88 (it transposes 78.77 before 75).

Milanese *Manualia* 400 (11<sup>th</sup> c.), 401 (dated 1268) and 402 (dated 1188). The enigmatic Sinai Psalter (VL 460) copies only a part of the canticle (see above), and in an abbreviated form, with the following order: 70.73-76.78.77.79-88, where the same sequence of verses appears. This arrangement (57.59.58.60-66.71-72.67.70.73-76.78.77.79-88.56) is therefore that of the majority of manuscript witnesses, Psalters as well as liturgical books<sup>66</sup>.

In Italy, an 11<sup>th</sup> century witness, VL 361, has reworked this majority arrangement and presents the following quite exceptional order: 57.59.58.63.60-62.64-65.71.66.72.67.74.70.73. 75-76.78-77.79-88.56. However, we can recognize the characteristics of the majority disposition: vv. 57-59.58, inversion of vv. 78-77 and presence of v. 56 at the end. It is difficult to detect a logic in the transformations attested in 361.

In France, the Queen's Psalter (VL 330, 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 8<sup>th</sup> c.) follows the majority disposition, but does not read v. 56 at the end of the hymn.

An additional modification is attested in Ireland: v. 56 is absent and the order is read vv. 83-82. The Irish witnesses also introduced some changes in vocabulary: in v. 60 *super caelos* (instead of *quae super caelos sunt*), in v. 61 *potentiae* (instead of *virtutes*), in v. 66 *calor* (instead of *aestus*), in v. 81 *iumenta* (instead of *universa pecora*), in v. 79 *beluae* (instead of *cete*), in v. 83 *israhelitae* (not *israhel*). They also read *fontes aquarum* (instead of *fontes*) in v. 77, an addition that comes from Ps 17:16; 41:2; 113:8<sup>67</sup>. This Irish form is attested by mss 254, 255 and 257, as well as by the Luxeuil lectionary (VL 251; the hymn only begins at v. 64 due to the loss of a folio) which testifies to the arrival of Irish liturgical pieces on the continent around 700.

Among the early Gallican Psalters, ms. 7 (ca. 810) has the majority order (57.59.58.60-66.71-72.67.70.73-76.78.77.79-88), but v. 56 is put back in its place and vv. 52-56 form the first part of the canticle of the Three Young Men (*hymnus ananiae azariae misahel*); the canticle is extended to v. 90. It is also preceded by the hymn of Azariah (vv. 26-45). In this it corresponds almost exactly to the presentation of the pieces in the Sedulius Psalter (VL 250, mid-ninth century), except that the canticle is not extended to v. 90. The extension of the canticle to v. 90 is also attested by the principal witness of the Milanese recension of Simeon, ms. 408 (between 858 and 899); and he too precedes the canticle of the Three Young Men by the canticle of Azariah, which he then extends to v. 51, to which he immediately adds vv. 52 to 56. In this witness, each of the three pieces is entitled *ymnum trium puerorum*. But within the Canticle of the Three Young Men, 408 arranges the verses differently; he has indeed the order 57.59.58.60-67.64(bis).71-72.69.70.73-90. It therefore copies v. 64 twice: once after v. 63 and again after v. 67 (which is in its proper place). It is the only one to copy v. 69 and not to reverse vv. 77 and 78.

The Verona Psalter (VL 300, ca. 600) copies the verses in the order 57.59-66.71-72.67-68.73-76.78.77.79-88. It thus omits v. 58 (a most unusual and perhaps accidental omission), as

---

<sup>66</sup> The Latin-Greek Psalter VL 263 (12<sup>th</sup> c., not retained for the edition, but digitized on the Internet) contains the Roman hymns of which the Old Latin text of the hymn of the Three Young Men has been partly aligned with the Greek text. The copyist has restored the order 57.58.59. He abbreviates and groups vv. 60-63 and v. 80 (birds) is omitted. The ms. 342 (9<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> c., not retained, but digitized on the Internet) gives the text of a series of canticles in transliterated Greek accompanied by an interlinear Latin version. For the hymn of the Three Young Men, it has the following unique order: 57.60-63.58-59.[margin 64-65].66-67.70-88. It is impossible to know the exact location of vv. 64-65 since they have been added in the margin. One will observe the displacement of vv. 60-63 between vv. 57 and 58, as well as the usual omission of v. 69. From v. 70 on, the order follows that of the LXX (and thus of the Vulgate).

<sup>67</sup> SCHNEIDER 1938, p. 97 (notes 34-35).

well as vv. 68-69 (actually very similar: frost-cold, frost-snow). It continues the hymn until v. 90, and precedes it with vv. 51-56.

It seems therefore that, apart from the few textual modifications visible in the Irish manuscripts, it is not possible to identify particular types of text on the basis of this structural criterion. We are in the presence of a majority order of verses, modified, most often without apparent logic, by different witnesses.

### *The Song of Azariah*

The canticle of Azarias (3:26-45) has a more limited attestation than the canticle of the Three Young Men. It appears only in the following direct witnesses: 7 182 250 330 408 and 460, and in indirect tradition, in Augustine and Verecundus who comment on it, as well as in Fulgentius who quotes it in part (vv. 26-31.39.40a.41.42a.45). Direct witnesses are less numerous, but the patristic quotations are decisive for a better understanding of the history of the text.

Manuscript 7 (ca. 810), a witness to the ancient Gallican liturgy, is incomplete; the following hymns have been preserved: Ex 15 (from *misisti iram* in v. 7b), Hab 3, 1 Sam 2, Is 26, the hymns of Azariah and the Three Young Men. After the hymn of the Three Young Men, the words *explicit psalterium* indicate that the hymns are one with the Psalter. The text of the hymns is almost completely identical to that of the Psalter copied by Sedulius in the middle of the 9<sup>th</sup> century (VL 250), which presupposes a common model (details below). However, in 250 the list of hymns is longer: Ex 15, Deut 32, Hab 3, 1 Sam 2, Is 26, the hymn of Azariah and the Three Young Men, Jon 2, Lk 1:46-55 (*Magnificat*); 1:68-79 (Zechariah); 2:29-32 (*Nunc dimittis*); Sedulius even added an abbreviated form of the Vineyard hymn<sup>68</sup>. Schneider argues that the archetype of 7 + 250 is related to the Augustine Bible<sup>69</sup>. A comparison of the texts of the main witnesses will facilitate the analysis.

	7 + 250 + 330	460	FU + VER
26	<i>benedictus es domine deus patrum nostrorum et laudabile (-lis 250*) et gloriosum nomen tuum in saecula</i>	<i>benedictus es domine deus patrum nostrorum et laudabilis et gloriosus (om.) in saecula</i>	<i>benedictus es domine deus patrum nostrorum et laudabile (-lis FU) et gloriosum (+ est VER) nomen tuum in saecula</i>
27	<i>quoniam iustus es (est 330*) in omnibus quae fecisti nobis et omnia opera tua et rectae viae tuae et omnia iudicia tua (x x x x x x x 7 250) veritas</i>	<i>quoniam iustus es in omnibus quae fecisti nobis et omnia opera tua veritas et rectae viae tuae et omnia iudicia tua</i>	<i>quoniam iustus es in omnibus quae (quaecumque VER) fecisti nobis et omnia opera tua (+ vera FU) et rectae viae tuae et omnia iudicia tua veritas (x x x x x VER)</i>
28	<i>et iudicia veritatis fecisti secundum omnia quae adduxisti (induxisti 330) nobis et super civitatem sanctam patrum nostrorum hierusalem quoniam in veritate et iudicio fecisti (induxisti 330) haec propter peccata nostra (iniquitates nostras 7 250)</i>	<i>veritatis fecisti secundum omnia quae adduxisti nobis et super civitatem sanctam patrum hierusalem quoniam in veritate et iudicio fecisti haec omnia propter peccata nostra</i>	<i>et iudicia (-cium FU) veritatis fecisti secundum omnia quae induxisti nobis et super civitatem sanctam patrum nostrorum Ierusalem quoniam in veritate et iudicio induxisti haec omnia propter peccata nostra</i>
29	<i>quoniam peccavimus et inique egimus discedere a te et perquam (multum 330) peccavimus in omnibus</i>	<i>quoniam peccavimus et iniquitatem fecimus in omnibus</i>	<i>quoniam peccavimus et inique egimus discedere (discedentes FU) a te et multum peccavimus in omnibus</i>
30	<i>et mandatis tuis non audivimus (obaudivimus 330) neque conservavimus neque fecimus sicut praecepisti nobis ut bene nobis esset</i>	<i>et mandatis tuis non obedivimus neque conservavimus neque fecimus sicut praecepisti nobis ut bene nobis esset</i>	<i>et mandatis tuis non oboedivimus neque (nec FU) conservavimus neque fecimus sicut praecepisti (praeceperas VER) nobis et bene nobis esset</i>

<sup>68</sup> GRYSON 1999, vol. 1, pp. 818-819; GRYSON 1987-1997, pp. 349-350.

<sup>69</sup> SCHNEIDER 1938, pp. 172-177.

31	<i>et omnia quaecumque nobis fecisti et omnia (× × × 250) quaecumque (quae 330) adduxisti (induxisti 330) nobis in vero iudicio fecisti</i>	<i>et omnia quaecumque nobis fecisti et omnia quae adduxisti in nobis in vero iudicio fecisti</i>	<i>et omnia quaecumque nobis fecisti et omnia quae induxisti nobis (~ quae indux. nobis et omnia quaec. fecisti nobis FU) in vero iudicio fecisti</i>
32	<i>et tradidisti nos in manus (manibus 250*) inimicorum iniquorum (× 250) inimicissimorum apostatarum (× 7) et regno iniquo et nequissimo prae omni terra</i>	<i>et tradidisti nos in manibus inimicorum inimicissimorum apostat&lt;ar&gt;um et regno iniquo et nequissimo prae omni tempore</i>	<i>et tradidisti nos in manibus inimicorum iniquorum inimicissimorum apostatarum et regno iniquo et nequissimo prae omni terra</i>
33	<i>et nunc non est nobis aperire os confusio et exprobratio facta est servis tuis et colentibus te</i>	<i>et nunc non est nobis aperire os confusio et exprobratio facta est servis tuis et colentibus te</i>	<i>et nunc non est nobis aperire os confusio et exprobratio facta est servis tuis et colentibus te</i>
34	<i>et ne tradas nos in finem (fine 330) propter nomen tuum et ne destruas testamentum tuum (× × × 7 330)</i>	<i>et ne tradas nos in fine propter nomen tuum et ne disperdas testamentum tuum</i>	<i>et ne tradas nos in finem propter nomen tuum (om.)</i>
35	<i>et ne avertas misericordiam tuam a nobis propter abraham dilectum tuum (dilectum a te 7) et propter isaac servum tuum et israhel sanctum tuum</i>	<i>et ne auferas misericordiam tuam a nobis propter abraham dilectum tuum et propter isaac servum tuum et israhel sanctum tuum</i>	<i>et ne avertas misericordiam tuam a nobis propter Abraham dilectum tuum et Isaac servum tuum et Israel sanctum tuum</i>
36	<i>quibus locutus es (est 330) adimplere semen eorum quasi (sicut 330) stellas caeli et quasi (sicut 330) arenam (arena 330, + maris 250) quae ad ora (oram 250) maris est (~ est ad ora maris 330)</i>	<i>quibus locutus es adimplere semen eorum quasi stellas caeli et velut arena quae est ad ora maris</i>	<i>quibus locutus es adimplere semen eorum sicut stellas coeli et sicut arena quae est ad oram maris</i>
37	<i>quoniam domine minorati sumus prae omnibus gentibus et sumus humiles in omni terra (omnem terram 330) hodie propter peccata nostra (iniquitates nostras 7 250)</i>	<i>quoniam domine minorati sumus prae omnibus gentibus et sumus humiles hodie propter peccata nostra</i>	<i>quoniam minorati sumus domine prae omnibus gentibus et sumus humiles in omnem terram hodie propter peccata nostra</i>
38	<i>et non est in tempore hoc (~ hoc tempore 330) princeps et propheta et dux neque holocaustomata (-toma 7) neque sacrificium neque oblatio (-nes 7, × × 330) neque incensus (-um 330) nec (neque 330) locus ad sacrificandum in conspectu tuo et invenire misericordiam (-dia 330, et in veram misericordiam 250)</i>	<i>et non est in tempore hoc princeps neque propheta neque dux neque holocaustomata neque sacrificium neque oblationem neque incensum nec locus ad sacrificandum in conspectu tuo et invenire misericordiam</i>	<i>et non est in hoc tempore princeps et propheta et dux neque holocaustomata neque sacrificium neque oblatio neque incensum neque locus ad sacrificandum in conspectu tuo et invenire misericordiam</i>
39	<i>sed in anima contribulata et spiritu humiliationis accipiamur (accipimus nos 250)</i>	<i>sed in anima co&lt;n&gt;tribulata spiritu humiliationis inveniamur</i>	<i>sed in anima contribulata et spiritu humiliationis accipiamur</i>
40	<i>quasi in holocausto (-tos 7, -tis 330) arietum et taurorum et multitudine (-nem 7) agnorum pinguium sic fiat sacrificium nostrum in conspectu tuo hodie et perficere subsequentes te quoniam non est confusio his (× 7 250) qui confidunt (***) confident 250*, × confidentibus 250<sup>c</sup>) in te</i>	<i>tamquam in holocaustis arietum et taurorum aut in multitudine agnorum pinguium sic fiat sacrificium nostrum in conspectu tuo hodie et perfice subsequentes te quoniam non est confusio his qui confidunt in te</i>	<i>quasi in holocaustis arietum et taurorum et multitudine agnorum pinguium sic fiat sacrificium nostrum in conspectu tuo hodie et perfice subsequentes te quoniam non est confusio his qui confidunt in te</i>
41	<i>et nunc exsequimur in toto corde et timemus te et inquirimus faciem tuam</i>	<i>nunc te sequimur in toto corde et timemus te quaerimus faciem tuam</i>	<i>et nunc exsequimur (sequimur FU) in toto corde timemus te quaerimus faciem tuam</i>
42	<i>ne confundas nos sed fac nobiscum secundum modestiam (maiestatem 250 330) tuam et secundum multitudinem miserationum tuarum</i>	<i>ne confundas nos sed fac nobiscum secundum modestia tua et secundum multitudinem miserationum tuarum</i>	<i>ne confundas nos et fac nobiscum secundum maiestatem tuam et secundum multitudinem miserationum tuarum</i>
43	<i>et libera nos secundum mirabilia tua et da gloriam nomini tuo domine</i>	<i>libera nos secundum multa mirabilia tua et da gloriam nomini tuo domine</i>	<i>da gloriam nomini tuo domine</i>
44	<i>et confundantur omnes qui ostendunt servis tuis mala et confundantur ab omni potentia sua et virtus eorum conteratur (virtutes eorum conterantur 250)</i>	<i>confundantur omnes qui ostendunt servis tuis mala et confundantur ab omni potentia sua et virtus eorum conteratur</i>	<i>confundantur omnes qui ostendunt servis tuis mala et confundantur ab omni potentia sua et virtus eorum conteratur</i>
45	<i>et cognoscant quoniam tu es (× 250) dominus deus solus et gloriosus (× × 330) in omni orbe terrarum</i>	<i>et cognoscant quoniam nomen tibi dominus tu solus altissimus et gloriosus in omni orbe terrarum</i>	<i>et cognoscant quia (quoniam FU) tu es dominus deus solus in omni orbe terrarum</i>

Table 7: Song of Azariah

It is clear that both witnesses 7 + 250 go back to a common archetype, as evidenced by their nearly identical wording, as well as the accidental omission in the second part of v. 27 by a shift from same to same on *omnia opera tua* (*omnia iudicia tua*) (an accident that could go back to the Greek model ἀληθινά ἀλήθεια). Some of the remarkable readings in each of the two witnesses can be explained by this same type of accident: thus the omission of 250 in v. 31 (*quaecumque* *quaecumque*) and that of 7 in v. 34 (*tuum* *tuum*). In v. 32, the omissions of 7 and 250 are accidental (*-rum* *-rum*). Note, however, in v. 35 the reading *dilectum a te* of 7 corresponds exactly to the Greek τὸν ἠγαπημένον ὑπὸ σοῦ.

Other variations are less far-reaching. Thus the variation *laudabilis - laudabile* (v. 26) is already attested in Greek, depending on whether the agreement is with κούπε or with ὄνομα; it is found throughout the Latin tradition. The substitution of *manibus* for *manus* (v. 32) is a frequent phenomenon in the Latin tradition (one need only consult the apparatuses of the Vulgate to be convinced). In v. 36, the addition of *maris* in 250 has no correspondence in Greek or in the Vulgate; the same is true for the plural *oblaciones* in 250 in verse 38. In v. 38, *holocaustoma* in 7 is probably a copying error, which is clearly the case with the reading in *veram misericordiam* in 250. The words *accipimus nos* in v. 39 in 250, as well as *multitudinem* in 7 in v. 40, are also to be considered as mistakes. The variations at the end of v. 40 in 7 and 250 (before and after correction) are explained by the hesitation between the two readings *his qui confidunt* and *confidentibus*. In v. 42, to translate ἐπιείκεια, the Latin tradition of the verse employs *tranquillitas* (VL 177), *clementia* (CY), *modestia* (VL 7 and 460, remarkable agreement), and *mansuetudo* (AU ep 111, the Vulgate and its dependent witnesses). It is clear that the lesson *maiestatem* of 250, which cannot render the Greek, is secondary; one finds it however in 330, in 408 and in Verecundus. The plural (*virtutes eorum conterantur*) of 250 in v. 44 has no equivalent in Greek or in the Vulgate and is isolated in the Old Latin tradition.

The text of 330 corresponds broadly to that of 7 + 250, but without the accident that characterizes them in v. 27. The same accident as in 7 (*tuum tuum*) is found in v. 34, however. It does not have the double reading *sacrificium-oblatio* of 7 + 250 in v. 38, but only *sacrificium*. As 250 he attests the lesson *maiestatem* in v. 42.

These three witnesses probably go back to the same Latin model of the canticle whose roots are to be found in North Africa as indicated by the great proximity with the texts of Verecundus and Fulgentius, as it appears from the table above. Among the following variations, we note that some seem to indicate a closer relationship between 330 and VER + FU:

28. *induxisti* 1 VER FU 330 ≠ *adduxisti* 7 250     *induxisti*<sup>2</sup> VER FU 330 ≠ *fecisti* 7 250
29. *discedentes* FU ≠ *discedere* 7 250 330 VER     *multum* VER FU 330 ≠ *perquam* 7 250
30. *oboedivimus* VER FU 330 ≠ *audivimus* 7 250     *praeceperas* VER ≠ *praecepisti* 7 250 330 FU
31. *induxisti* VER FU 330 ≠ *adduxisti* 7 250
34. accidental omission of *et ne destruas testamentum tuum* VER 7 330
36. *sicut*<sup>1 and 2</sup> VER 330 ≠ *quasi* 7 250     *quae est ad ora maris* VER 330 (*ora*) ≠ 7 250
37. *omnem terram* VER 330 ≠ 7 250
38. *hoc tempore* VER 330 ≠ 7 250
40. *holocaustis* VER FU 330 ≠ 7 250     *perfice* VER ≠ 7 250 330
41. *sequimur* FU ≠ 7 250 330 VER     *quaerimus* ≠ 7 250 330
42. *maiestatem* VER 250 330 ≠ 7
43. omission of the first part of the v. VER ≠ 7 250 330
45. omission of *et gloriosus* VER FU 330 ≠ 7 250

What about 460? Its proximity to the African text is quite clear. If we put aside the possible errors of reading, there remain only some remarkable lessons:

26. omission of *nomen tuum*
- 26-27. accidental omission of *veritas et iudicia tua* (*veritas* ⁀ *veritatis*)
29. *iniquitatem fecimus* ≠ 7 250 330 VER FU     accidental omission of *discedere a te et perquam peccavimus* (*fecimus* ⁀ *peccavimus*)
32. accidental omission of *iniquorum* (*inimicorum* ⁀ *iniquorum*)     *prae omni tempore* ≠ 7 250 330 VER: wrong resolution of an abbreviation?

34. *disperdas* ≠ 250 (the other witnesses omit the second part of the verse)
35. *auferas* ≠ 7 250 330 VER
36. *velut* ≠ 7 250 330 VER
37. omission of *in omni terra*
38. *oblationem* ≠ 7 250 VER
40. *holocaustis* with 330    *perficie* with VER FU ≠ 7 250 330
41. *sequimur* with FU ≠ 7 250 330 VER    *quaerimus* with VER FU ≠ 7 250 330
42. *modestia*<*m*> *tua*<*m*> with 7 ≠ 250 330 VER
43. addition of *multa* before *mirabilia*
45. addition of *nomen tibi*    *altissimus et gloriosus* ≠ 7 250 330 VER FU: double lesson

Among the manuscript witnesses to the canticle of Azariah, VL 408, the only witness retained from the Milanese recension of Simeon, continues the canticle until v. 51, thus linking the two canticles of chapter 3. The text of the hymn differs little from the African text. Here are the notable lessons (in comparison with the text of 7 250 330):

26. *laudabile et gloriosum nomen tuum in saecula*] *laudabilis et superexaltatus in saecula* 408: the canticle of Azarias bearing the title *hymnum trium puerorum*, it is the refrain of the canticle of the Three Young Men that is noted here.
27. *opera tua*] + *vera* 408 with FU and Greek
28. *adduxisti/induxisti*] *fecisti* 408    omission of *hierusalem*
29. omission of *perquam/multum*
31. *fecisti*] *induxisti* 408    omission of *in vero iudicio fecisti*
32. *regno iniquo et nequissimo*] *regi iniquo et pessimo* 408
34. accidental omission of the first part of the v. (*tuum* <sup>tuum</sup>)    *destruas*] *dispexeris* 408
36. *quasi...quasi*] *sicut...sicut* 408 with 330 VER
39. *anima contribulata et spiritu humiliationis accipiamur*] *in anima spiritu humilitatis suscepit in nobis* 408
40. *fiat*] *faciat* 408: reading mistake    *perficere*] *perficie* 408 with 460 VER FU
41. *inquirimus*] *quaerimus* with 460 VER FU
42. *modestiam*] *maiestatem* with 250 330 VER FU
45. *in omni orbe terrarum*] *in omnem orbem* 408

Contrary to Schneider's assertion, the model common to all these witnesses is different from Augustine's text. The discrepancies appear in almost every verse, which will lead to the assignment of the sigle **A** to the long quotation from his *Epistle III* (dated 409). The following lessons in particular should be noted:

28. *adduxisti...fecisti*] *intulisti...intulisti* AU (cf. v. 31)
29. *inique egimus*] *legi non paruimus* AU
30. *audivimus*] *obaudivimus* AU
31. *fecisti...adduxisti/induxisti*] *intulisti...intulisti* AU (cf. v. 28)
32. *apostatarum* 250] *transfugarum* AU    *regno iniquo et nequissimo*] *regi iniusto et pessimo* AU    *prae omni terrae*] *ultra universam terram* AU
33. *aperire*] *ut possimus aperire* AU    *exprobratio*] *opprobrium* AU    *colentibus te*] *eis qui te colunt* AU
34. *tradas*] *tradideris* AU    *finem*] *perpetuum* AU    *destruas*] *dispexeris* AU
35. *ne avertas*] *ne abstuleris* AU    *dilectum a te*] *qui a te dilectus est* AU

36. *adimplere]* *multiplicaturum te* AU      *quasi stellas]* *ut astra* AU      *harenam quae ad ora maris est]*  
*harenam maris* AU (cf. 250)
37. *minorati sumus]* *minimi facti sumus* AU      *gentibus]* *nationibus* AU
38. *holocaustomata...sacrificium...oblatio...incensus]* *holocausta...oblatio...supplicationes* AU
39. *humiliationis]* *humilitatis* AU
40. *holocausto]* *holocaustomatibus* AU
41. *exsequimur]* *sequimur* AU      *inquirimus]* *quaerimus* AU
42. *modestiam/maiestatem]* *mansuetudinem* AU      *miserationum tuarum]* *misericaordiae tuae* AU
44. *confundantur<sup>1</sup>]* *vereantur* AU
45. *cognoscant]* *sciunt*      *in omni orbe terrarum]* *in universo orbe terrae* AU

Augustine's text, which is obviously open-book quoted, is not free from copying errors, as in vv. 29-31 (*quoniam peccavimus et legi non paruimus et mandatis tuis non obaudivimus ut bene nobis esset, et omnia quae intulisti nobis vero iudicio intulisti*), whose shorter form can be explained by omissions by passing from the same to the same.

The African model common to these witnesses does not correspond either to the text of Cyprian who quotes vv. 37-42 in CY te 3,20. Cyprian's wording varies considerably as the following lessons show:

38. *et dux]* *neque potestas neque dux* CY      *holocaustomata]* *holocausta* CY      *sacrificium]* *hostia* CY  
*oblatio]* *thus* CY      *ad sacrificandum]* *sacrificare* CY      *in conspectu tuo]* *coram te* CY      *misericaordiam]*  
*+ a te* CY
39. omission of *contribulata* CY      *humiliationis]* *humilitatis* CY      *accipiamur]* *acceptos nos habe* CY
40. *quasi]* *ut* CY      *in holocaustis]* *holocaustos victimas* CY      *multitudinem]* *quasi multa milia* CY      *pin-*  
*guium]* *qui sunt pinguissimi* CY      *sacrificium nostrum]* *hostia nostra* CY      *in conspectu tuo]* *coram te* CY  
*perficere subsequentes te]* *consummetur potestas haec* CY      *non est confusio]* *non erubescunt* CY
42. *ne confundas nos]* *ne nos in obprobrium tradas* CY      *modestiam/maiestatem]* *clementiam* (var. *tranquil-*  
*litatem*) CY      *multitudinem]* *amplitudinem* CY      *miserationum tuarum]* *misericaordiae tuae* CY

The European Old Latin text of the hymn is best represented by the Würzburg palimpsest (VL 177)<sup>70</sup>, which, as we shall see later, bears witness to the type of European text of the first half of the fourth century. It is also possible to compare it with the European text transmitted by VL 182<sup>71</sup>. Three observations are to be made. The European text uses a different vocabulary. The two witnesses 177 and 182 diverge quite regularly. Finally, one should note the proximity with some of Augustine's lessons. For the canticle of Azarias, here are the characteristic lessons of 177 and 182 (in comparison with the African text):

27. *fecisti nobis* 182] *fecisti* 177      *opera tua]* + *vera* 177 182
- 27-28. accidental omission of *tua veritas et iudicia* 177 by homoeoteleuton; 182 does not attest to the omission
28. *secundum omnia quae adduxisti/induxisti]* *per* (propter 182) *omnia quae intulisti nobis* 177 182      *super*  
*civitatem sanctam]* *civitati sanctae* 177 182      *fecisti/induxisti]* *intulisti* 177 182
29. *inique egimus* 182] *legi non paruimus* 177 with AU      *discedere a te/discedentes a te]* *quod a te recessi-*  
*mus* 177 182

<sup>70</sup> From v. 39 on, the fragments of St. Gall (VL 176) are attested, but in a very fragmentary form that shows only two differences from that of 177: *sed]* *et* 176 in v. 39; *sequentes]* *subsequentes* 176 in v. 40.

<sup>71</sup> HAELEWYCK 2022.

30. *mandatis tuis* 182] *peccavimus in omnibus mandatis tuis* 177      omission of *neque fecimus* 177; 182 does not attest to the omission      *sicut] ut* 177 182
31. *fecisti ... adduxisti/induxisti] intulisti ... fecisti* 177 182 with AU partim
32. *iniquorum* 182] *nostrorum* 177 (the rest is unreadable)      *regno iniquo et nequissimo] regi iniusto et pessimo* 177 182 with AU      *prae omni terra] prae universa terra* 182; *praeter universam terram* 177: wrong resolution of an abbreviation, cf. AU (*universam terram*)
33. *aperire] ut possimus aperire* 177 182 with AU      *confusio et exprobratio] verecundia et turpitudine* 177 182      *colentibus te* 182] *iis qui te colunt* 177 cf. AU
34. *tradas] tradideris* 177 182 with AU      *in finem] in perpetuum* 177 182 with AU      omission of *propter nomen tuum* 177; 182 does not attest to the omission      *destruas/disperdas] disperseris* 177; accidental omission of the second part of the v. in 182 (*tuum*  $\widehat{\text{tuum}}$ )
35. *ne avertas/auferas] ne abstuleris* 177 182 with AU      *dilectum tuum] qui a te dilectus est* 177 182 with AU      accidental omission (in variant) of *et israhel sanctum tuum* 177 (*tuum*  $\widehat{\text{tuum}}$ ); 182 does not attest to the omission, but reads *iherusalem* instead of *israhel*
36. *adimplere] multiplicare* 182; *te multiplicaturum* 177 cf. AU (*multiplicaturum te*)      *ad ora maris] circa ora maris* 177 182
37. *minorati sumus] minimi facti sumus* 177 182 with AU      *prae omnibus gentibus] prae omnes nationes* 177 (cf. AU *nationibus*); *inter ceteras gentes* 182      omission of *omnem* before *terram* (as in 182) and of *nostra* after *peccata* 177 (182 reads *nostra*)
38. *oblatio] supplicationes* 177 with AU; 182 omits *neque sacrificium neque oblatio* by accident (*neque*  $\widehat{\text{neque}}$ )      omission of *neque oblationes* 177 with 330      *miserencordiam* 182] + *tuam* 177
39. omission of *contribulata* 177 182      *humiliationis] humilitatis* 177 182 with AU
40. *quasi in holocaustis] ut in holocaustomatibus* 177 182 with AU      *subsequentes* with 176 182] *sequentes* 177      *non est] non erit* 177 182      *confusio* 182] *turpitudine* 177      *qui confidunt in te] qui in te confidunt* 177 182
42. *modestiam/maiestatem] tranquillitatem* 177 182      *miserationum tuarum* 182] *miserencordiae tuae* 177 with AU
44. *confundantur] vereantur* 177 with AU; *revereantur* 182
45. *cognoscant] sciant* 177 182 with AU      *in omni orbe terrarum] in universo orbe terrae* 177 182 with AU

### ***The song of Divine Transcendence***

Ph. Bernard, in his study of the Canticle of the Three Young Men in Western liturgical repertoires<sup>72</sup>, distinguishes two sections in the Canticle of Daniel: the Canticle of Creatures (3:57-88) and a piece he calls the Canticle of Divine Transcendence (3:52-55). He has shown that in the liturgical repertoires he has studied<sup>73</sup>, the vast majority of manuscripts include the entire Canticle of Creatures, and the overwhelming majority of these are French, Aquitanian and Spanish manuscripts.

However, from the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, German liturgical manuscripts substituted the hymn of Divine Transcendence for this hymn. This piece can only be secondary: not only is it very shortened, but the deleted verses have been replaced by passages borrowed or inspired from other biblical books. Indeed, the words *benedictus es qui ambulat super pennas ventorum* come from Ps 103:3 (cf. Ps 17:11), and the phrase *benedictus es super sceptrata divinitatis tuae*

<sup>72</sup> BERNARD 1993.

<sup>73</sup> He lists 62 of them on pp. 237-240.



is distantly inspired by Ezek 20:37 or even Wis 10:13-14<sup>74</sup>. This composition, however, predates the 11<sup>th</sup> century, since it is attested by the Milanese Psalters of the recension with diacritical marks, VL 405 406 407, which all three date from the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century<sup>75</sup>. It will later be found in the Ambrosian *Manualia* of the cathedral office from the 11<sup>th</sup> century onwards (VL 400 401 402), where it introduces the morning office from the period of Ambrose<sup>76</sup>. However, as late as the ninth century, it does not appear in the main witness of the Milanese recension of Simeon, VL 408, which gives the authentic biblical text of verses 52-56. Schneider assumes that Simeon can not have known this piece<sup>77</sup>. But could we not consider that the author of this recension rejected this piece in order to return to the biblical text? This hypothesis is not implausible when one knows that he made two other important changes: he continued the canticle of the creatures until v. 90 and preceded it with the canticle of Azariah (3:25-51). As Bernard points out, the canticle of the creatures was also supplanted at the Four-Times by an *Alleluia benedictus es (domine deus patrum nostrorum et laudabilis in saecula)* (Dan 3:52) and by an *Omnipotentem semper adorent*, a poetic composition paraphrasing the text of the canticle by Walafrid Strabon (d. 849)<sup>78</sup>.

The Canticle of Divine Transcendence does not really fit into the framework of an edition of the Old Latin versions of Daniel, since this free composition incorporates elements borrowed from other passages of the Bible. Here, however, is the text of the canticle edited on the basis of the Ambrosian witnesses VL 400 401 402 405 406 407<sup>79</sup>. The lemma is that of 405 406 407.

*hymnus trium puerorum*

*benedictus es domine deus patrum nostrorum*

*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*

*et benedictum nomen gloriae tuae quod est sanctum*

*et laudabile et superexaltatum (gloriosum 400 401 402) in saecula*

*benedictus es in templo sancto gloriae tuae*

*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*

*benedictus es super sedem sanctam deitatis tuae*

*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*

*benedictus es super thronum sanctum regni tui*

*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*

*benedictus es super scepra divinitatis tuae*

*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*

*benedictus es qui sedes super cherubim et seraphim*

*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*

*benedictus es qui ambulas super pennas ventorum et super undas maris*

<sup>74</sup> This passage from the book of Wisdom combines the mention of the scepter (in the singular, v. 14) and that of the pit (v. 13) (I thank P. Bogaert who drew my attention to this last reference). FERRETTI 1937, p. 213.

<sup>75</sup> SCHNEIDER 1938, pp. 70-74 studied the use of the danielic canticle at the Four-Times and leaned towards a late milanese insertion of this piece for which he assumed however a greek model called *tractus*.

<sup>76</sup> The Creature's Song is sung on Sunday. See SCHNEIDER 1938, pp. 9-10 and 100-101.

<sup>77</sup> SCHNEIDER 1938, p. 74.

<sup>78</sup> Ph. Bernard says « Au total, à partir du XI<sup>ème</sup> siècle, le ‘Cantique des créatures’ a été, dans trois mss. sur quatre, éliminé par trois rivaux: aux Quatre-Temps du quatrième mois, quand ils étaient rattachés à la semaine octave de la Pentecôte, par un *Alleluia Benedictus es*; aux Quatre-Temps de septembre, par *Omnipotentem*; aux deux autres Quatre-Temps, par le ‘Cantique de la transcendance’, principalement en Allemagne. C’est aux Quatre-Temps du premier mois qu’il a le mieux résisté, notamment dans les mss. français, aquitains et espagnols » (pp. 240-241).

<sup>79</sup> The refrain *et laudabilis et superexaltatus in saecula* is sometimes noted in an abbreviated form that is not reported here.

*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*  
*(var. + benedicite omnia opera domini domino)*  
*benedicant te omnes angeli et sancti tui*  
*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*  
*(+ benedicant te omnes angeli et sancti tui*  
*et laudabilis et superexaltatus in saecula 407\*)*  
*benedicant te caeli terra mare et omnia quae in eis sunt*  
*et laudabilis et superexaltatus (gloriosus 400 401 402) in saecula*

In conclusion, of the three hymns transmitted by the Latin tradition in connection with the supplement to chapter 3 of Daniel, only that of Azariah (3:26-45) contributes significantly to the illumination of the types of text. Indeed, the canticle of the Three Young Men (3:57-88[90]), with its rudimentary syntax and boilerplate vocabulary, varies very little in either direct or indirect tradition (the rare patristic quotations are unusable). The canticle of Divine Transcendence (3:52-56) must be left out of the edition. On the other hand, the variety of vocabulary of the direct and indirect witnesses, together with the fact that several ecclesiastical writers quote at length or comment on the text of the canticle of Azarias, will make it possible to write, for this one, at least three of the major lines usual in Beuron's edition (not counting the vulgate **V** line which closes the scheme of the edition). For vv. 37-42, Cyprian's text will be noted in major line **K**, representing the type of ancient African text (middle of the third century). The text transmitted by 7 250 330 Verecundus and Fulgentius may be given the siglum **C**, reserved for late African authors. The text of witnesses 176 177 (whose wording is close to that of Lucifer of Cagliari in other passages of the book of Daniel), as well as 182, will be identified by the abbreviation **D** corresponding to the European text of around 350 CE. Augustine's text differs considerably from the late African text; it is not, however, identical with the European text of the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century, although it shares some lessons with it. The particular wording of his text will allow for a major line **A**.

### 5. *Text types*

The analysis of the Canticle of Azariah had made it possible to identify four main types of Old Latin text (**K C D** and **A**). And what about the rest of the book, especially in the parts common to Hebrew and Greek? In indirect tradition, three passages of the book are abundantly quoted in patristic literature: the vision of the four beasts and the son of man in chapter 7, the prophecy of the seventy weeks at the end of chapter 9 and the announcement of the resurrection at the beginning of chapter 12. It is mainly thanks to these passages that it has been possible to lay the groundwork for the history of the Old Latin text of Daniel. It shall be seen that, even if the Church uses the text of Theodotion, as Jerome affirms, there are still numerous traces of the use of the Septuagint text in the oldest Latin authors<sup>80</sup>.

#### *The origins*

The oldest traces of the Old Latin text of Daniel are to be found, in the second century, in the Latin translations of the *Pastor of Hermas* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and in the third in Tertullian and Victorinus of Pettau.

The so-called vulgate version of the *Pastor of Hermas* contains two allusions to Daniel:

---

<sup>80</sup> See BURKITT 1896, pp. 18-25. Burkitt worked on older editions, but his conclusions remain valid. The examples reported by Burkitt are included in ZIEGLER, MUNNICH, FRAENKEL 1999, pp. 96-100.

6:22: *propter hoc misit dominus angelum suum qui est super bestias cuius nomen est Hegrin, et obturavit os eius ne te dilaniaret* (HER V vis 4,2). Two contacts with the text of θ' are recognized: *obturare* for ἐμφράσω and *dilaniare* for λυμαίνομαι (*vexare* in 176). *Hegrin*, which could not be the name of the angel, but that of one of the beasts (despite the construction of the sentence), could be a distortion of the adjective ἄγριος that qualifies the beasts in 4:22 (μετὰ θηρίων ἀγρίων ἔσται ἡ κατοικία σου).

9:20: *coepti orare dominum et confiteri peccata mea* (HER V vis 1,1). The vocabulary is too general.

Probably made in Africa, the Latin translation of the *Epistle of Barnabas* is the first witness in the Latin world to use two of the most famous Danielic prophecies: the vision of the four beasts in chapter 7 and the prophecy of the seventy weeks in chapter 9. With the exception of the latter passage, they are all introduced explicitly as coming from Daniel:

7:7-8: *et vidi quartam bestiam nequam et fortem et saeviozem ceteris bestiis marinis et apparuerunt illi decem cornua et ascendit aliud cornu breve in medio illorum et deiecit cornua tria de maioribus cornibus* (BAR 4,5 [29,12])

7:24: *regna in terris decem regnabunt, et resurget retro pusillus rex qui deponet tres in unum de regibus* (BAR 4,4 [29,6])

9:24: *consummata enim temptatio, de qua scriptum est sicut Danihel dicit, adpropinquavit. propter hoc enim dominus intercidit tempora et dies ut adceleret dilectus illius ad hereditatem suam* (BAR 4,3 [28,23])

9:24ss: *et erit septimo die consummato aedificabitur templum deo praeclare in nomine domini* (BAR 16,6 [87,4])

In reality, these are more like free quotations. The three terms used to describe the fourth beast - *nequam, fortis, saevus* - do not exactly match the adjectives in the two forms of the Greek (φοβερός in ο' and φοβερός, ἔκθαμβος, ἰσχυρός θ'); only *fortis* matches the ἰσχυρός of θ'. Note also these other points of contact with Theodotion: *resurgere* (θ' ἀναστήσεται, ο' στήσεται) in 7:24 and *intercidere* (θ' συνετημήθησαν, ο' ἐκρίθησαν) in 9:24. It is not impossible that these free quotations, which rely on the text of Theodotion, come from collections of *testimonia*, as R. Gryson has assumed in his edition of Isaiah<sup>81</sup>. The lessons of Barnabas Latin will appear in the apparatus and not in the schema.

With Tertullian (TE, X text), the ground is more assured. We must distinguish here between the authentic Tertullian works, the *Adversus Marcionem* (between 207 and 211), the *De ieiunio* (ca. 210/211), the *Adversus Praxean* (ca. 210/211) and the *Scorpiace* (ca. 211/212), and a somewhat older work whose authenticity is in question, at least for its biblical quotations, namely the *Adversus Iudaeos* (dated 197). According to Burkitt and Munnich, Tertullian usually follows the ο' text (in one case according to a quotation from Justin), but from time to time his text corresponds to that of θ'. Here are the passages on which this assertion rests: 1:17; 3:16b-18.92; 7:10.13-14; 9:1a.3c.21.23b; 10:1a.2-3.11a.12. We will comment on only a few of them below.

	ο'	θ'	TE sco 8
3:16	οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχομεν ἀποκριθῆναι σοι ἐπὶ τῆ ἐπιταγῇ ταύτῃ	οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου ἀποκριθῆναι σοι	<i>non habemus necessitatem respondendi huic tuo imperio</i>
3:17	ἔστι γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἷς κύριος ἡμῶν, ὃν φοβούμεθα, ὃς ἐστι δυνατὸς ἐξελεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς καμίνου τοῦ πυρός, καὶ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, βασιλεῦ, ἐξελεῖται ἡμᾶς	ἔστι γὰρ θεός, ὃ ἡμεῖς λατρεύομεν, δυνατὸς ἐξελεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς καμίνου τοῦ πυρός τῆς καιομένης, καὶ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, βασιλεῦ, ῥύσεται ἡμᾶς	<i>est enim deus noster, quem colimus, potens eruere nos de fornace ignis et ex manibus tuis</i>

<sup>81</sup> GRYSOY 1987-1997, p. 16.

3:18	καὶ τότε φανερόν σοι ἔσται, ὅτι οὔτε τῷ εἰδώλῳ σου λατρεύομεν οὔτε τῇ εἰκόνι σου τῇ χρυσεῖ, ἣν ἔστησας, προσκυνοῦμεν	καὶ ἐὰν μή, γνωστὸν ἔστω σοι, βασιλεῦ, ὅτι τοῖς θεοῖς σου οὐ λατρεύομεν καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι, ἣ ἔστησας, οὐ προσκυνοῦμεν	<i>et tunc manifestum fiet tibi quod neque idolo tuo famulabimur, nec imaginem tuam auream quam statuisti adorabimus</i>
	ο΄	θ΄	TE Prax 3
7:10	χιλία χιλιάδες ἐθεράπευον αὐτὸν καὶ μύρια μυριάδες παρεστήκεισαν αὐτῷ	χιλία χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ, καὶ μύρια μυριάδες παρεστήκεισαν αὐτῷ	<i>milies centies centena milia assistebant ei, et milies centena milia apparebant ei</i>
	ο΄	θ΄	TE Marc 3,7
7:13	καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἔως παλαιοῦ ἡμερῶν παρήν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ	καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος καὶ ἔως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασε καὶ προσήχθη αὐτῷ	<i>et ecce cum nubibus caeli tamquam filius hominis veniens, venit usque ad veterem dierum, aderat in conspectu eius, et qui assistebant adduxerunt illum</i>
7:14	καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία βασιλική, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα λατρεύουσα αὐτῷ, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἣτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἣτις οὐ μὴ φθαρή	καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ πάντες οἱ λαοί, φυλαί, γλῶσσαι δουλεύουσιν αὐτῷ· ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἣτις οὐ παρελεύσεται, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ διαφθαρήσεται	<i>et data est ei potestas regia, et omnes nationes terrae secundum genera et omnis gloria famulabunda, et potestas eius usque in aevum quae non auferetur, et regnum eius quod non vitiabitur</i>
			<i>(+ et data est illi regia potestas et universae nationes et gloria omnis serviens illi</i>
			<i>et potestas eius aeterna quae non auferetur et regnum eius quod non corrumpetur TE Marc 4,39)</i>
	ο΄	θ΄	TE je 10
9:21	καὶ ἔτι λαλοῦντός μου ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ μου καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῷ ὑπνῳ μου τὴν ἀρχὴν, Γαβριηλ, τάχει φερόμενος προσήγγισέ μοι ἐν ὧρα θυσίας ἐσπερινῆς	καὶ ἔτι ἐμοῦ λαλοῦντος ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ Γαβριηλ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ὁράσει ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ, πετόμενος καὶ ἦσατό μοι ὡσεὶ ὧραν θυσίας ἐσπερινῆς	<i>et adhuc loquente me in oratione, ecce vir quem videram in somnis initio, velociter volans appropinquavit mihi quasi hora vespertini sacrificii</i>
	ο΄	θ΄	TE je 9
10:1	ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ πρώτῳ Κύρου βασιλέως Περσῶν	ἐν ἔτει τρίτῳ Κύρου βασιλέως Περσῶν	<i>anno tertio Cyri regis Persarum</i>
10:2	ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐγὼ Δανιηλ ἤμην πενθῶν (τρεις εβδομαδας)	ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐγὼ Δανιηλ ἤμην πενθῶν τρεῖς εβδομάδας ἡμέρων	<i>in illis diebus ego Daniel eram lugens per tres hebdomadas</i>
10:3	ἄρτον ἐπιθυμιῶν οὐκ ἔφαγον, καὶ κρέας καὶ οἶνος οὐκ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου, ἔλαιον οὐκ ἠλειψάμην ἕως τοῦ συντελέσαι με τρεῖς εβδομάδας τῶν ἡμερῶν	ἄρτον ἐπιθυμιῶν οὐκ ἔφαγον, καὶ κρέας καὶ οἶνος οὐκ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου, καὶ ἄλειμμα οὐκ ἠλειψάμην ἕως πληρώσεως τριῶν ἐβδομάδων ἡμερῶν	<i>panem suavem non edi, caro et vinum non introierunt in os meum, oleo unctus non sum donec consummarentur tres hebdomades</i>
10:11	Δανιηλ, ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινὸς εἶ	Δανιηλ ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν	<i>Daniel, homo es miserabilis</i>
10:12	μὴ φοβοῦ, Δανιηλ· ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πρώτης, ἣς ἔδοκας τὴν διάνοιάν σου διανοηθῆναι καὶ ταπεινωθῆναι ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου σου, εἰσηκούσθη τὸ ῥήμα σου, καὶ ἐγὼ εἰσῆλθον ἐν τῷ ῥήματί σου	μὴ φοβοῦ, Δανιηλ· ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας, ἣς ἔδοκας τὴν καρδίαν σου τοῦ συνιέναι καὶ κακωθῆναι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ σου, ἠκούσθησαν οἱ λόγοι σου, καὶ ἐγὼ ἤλθον ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου	<i>ne timueris, quoniam ex die prima qua dedisti animam tuam recogitavi et humiliationi coram deo, exauditum est verbum tuum, et ego introvi verbo tuo</i>

Table 8: Tertullian

In spite of the freer character of the translation of 3:17 or the few concordances of detail with the text of Theodotion, it is clear that TE follows the LXX text in 3:16-18.

The quotation from 7:10 is characterized by the inversion μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ ... χίλια χιλιάδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ, which he alone attests in the Old Latin tradition. However, we read the inversion of the numbers μύριαι μυριάδες ... χίλια χιλιάδες in Greek in Clement of Rome, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyril of Alexandria, who quote the verse freely. The inversion is likely explained by the influence of the text of Rev 5:11 (μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων). The translation of λειτουργέω by *apparere* will appear again only in Tyconius<sup>82</sup>, but without the inversion of the numbers: *milies milia apparebant illi* (TY 5). This is a sign of the antiquity of the latter's translation.

In 7:13, two readings bring TE closer to the Theodotion translation: *cum* (= μετά; ο' ἐπί) and *veniens* (= ἐρχόμενος; ο' ἦρχετο). The reading *et aderat in conspectu eius et qui adsistebant adduxerunt illum (eum)* is an exact quotation of the Greek text ο' as it appears in Justin : καὶ παρῆν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτόν (Dial. 31,3) instead of παρῆν καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ. We thus have in the West a partial<sup>83</sup> reflection of the text that was current in the East in the first half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. Tertullian even attests to a double lesson since παρῆν is already rendered earlier as *venit*.

The first quotation from 7:14 corresponds exactly to the LXX text. Of particular note is the expression *famulabunda* to render λατρεύουσα αὐτῷ, an expression that TE is the only one to use for this passage in the entire Old Latin tradition, and which is a hapax in Latin literature. In 3:18 the Greek verb was rendered *famulari* (TE sco 8). The discrepancies between the quotations are not explained by different forms of an already fixed Latin biblical text, but rather by the freedom of Tertullian to translate the Greek text directly. This is indicated in particular by the use of the synonymous expressions *omnes nationes - universae nationes, serviens illi - famulabunda, aeterna - usque in aevum, corruptetur - vitiabitur*.

In 9:21 where TE follows the text ο', there is a similarity to that of θ' in the translation *volans*. The name of the angel is omitted in TE.

*Anno tertio* in 10:1 corresponds to the text θ'.

In 10:3, *donec consummarentur* translates exactly the text ο'. Note in TE the absence of a translation of the word (τῶν) ἡμερῶν, a word omitted in Papyrus 967.

In 10:11-12, TE translates the text ο' except for the expression *coram deo* which corresponds to the text θ'.

The *Adversus Iudaeos* attributed to him also contains large sections of the Latin text of Daniel, especially chapters 7 and 9. And it is sometimes possible to establish a comparison with other works of Tertullian (cf. supra). Two quotations will be taken as examples:

	ο'	θ'	TE Jud 14 (cf TE Marc 3,7)
7:13	καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ἕως παλαιοῦ ἡμερῶν παρῆν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ	καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐφθασε καὶ προσήχθη αὐτῷ	<i>et ecce cum nubibus caeli quamquam filius hominis veniens, venit usque ad veterem dierum et aderat in conspectu eius, et qui adsistebant adduxerunt eum</i>
7:14	καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία βασιλική, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα λατρεύουσα αὐτῷ· καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἣτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἣτις οὐ μὴ φθαρή	καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ πάντες οἱ λαοί, φυλαί, γλῶσσαι δουλεύουσιν αὐτῷ· ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία	<i>et data est illi potestas regia et omnis terra secundum genus et omnis gloria serviens ei, et potestas eius aeterna</i>

<sup>82</sup> However, see Munnich's remark in ZIEGLER, MUNNICH, FRAENKEL 1999, pp. 96-97.

<sup>83</sup> Partial, because the text of TE does not correspond exactly to the text of Dan 7:9-28 quoted at length by Justin in Dial. 31,3.

		αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ παρελεύσεται, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ διαφθαρήσεται	<i>quae non auferetur, et regnum eius quod non corrumpetur</i>
			TE Jud 8
9:21	καὶ ἔτι λαλοῦντός μου ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ μου καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ μου τὴν ἀρχὴν, Γαβριηλ, τάχει φερόμενος προσήγγισέ μοι ἐν ὥρᾳ θυσίας ἑσπερινῆς.	καὶ ἔτι ἐμοῦ λαλοῦντος ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ Γαβριηλ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ὄρασει ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ, πετόμενος καὶ ἤψατό μου ὡσεὶ ὥραν θυσίας ἑσπερινῆς.	<i>et adhuc me loquente in oratione, ecce vir Gabriel quem vidi in visione in principio, volans et tetigit me quasi hora sacrificii vespertini</i> (cf. TE je 10 supra)
9:22	καὶ προσήλθε καὶ ἐλάλησε μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ εἶπε Δανιηλ, ἄρτι ἐξῆλθον ὑποδείξαι σοι διάνοιαν.	καὶ συνέτισέ με καὶ ἐλάλησε μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ εἶπε Δανιηλ, νῦν ἐξῆλθον συμβιβᾶσαι σε σύνεσιν.	<i>et intellegere fecit me et locutus est mecum et dixit: Daniel, nunc exivi imbue te intelligentiam</i>
9:23	ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς δεήσεώς σου ἐξῆλθε πρόσταγμα παρὰ κυρίου, καὶ ἐγὼ ἦλθον ὑποδείξαι σοι, ὅτι ἐλεεινὸς εἶ καὶ διανοήθητι τὸ πρόσταγμα.	ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς δεήσεώς σου ἐξῆλθε λόγος, καὶ ἐγὼ ἦλθον τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι σοι, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν εἶ καὶ ἐννοήθητι ἐν τῷ ῥήματι καὶ σῦνες ἐν τῇ ὄπτασίᾳ.	<i>in principio obsecrationis tuae exivit sermo, et ego veni ut adnuntiem tibi quia vir desideriorum tu es. et cogita in verbo et intellege in visione</i>
9:24	ἑβδομήκοντα ἑβδομάδες ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου ἐκρίθησαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν Σιων συντελεσθῆναι τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τὰς ἀδικίας σπανίσαι καὶ ἀπολεῖψαι τὰς ἀδικίας καὶ διανοηθῆναι τὸ ὄραμα καὶ δοθῆναι δικαιοσύνην αἰώνιον	ἑβδομήκοντα ἑβδομάδες συνετημήθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ συντελεσθῆναι ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τοῦ σφραγίσαι ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ ἐξυλάσασθαι ἀδικίας καὶ τοῦ ἀγαγεῖν δικαιοσύνην αἰώνιον	<i>septuaginta ebdomades breviatae sunt super plebem tuam et super civitatem sanctam quoadusque inveteretur delictum ut signentur peccata, et exorentur iniustitiae, et inducatur iustitia aeterna,</i>
	καὶ συντελεσθῆναι τὸ ὄραμα καὶ εὐφρᾶναι ἅγιον ἁγίων.	καὶ τοῦ σφραγίσαι ὄρασιν καὶ προφήτην καὶ τοῦ χρίσαι ἅγιον ἁγίων.	<i>ut et signentur visio et prophetes, et ut unguatur sanctus sanctorum</i>
9:25	καὶ διανοηθῆσιν καὶ εὐφρανθῆσιν καὶ εὐρήσεις προστάγματα ἀποκριθῆναι καὶ οἰκοδομήσεις Ἱερουσαλημ πόλιν κυρίῳ	καὶ γνώσῃ καὶ συνήσεις· ἀπὸ ἐξόδου λόγου τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι καὶ τοῦ οἰκοδομήσαι Ἱερουσαλημ ἕως χριστοῦ ἡγουμένου ἑβδομάδες ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑβδομάδες ἐξήκοντα δύο· καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ οἰκοδομηθήσεται πλατεῖα καὶ τεῖχος, καὶ ἐκκενωθήσονται οἱ καιροί.	<i>et scies et percipies et intelleges: a profecione sermonis integrando et aedificando Hierusalem usque ad christum duces ebdomades sexaginta et duae et dimidia. et convertet et aedificabitur in latitiam et convallationem, et innovabuntur tempora</i>
9:26	καὶ μετὰ ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ἐξήκοντα δύο ἀποσταθήσεται χρίσμα καὶ οὐκ ἔσται, καὶ βασιλεὺς ἐθνῶν φθереῖ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον μετὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ἤξει ἡ συντέλεια αὐτοῦ μετ' ὀργῆς καὶ ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας· ἀπὸ πολέμου πολεμηθήσεται.	καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἑβδομάδας τὰς ἐξήκοντα δύο ἐξολεθρευθήσεται χρίσμα, καὶ κρίμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ· καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον διαφθερεῖ σὺν τῷ ἐρχομένῳ, καὶ ἐκκοπήσονται ἐν κατακλισμῷ, καὶ ἕως τέλους πολέμου συντετημένον ἀφανισμοί.	<i>et post ebdomadas has LX et II semis exterminabitur unctio et non erit, et civitatem et sanctum exterminabit cum duce adveniente, et concidentur quomodo (sicut) in cataclysmo usque in finem belli quod concidetur usque ad interitum</i>
9:27	καὶ δυναστεύσει εἰς πολλοὺς ἡ διαθήκη, καὶ πάλιν ἐπιστρέψει καὶ ἀνοικοδομηθήσεται εἰς πλάτος καὶ μήκος· καὶ κατὰ συντέλειαν καιρῶν [καὶ μετὰ ἐτῶν	καὶ δυναμώσει διαθήκην πολλοῖς, ἑβδομάς μία·	<i>et confirmabit testamentum in multis ebdomada una,</i>

<p>ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καιροὺς καὶ ἐξήκοντα δύο καιροὺς] [ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας πολέμου καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἐρήμωσις] [ἐν τῷ κατισχυῶσαι τὴν διαθήκην ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἑβδομάδας·] καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἀρθήσεται ἡ θυσία καὶ ἡ σπονδή, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων ἔσται ἕως συντελείας <u>καιροῦ</u>, καὶ συντέλεια δοθήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρήμωσιν.</p>	<p>καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἀρθήσεται θυσία καὶ σπονδή, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων, καὶ ἕως συντελείας (+ καιροῦ Ziegler), καὶ συντέλεια δοθήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρήμωσιν.</p>	<p><i>et dimidia ebdomadis aufertur meum sacrificium et libatio, et in sancto exsecratio vastationis, et usque ad finem <u>temporis</u> consummatio dabitur super hanc vastationem</i></p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 9: Tertullian's *Adversus Iudaeos*

Let us begin by comparing the quotations of the *Adversus Iudaeos* with those of Tertullian's other works. In 7:13-14 and 9:21, the two quotations of Tertullian differ. One will note in particular the following variations.

7:14 *omnis terra] omnes nationes terrae: = ο' secundum genus] secundum genera: = ο' serviens ei: = ο'] famulabunda corruptetur] vitiabitur*

9:21 *Gabriel] om.: = θ' vidi] videram in visione: = θ'] in somnis: cf. ο' in principio] initio + velociter: = ο' tetigit me: = θ'] appropinquavit mihi: = ο' sacrificii vespertini] vespertini sacrificii*

As for the rest, the quotations from the *Adversus Iudaeos* are largely based on the text of Theodotion, as the many underlined words in the table indicate. I have only noted a few places where readings clearly correspond to the text of the LXX or come close to it:

7:13 *qui adsistebant adduxerunt eum*

7:14 *omnis terra: cf. πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς secundum genus: cf. κατὰ γένη omnis gloria serviens ei auferetur quod non corruptetur*

9:26 *non erit:* but with witnesses of the Lucianic recension and of chains.

9:27 *temporis:* with all manuscripts and versions of the text of Theodotion (the edited text is based on a conjecture by Ziegler).

The works of Tertullian also contain numerous allusions to the text of Daniel (2:34-35; 3:15.21; 4:29; 6:10.16.23; 7:13-14; 9:24-27; 10:14; 12:4; 13:7.32). Let us review them, distinguishing between works of indisputable authenticity and *Adversus Iudaeos*:

3:15 + 6:16 *vetus quidem oratio et ab ignibus et a bestiis et ab inedia liberabat* (TE or 29,1 [274]). The word πῦρ is attested by both Greek texts.

3:21 *qui tres sanctos in fornace Babylonii regis orantes cum sarabaris et tiaris suis exaudivit* (TE or 15,2 [265]); *quod Babylonii ignes trium fratrum nec tiaras nec sarabaras, quamquam Iudaeis alienas, laeserunt* (TE res 58 [119,4]). Although the word σαράβαρα recurs in both θ' and ο' in 3:94, the use of the term joined to that of τιάρα appears only in θ' 3:21 (σὺν τοῖς σαραβάροις αὐτῶν καὶ τιάραις; ο' ἔχοντες τὰ ὑποδήματα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς τιάρας).

4:29 *peccator restituendo sibi institutam a domino exomologesin sciens praeteribit illam, quae Babylonium regem in regna restituit? diu enim paenitentiam domino immolarat septenni squalore exomologesin operatus, unguium leoninum in modum efferatione et capilli incuria horrorem aquilinum praeferente* (TE pae 12,7 [169,22]). The mention of the seven years is found throughout the Greek.

6:10 *bonum tamen sit aliquam constituere praesumptionem, quae et orandi admonitionem constringat et quasi lege ad tale munus extorqueat a negotiis interdum, ut, quod Danieli quoque legimus observatum utique ex Israelis disciplina, ne minus ter die saltem adoremus, debitores trium* (TE or 25,5 [272]). The prayer three

times a day is common to both Greek texts, but *ter die* seems closer to the text ο' (τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας; θ' καιροῦς τρεῖς τῆς ἡμέρας).

6:23 *non roris angelum in mediis ignibus sistit nec ora leonibus obstruit nec esurientibus rusticorum prandium transfert, nullum sensum passionis delegata gratia avertit, sed patientes et sentientes et dolentes sufferentia instruit, virtute ampliat gratiam, ut sciat fides, quid a domino consequatur, intellegens quid pro dei nomine patiatur* (TE or 29,1 [274,6]). Nothing can be derived from this single allusion to the mouths of lions.

7:13 *filio hominis veniente in nubibus* (TE Marc 3,24 [421,25]); *ecce cum caeli nubibus filius hominis adveniens* (TE Marc 4,39 [556,2]); *filius hominis* (TE Marc 4,41 [562,11]); *filius hominis veniens cum caeli nubibus* (TE Marc 4,10 [448,1]); *et ecce super nubes tanquam filius hominis* (TE car 15 [272,10]). The use of the preposition *cum* certainly brings two of these allusions closer to the text of θ' (μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν; ο' ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν), but it is not clear that Tertullian is referring to the text of Daniel rather than to the parallel passages of the New Testament (Mt 24:30; 26:64; Mk 13:26; Lk 21:27) whose influence will be exerted throughout the Old Latin tradition where the three prepositions *cum*, *in* and *super* will constantly return. The inversion *caeli nubibus* is found once again in Augustine (AU tri 2,33); this meeting is of no consequence, it may be the fruit of chance. Tertullian's freedom is also evident in the choice of the verb *advenire* in the second allusion.

7:14 *et data est illi regia potestas...et universae nationes...et gloria omnis serviens illi, et potestas eius aeterna quae non aufertur, et regnum eius quod non corrumpetur* (TE Marc 4,39 [556,3]). This text, very close to a quotation, corresponds to the text ο' (cf. table above). One will observe however that it differs from the quotation of TE Mark 3,7 (cf. table) to approach by places the quotation of TE Jud 14: *gloria omnis serviens illi...aeterna...aufertur...quod non corrumpetur*.

10:11+10:14 *veni demonstrare tibi quatenus miserabilis es* (TE je 7 [283,19]). The allusion combines two passages of the ο' text: *veni demonstrare tibi* refers to v. 14 (ἦλθον ὑποδείξαι σοι; θ' ἦλθον συνετίσαι σε) and *miserabilis es* to v. 11 (ἄνθρωπος ἐλεινὸς εἶ; θ' ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμῶν).

13:7 *ceterum in stadio mariti non putem velatam deambulasse quae placuit* (TE cor 4 [159,18]). Throughout the story of Susanna, both Greek texts use the term παράδεισος to refer to the garden. Only the text ο' uses the word στάδιον in v. 37, which is found here in the expression *in stadio mariti*.

13:32 *si et Susanna in iudicio revelata* (TE cor 4 [159,14]). The verb *revelari* has the same correspondent in both texts (ο' ἀποκαλύψαι; θ' ἀποκαλυφθῆναι).

2:34-35 *cuius mons Christus est, sine manibus concidentium praecisus implens omnem terram apud Danielem ostensus* (TE Jud 3 [261,61]); *petra sane illa apud Danielem de monte praecisa, quae imaginem saecularium regnorum comminuet et conteret* (TE Jud 14 [325,19]). The use of *praecisus* corresponds more to θ' (ἀπεσχίσθη) than to ο' (ἐτμήθη). But it is clearly to the text of θ' (καὶ ἐπλήρωσε πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν) that the phrase *implens omnem terram* (ο' καὶ ἐπάταξε πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν) refers to. The first allusion adds *concidentium* after *sine manibus*: this addition will also be attested by Cyprian.

9:24 *animadvertamus igitur, terminum quomodo in verbo quoadus<que> praedicat LXX ebdomadas futuras* (TE Jud 8 [278,42]); *et manifestata est iustitia aeterna, et unctus est sanctus sanctorum, id est Christus, et signata est visio et prophetes (-tia T), et dimissa sunt peccata...quid est autem quod dicit signari (-re φTPNF) visum (visionem T) et prophetiam (-tam PNF)?* (TE Jud 8 [282,88]); *Daniel signari visionem et prophetiam dicebat* (TE Jud 11 [312,57]); *unde firmissime dicit adventum eius signare visum et prophetiam* (TE Jud 11 [312,61]); *ita septuaginta ebdomadibus conclusis et civitatem exterminatam et sacrificium et unctionem exinde cessare* (TE Jud 11 [313,67]). These allusions in *Adversus Iudaeos* all refer to the text of θ': anointing (τοῦ χρίσαι; ο' εὐφρᾶναι) of the holy of holies, sealing vision and prophet (prophecy).

9:25 *in quibus si reciperent eum, aedificabitur in latitudinem et longitudinem, et innovabuntur tempora* (TE Jud 8 [278,44]); *dicit enim ei <angelus:> et intellege et conice: a profectioe sermonis respondere me tibi haec (idem) videamus quid aliae VII et dimidia ebdomades...in quo actu sint adimpletae* (TE Jud 8 [279,59]); *recapitulavit et dixit: intra LX et II et dimidiam ebdomadas nasci illum et ungui sanctum sanctorum* (TE Jud 8 [278,48]). The first allusion is taken from the commentary which follows the quotation noted earlier in the table (TE Jud 8 [277,30]). Note that the translation of the text of θ' is different: here *aedificabitur in latitudinem et longitudinem*, there *aedificabitur in latitiam et convallationem*. The idea of renovation of times (*innovabuntur tempora*) rests on a variant of the text of θ' - ἐκκαινωθήσονται instead of ἐκκενωθήσονται - which Tertullian alone attests.



9:26(.27) *dicit enim Daniel et civitatem sanctam et sanctum exterminari <habere> cum duce venturo, et destrui pinnaculum usque ad interitum* (TE Jud 8 [275,4]); *ebdomades autem VII et dimidia, cum implerentur, pati habere, et civitatem et sanctum exterminari cum duce venturo, et destrui pinnaculum usque ad interitum post unam et dimidiam ebdomadam* (TE Jud 8 [278,50]); *cessaverunt illic libamina et sacrificia (cf vs 27)...nam et unctio illic exterminata est post <exterminationem uncti, hoc est post> passionem Christi, erat enim praedictum huius exterminium [exterminari illic unctionem]* (TE Jud 8 [285,131]). The use of the verb *exterminari* refers to the text of θ' (ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ... διαφθερεῖ) as well as ο' (φθερεῖ). The expression *cum duce venturo* (but *cum duce adveniente* in the quotation, cf. table above) is a fortuitous contact with the Vulgate. The quotation also used the words *usque ad interitum* to render the ἀφανισμομοί of θ'. These three allusions in *Adversus Iudaeos* thus agree with the Theodotion text; there is no indication of exclusive contact with the LXX text. For v. 27, the words *libamina* and *sacrificia* (but *sacrificium* and *libatio* in the quotation, cf. table above) have correspondents in both Greek texts.

In total, even in the allusions, the authentic Tertullian works are based on the LXX text, while the quotations from the *Adversus Iudaeos* correspond to the text of Theodotion. Only one exception has been found in 3:21, and there is some doubt about 6:10. In the allusions, the *Adversus Iudaeos* sometimes uses a different wording which is explained by the author's liberty in writing, and not by a different Greek model.

The commentary on the Apocalypse by Victorinus of Pettau (VICn Apc) dates from the end of the third century. As R. Gryson writes, the work "is situated halfway between scholias and an extended commentary"<sup>84</sup>. It does, however, contain some allusions to the book of Daniel, but above all three quotations:

Concerning the interpretation of the dream of the great statue in chapter 2, VICn summarizes vss 32-35, then quotes vss 38-40 and 43-44 (VICn Apc 21,3). The stone falls from the mountain without human intervention (*daniel dixit lapidem sine manibus excisum*), strikes the statue and reduces it to dust (*in pulverem redegerat*) before becoming a mountain that fills the whole earth. The expression *in pulverem redegerat* is to be compared to Tyconius (*in pulverem commoluisse*) and to v. 35.

Here is how VICn quotes vss 2:38-40: *tu es, inquit, caput aureum. et gens tua surget regnum aliud humilium te, et tertium regnum erit quod dominabitur totae terrae. quartum autem regnum durissimum et fortissimum tamquam ferrum quod domat omnia et omnem arborem excidit*. He is the only Old Latin witness in the passage. The words *gens tua* freely accommodates the Greek (ο' μετὰ σέ, θ' ὀπίσω σου). The words *durissimum and fortissimum*, where the Greek has only one adjective (ισχυρά), is a double reading. The last words, *et omnem arborem excidit*, translate the ο' text (καὶ πᾶν δένδρον ἐκκόπτων).

Vss 2:43-44 are rendered in this way: *et in novissimo tempore, inquit, tamquam testum ferro mixtum misceruntur homines et non erunt concordēs neque consentanei. et in illis temporibus suscitabit dominus deus regnum aliud, quod suscipient, inquit, sancti summi dei regnum* (cf. 7:18) *et regnum hoc alia gens non indagabit; namque deus percutiet et indagabit omnia regna terrae, et ipsud manebit in perpetuum*. Here also, despite the many adjustments, the contacts with ο' are to be noted: *non erunt concordēs neque consentanei* translates οὐκ ἔσονται δὲ ὁμονοῦντες οὐδὲ εὐνοοῦντες (θ' καὶ οὐκ ἔσονται προσκολλώμενοι), *et in illis temporibus* καὶ ἐν χρόνοις (θ' καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις), *regnum aliud* βασιλείαν ἄλλην (θ' βασιλείαν) *et alia gens* ἄλλο ἔθνος (θ' λαῶ ἑτέρῳ *alteri populo*). The second *indagabit* may be explained by a confusion between λικμάω (winnow, *ventilare*) and ἰχνεύω (follow on the trail).

The quotation from 11:37, *ait enim Daniel: desiderium mulierum non cognoscet...et nullum deum patrum suorum cognoscet* (VICn Apc 13:3), follows more of the ο' text, but with the transposition ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ γυναικὸς οὐ προνοηθῆ...ἐπὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ προνοηθῆ of which, however, no trace is found in the Greek tradition.

---

<sup>84</sup> GRYSOΝ 2000-2003, p. 81.

The o' text is followed in 11:45: *et statuet, inquit, templum suum inter montem maris et duo maria* (VICn Apc 13:4). Indeed *statuet* translates στήσει (θ' πήξει, figet). But where does *et duo maria* come from?

The particular lessons of Victorinus of Pettau will be identified by the siglum Y.

### ***The Old African text (K)***

The Cyprian's quotations are too numerous to be able to analyze them all. A few examples consisting of long or repeated quotations may suffice to reach certain conclusions.

Apart from the canticle of Azariah, Cyprian quotes 3:16-18 four times (CY ep 6,3; ep 58; Fo 11; te 3,10) without any change. Other quotations are 2:31-35 (CY te 2,17), 6:23-27 (CY te 3,20), 7:13-14 (CY te 2,26) and 9:4-7 (CY lap 31).

2:31-35: <sup>31</sup> *et ecce imago nimis magna, et contemplatio eius imaginis metuenda et elata stabat contra te,* <sup>32</sup> *cuius caput fuit ex auro bono, pectus et brachia eius argentea, venter et femora aerea.* <sup>33</sup> *pedes autem ex parte quidem ferrei, ex parte autem fictiles,* <sup>34</sup> *quoadusque abscisus est lapis de monte sine manibus concidentium et percussit imaginem super pedes ferreos et fictiles et comminuit eos minutatim.* <sup>35</sup> *et factum est simul ferrum et testa et aeramentum et argentum et aurum, facta sunt minuta quasi palea aut pulvis in area aestate, et ventilavit illa ventus, ita ut nihil remanserit in illis, et lapis qui percussit imaginem factus est mons magnus et inplevit totam terram.* V. 31 corresponds more to the o' text than to the θ' text. The adverb *nimis* indeed appears only in o' (σφόδρα), and the construction of the end of the verse is reminiscent of the o' text, but with the inversion και ἡ πρόσοψις τῆς εἰκόνας φοβερά, ὑπερφερῆς εἰστήκει ἐναντίον σου. Instead, vss 32-34 follow o'. The o' text comes through more clearly under the wording of v. 35: *factum est* (ἐγένετο), inversion *ferrum et testa* (ὁ σίδηρος και τὸ σίδηρος ὄστρακον), *quasi palea* (ὡσεὶ ἀχύρου, but *aut pulvis* refers to the text θ'), *ventilavit illa ventus* (ἐρίπισεν αὐτὰ ὁ ἄνεμος).

3:16-18: <sup>16</sup> *responderunt autem Sedrac, Misac, Abdenago et dixerunt regi: Nabuchodonosor rex, non opus est nobis de hoc verbo (sermone QM) respondere tibi.* <sup>17</sup> *est enim deus cui nos servimus potens eripere nos de camino ignis ardentis, et de manibus tuis, rex, liberabit nos.* <sup>18</sup> *et si non, notum sit tibi quia diis tuis non deservimus et imaginem auream quam statuisti non adoramus.* In v. 16, the *autem* corresponds to the δε of the o' text, as does the word order *Nebuchadnezzer rex*. In contrast, the words *de hoc verbo (sermone)* have a correspondent only in θ' (περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος; ο': ἐπὶ τῇ ἐπιταγῇ ταύτῃ). V. 17 translates the text of θ'. So does v. 18, with the exception of the adjective *auream*, which has its correspondent in o' (τῇ χρυσοῦ).

6:23-27: <sup>23</sup> *et rex vehementer gavisus est et iussit Danihelum de lacu leonum eici, et nihil illi nocuerunt leones quia confidebat et crediderat deo suo.* <sup>24</sup> *et iussit rex, et perduxerunt illos homines qui accusaverunt Danihelum et miserunt illos in lacum leonum et uxores eorum et natos eorum, et antequam pervenirent in pavimentum lacus, adprehensi sunt a leonibus, et omnia ossa eorum comminuerunt.* <sup>25</sup> *tunc Darius rex scripsit: omnibus gentibus, tribubus, linguis qui sunt in regno meo, pax sit vobiscum a facie mea.* <sup>26</sup> *censeo ego ut hi omnes qui sunt in regno meo sint timentes et trementes deum summum cui servit Daniel, quia ipse est deus vivus et permanet in saecula, et regnum eius non transibit, et dominatio eius in perpetuum ambulabat.* <sup>27</sup> *et salvos facit et facit signa et prodigia mirabilia in caelo et in terra, qui eripuit Danihelum de lacu leonum.* Cyprian's text follows, but with some differences (transpositions, double readings, additions), the text of θ', with the exception of the words *nihil illi nocuerunt leones* in v. 23 which correspond to οὐ παρηνώγησαν αὐτῶ οἱ λέοντες of the o' text (θ': πᾶσα διαφθορὰ οὐχ εὐρέθη ἐν αὐτῶ).

7:13-14: <sup>13</sup> *videbam in visu nocte, et ecce in nubibus caeli quasi filius hominis veniens, venit usque ad veterem dierum et stetit in conspectu eius, et qui adsistebant obtulerunt eum.* <sup>14</sup> *et data est ei potestas regia, et omnes reges terrae per genus et omnis claritas serviens ei, et potestas eius aeterna quae non auferetur, et regnum eius non corrumpetur.* In v. 13 the preposition in *in nubibus* corresponds to ο' ἐπὶ (θ': μετά). The participle *veniens* translates the ἐρχόμενος of θ'. In contrast, the phrase *qui adsistebant obtulerunt eum* follows exactly the o' text (οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῶ). The Greek correspondents of v. 14 are to be looked for mostly in the o' text: ἐξουσία βασιλική (*potestas regia*), κατὰ γένη (*per genus*), πᾶσα δόξα (*omnis claritas*) and ἀρθῆ (*auferetur*).

9:4-7: <sup>4</sup> *domine deus magnus et fortis et metuendus, qui servas testamentum et miserationem eis qui te diligunt et conservant imperia tua,* <sup>5</sup> *peccavimus, facinus admisimus, impii fuimus, transgressi sumus ac deseruimus praecepta tua et iudicia tua,* <sup>6</sup> *non audivimus puerorum tuorum prophetarum quae (qui R) locuti sunt in nomine tuo super reges nostros et omnes gentes et super omnem terram.* <sup>7</sup> *tibi, domine, tibi iustitia, nobis autem confusio (+ faciei V).* On the whole, Cyprian's text follows the  $\theta'$  text (with an accidental omission in v. 6). One notes however contacts with  $\sigma'$ . Thus in v. 4 the series of adjectives *magnus et fortis et metuendus* corresponds to the  $\sigma'$  text (ὁ μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ὁ φοβερὸς;  $\theta'$ : ὁ μέγας καὶ θαυμαστός). The *puerorum* of v. 6 translates τῶν παίδων from  $\sigma'$  ( $\theta'$ : τῶν δούλων). The word is in the genitive to mimic the Greek; this same desire to mimic the Greek of  $\sigma'$  explains the reading *quae locuti sunt* (ἃ ἐλάλησαν;  $\theta'$ : οἱ ἐλάλουν).

In conclusion, Cyprian's quotations sometimes follow the text of Theodotion and sometimes the Septuagint. Some of the contacts with the Septuagint are far from negligible: the Septuagint is behind the translation of 2:35. He probably used a Latin translation of Daniel made on the basis of Septuagint, but already corrected on the text of Theodotion<sup>85</sup>. This characteristic will naturally be found in the works which copy Cyprian, in particular the *De errore profanarum religionum* of Firmicus Maternus (FIR err) which quotes 2:31-35 and 7:13-14, as well as the *Altercatio ecclesiae et synagogae* falsely attributed to Augustine (PS-AU alt) which quotes 12:4.

The old African text is also characterized by the use of particular vocabulary and expressions. Studies have been made of the Old Latin text of the Heptateuch, the Psalter, and the New Testament<sup>86</sup>. They can easily be completed by consulting the introductions to the volumes already published of Beuron's *Vetus Latina*. Here is the case for Daniel, where a comparison with other types of Old Latin text is possible ( $\neq$  separates Cyprian's reading from those of others):

13:2 καλή *formosa*  $\neq$  *bona* (D)

1:1 ἐπολιόρκει *expugnabat*  $\neq$  *obsidebat* (D)

2:31 πρόσοψις *contemplatio*  $\neq$  *effigies* (D) ὑπερφερής *elata*  $\neq$  *excelsa* (D)

2:32 χρυσίου χρηστοῦ *ex auro bono*  $\neq$  *ex auro suavi* (D)

2:34 εἰς τέλος *minutatim*  $\neq$  *usque ad finem* (D)

2:44 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας *in perpetuum*  $\neq$  *in aeternum* (D)

3:16 οὐδὲν χρεῖαν ἔχομεν *non opus est nobis*  $\neq$  *non habemus necessitatem* (X), *non necesse habemus, non habemus causam* (European texts)

3:17 λατρεύομεν *servimus* with D  $\neq$  *colimus* (X) ἐξελέσθαι *eripere*  $\neq$  *eruerere* (X), forms of *liberare* (European texts) ἐκ τῆς καμίνου *de camino*  $\neq$  *de fornace* (X D)

3:18 λατρεύομεν *servimus* with D  $\neq$  *famulabimur* (X)

3:38 θυσία *hostia*  $\neq$  *sacrificium* (C D) θυμίαμα *thus*  $\neq$  *incensum* (C), *supplicationes* (D)

3:39 προσδεχθῆμεν *acceptos nos habe*  $\neq$  *accipiamur* (C D)

3:40 πiónων *qui sunt pinguisissimi*  $\neq$  *pinguium* (C D) θυσία *hostia*  $\neq$  *sacrificium* (C D) ἐκτελέσαι *consummetur*  $\neq$  forms of *perficere* (C D) οὐκ ἔσται αἰσχύνη *non erubescet*  $\neq$  *non est confusio* (C), *non erit turpitude* (D)

3:42 μὴ κατασχύνῃς ἡμᾶς *ne nos in obprobrium tradas*  $\neq$  *ne confundas nos* (C D) τὴν ἐπιείκειαν *clementiam*  $\neq$  *maiestatem, modestiam* (C), *tranquillitatem, mansuetudinem* (D) τὸ πλῆθος *amplitudinem*  $\neq$  *multitudinem* (C D)

<sup>85</sup> BLUDAU 1897, p. 16.

<sup>86</sup> BILLEN 1927; CAPELLE 1913; VON SODEN 1909.

- 4:24 ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις *elemosynis* ≠ *miseriordiis* (European text) τοῖς παραπτώμασι *peccatis* ≠ *delictis* (D)
- 6:25 τοῖς λαοῖς *gentibus* ≠ *populis* (D)
- 6:26 διαφθαρήσεται *transibit* ≠ *corruptetur* (D) ἕως τέλους ἀντιλαμβάνεται *in perpetuum ambulabit* ≠ *usque ad finem permanet* (D)
- 6:27 ῥύεται *salvos faciet* ≠ *liberat* (D) τέρατα *prodigia et mirabilia* ≠ *ostenta* (D) ἐξείλατο *eripuit* ≠ *eruit/liberavit* (European texts)
- 7:13 ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασε *venit usque ad veterem dierum* with X ≠ *usque ad vetustum/antiquum dierum anticipavit/pervenit* (European texts)
- 7:14 αἰώνιος *aeterna* with X ≠ *perpetua* (D)
- 9:4 τὸ ἔλεος *miserationem* ≠ *miseriordiam* (European texts) τοῖς φυλάσσουσι τὰς ἐντολάς *eis qui conservant imperia* ≠ *servantibus praecepta* (European texts)
- 9:5 ἐξεκλίναμεν *deseruimus* ≠ *declinavimus* (European texts)
- 12:4 ἔμπραξον *muni* ≠ *obstrue* (D) διδαχθῶσι *discant* ≠ *doceantur* (D) πληθυνθῆ ἡ γνῶσις *inpleatur agnitio* ≠ *multiplicetur scientia* (D)
- 12:7 γνώσονται *cognoscent* ≠ *scient* (D)

Two contemporary works falsely attributed to Cyprian, the *Ad Novatianum* (PS-CY Nov, dated 253/7 or later) and the *De pascha computus* (PS-CY pa, dated 243) contain two quotations from Daniel. Their African origin, however, is not entirely certain. The first quotes Dan 7:9-10 (PS-CY Nov 17), the second 9:24-27 (PS-CY pa 13):

7:9-10: <sup>9</sup> *vidi...thronum positum, et vetustus dierum sedebat super eum, et vestitus eius erat tamquam nix, et capilli capitis illius tamquam lana alba. thronus illius flamma ignis, rotae illius ignis ardens.* <sup>10</sup> *flumen ignis prodibat ante eum, milia milium serviebant ei, et milium milia adsistebant illi. ad iudicium sedit, et libri aperti sunt.* The first words of v. 9 (*vidi thronum positum*) do not correspond exactly to any of the Greek texts (ο' θ': ἐθεόρουσαν ἕως ὅτου θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν). For the remaining, it is the text of θ' that is translated, but with some particular readings: additions of *super eum* and *erat*; the adjective *alba* is not noted after *nix*, but after *lana* (instead of *munda* or *candida*). In v. 10, it alone renders εἶλεκεν as *prodibat* (instead of *ducebat, currebat, percurrerat, trahebat*, etc.).

9:24-27: (*de ipsis enim angelum dei meminimus Danielo dixisse:*) <sup>24</sup> *LXX hebdomades breviatae sunt super populum tuum et super civitatem illam sanctam ut consummetur peccatum, et ut signentur peccata, et deleantur iniustitiae, et expientur iniustitiae, et ut reducatur iustitia aeterna, et ut signetur visio et prophetia, et ut ungueatur sanctum sanctorum.* <sup>25</sup> *et cognosces et intelliges: ab exitu sermonis, ut respondeatur et ut aedificetur Hierusalem usque ad christum ducem, hebdomades VII et hebdomades LXII, et convertetur, et aedificabitur platea et murus, et exinanientur tempora.* <sup>26</sup> *et post hebdomadas has LXII disperibit unctio, et iudicium non est in eo, et civitatem et illum sanctum corruptet cum illo duce qui veniet, et excidentur in cataclysmo, et usque ad finem belli breviati exterminii.* <sup>27</sup> *et confirmabit testamentum multis hebdomas una, et in dimidio hebdomadis auferetur meum sacrificium et libatio, et super illum sanctum execratio vastationum, et usque ad consummationem temporis consummatio dabitur super hanc vastationem.* This is also a translation of the θ' text. Note that the article is often translated by a demonstrative, an indication of the antiquity of the translation: *super civitatem illam sanctam* (ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν) in v. 24, *post hebdomadas has LXII* (μετὰ τὰς ἑβδομάδας τὰς ἐξήκοντα δὲ τὴν ἁγίαν), *illum sanctum* (τὸ ἅγιον) and *cum illo duce* (σὺν τῷ ἐρχομένῳ) in v. 26, *super illum sanctum* (ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν) and *super hanc vastationem* (ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρήμωσιν) in v. 27. In v. 24, one can also observe the reading *et expientur iniustitiae* which corresponds to the variant καὶ ἀπολεῖται τὰς ἀδικίας attested by many witnesses of the θ' text who borrowed it from the ο' text, and which will then reappear, in Africa again, but in a different form, in Hilarius: *et abolenda delicta* (HILn curs 10-11).

These two works follow the text of Theodotion and show no relation with the Septuagint.

### The recent African text (C)

Apart from the two hymns of chapter 3 where the recent African text is well attested in both direct and indirect tradition (see above), it has left traces from the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century to the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup>. In the 4<sup>th</sup> century, in Optatus of Milevis, Tyconius, Zeno of Verona and Hilarianus, in the 4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> century in a work falsely attributed to Cyprian, in the 5<sup>th</sup> century in Quodvultdeus and in the *Contra Varimadum* of Pseudo-Vigilus, and at the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century in Fulgentius of Ruspe. They sometimes make it possible to reconstitute a major line C.

We read only one quotation, slightly rearranged, from Daniel in Optatus of Milevis, in his *Contra Donatistas* (OPT Par 3,3) composed around 365. It follows the ancient African text:

4:24: *et tu rex, audi consilium meum et placeat tibi: peccata tua eleemosynis redime et iniustitias tuas in miserationibus pauperum* (+ *et erit deus propitius peccatis* G, we will come back to this variant later) (CY: *propterea, rex, consilium meum placeat tibi, et peccata tua eleemosynis redime et iniustitias tuas miserationibus pauperum*).

We find six brief allusions or quotations in Tyconius around 380, in his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, lost but reconstructable, and in his *Liber regularum*:

In the allusion to 13:42 (TY Apc 20), Tyconius uses the expression *occultorum cognitor* (ὁ τῶν κρυπτῶν γνώστης) which is attested by almost all of the witnesses to the verse.

For 2:34-35 (TY reg 1), we have already noted supra (about VICn) the expression *in pulverem commoluisse*.

He makes known for 7:10 (TY reg 5,4,2) a quite particular wording: *milies milia apparebant illi, et decies milies decies milia circumstebant*. He is alone among the 72 quotations/allusions in rendering ἐθεράπευον ο' - ἐλειτούργουν θ' by *apparebant* and παρειστήκεισαν (ο' θ') by *circumstebant*.

When Tyconius alludes rather freely to 11:38 by these words *in deum locus eius glorificabitur id est clarificabitur* (TY reg 1,10), one recognizes in the double reading *glorificabitur - clarificabitur* to render δοξάσει, the famous Africanism *clarificare*.

In 12:4, Tyconius is the only witness to the transposition *signa librum consummationis usque ad tempus* (TY Apc 3,56) which is found, quite naturally, in the commentary on the Apocalypse of Beatus (BEA Apc 5,10,18) (Beatus draws inspiration from Tyconius); the others read *usque ad tempus consummationis* with Greek.

This is again a characteristic reading of TY (TY Apc 307) which will be taken up by Beatus (BEA Apc 5,10,18): 12:10 *delinquant iniusti ne recogitent omnes iniqui et peccatores, et intellectores intellegant* to translate ἀνομήσωσιν ἄνομοι καὶ οὐ συνήσουσιν ἄνομοι νοήμονες συνήσουσι; we note two contacts with the ο' text: *omnes* = πάντας and *peccatores* = οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί.

The bishop of Verona, Zeno, a native of Africa who died before 380, makes numerous allusions to the book of Daniel but only one quotation:

In 13:49 (*revertimini ad iudicium, falsum enim isti contestati sunt de ea* ZE 1,40,2), he transmits a text that differs from the European text and follows the Greek word for word (ἀναστρέψατε εἰς τὸ κριτήριον ψευδῆ γὰρ οὗτοι κατεμαρτύρησαν αὐτῆς). This wording is used to reconstruct the text type C.

The *Exhortatio de paenitentia*, falsely attributed to Cyprian (PS-CY pae), but written in the 4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> c. probably in Africa, contains an explicit quotation from Dan 4:31-32:

4:31-32: (*apud Daniele(m):*)<sup>31</sup> *et post finem dierum ego, Nabuchodonosor, oculos meos in caelum sustuli, et sensus meus in me conversus est, et altissimum laudavi et regem caeli benedixi et viventem in saecula laudavi quia potestas eius aeterna est, regnum eius in generatione et generationem.*<sup>32</sup> *et omnes qui inhabitant terram, nihil* (+ *aestimati sunt P\**, + *existimati sunt P<sup>2</sup>*) (PS-CY pae [22]). For these two verses, the comparison can only be made with the European text of 177. Note the translation of τῷ ὑψίστῳ by the superlative *altissimum* (*excelsum* 177), the reading *laudavi et regem caeli benedixi* (*benedixi* 177), *in generatione et generationem* (fortuitous agreement with the Vulgate; *in saecula et saecula* 177) for εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν. The abrupt ending

of v. 32 "and those who dwell on the earth are nothing" explains the variants in ms. P "...are counted for nothing" (= θ').

The African bishop Hilarianus, in his *De cursu temporum* (HILn curs), composed in 397, quotes the prophecy of the seventy weeks of Dan 9:22-26. This explicit and rather long quotation must have been made book-open<sup>87</sup>:

9:22-26: (*Daniel enim in decima visione sua...apparuit ei angelus dei dicens:*)<sup>22</sup> *Daniel, modo providii ad ostendendum tibi sensum.*<sup>23</sup> *exivit enim domini praeceptum, et veni ut demonstrem tibi: vir enim concupiscens es tu. recogita igitur in praeceptum et intellege visionem.*<sup>24</sup> *septuaginta hebdomadae incisae sunt in populum tuum et in civitatem Hierusalem...ad obliteranda quae acceperunt, et consummanda peccata, et exorandas iniustitias, et abolenda delicta, et aequitatem sempiternam excogitandam [exagitandam ?]), et ut concludatur visio et prophetia, et ut unguatur sanctum sanctorum.*<sup>25</sup> *et cognosce (edd., tu quiesce codd.) et intellege de proventu sermonum, sive praeceptum respondendum et aedificandam urbem Hierusalem, usque ad christum ducem, hebdomadas VII.*<sup>26</sup> *post LXII hebdomadas...disperdetur unctio* (HILn curs 10-14). The translation is based for the most part on the Theodotion text, but more than one contact with the Septuagint text is detected<sup>88</sup>. Thus, in v. 22 *ad ostendendum tibi* (ὕποδειξά σοι against *imbuere te* in **X** = συμβιβάσαι σε θ'); in v. 23, the reading *praeceptum* (πρόσταγμα against *sermo* **XD** = λόγος θ'), *demonstrem tibi* (ὕποδειξά σοι vs *adnuntiem tibi* in **X** = ἀναγγεῖλαί σοι θ') and again *praeceptum* (πρόσταγμα vs *verbo* **X** = τῷ ῥήματι θ'). In v. 24, the addition of *Hierusalem* corresponds to the Σιών reading of the o' text. The reading *ad obliteranda quae acceperunt et consummanda peccata* assumes an inversion of the two verbs τοῦ σφραγίσαι...τοῦ συντελεσθῆναι which, however, does not appear in the Greek tradition. On the reading *et abolenda delicta*, see above. He alone renders δικαιοσύνη by *aequitas* (against *iustitia*) and τοῦ σφραγίσαι by *ut concludatur* (against *signentur, impleantur*). In v. 25, the *tu quiesce* of the unanimous manuscript tradition for γνώση is surprising; the editors were right to correct it to *et cognosce*. His usual *praeceptum* reappears in the reading *sive praeceptum respondendum* (for τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι), but the text there is probably corrupt. It is the only witness to a translation of ἀπὸ ἐξόδου by *de proventu* (against *a profectio, ab exitu, ab initio*). The end of v. 25 is not translated. In v. 26 he is the only one to render ἐξολεθρευθήσεται by *disperdetur* (against *interibit, exterminabitur, disperibit, interiet, occidetur*).

Quodvultdeus has already been discussed above in the section in the order of the visions in the book. What about his text? In his works, especially in his *Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei* composed between 445 and 451, he makes numerous allusions to the book of Daniel, of which he summarizes or reformulates passages. Some of them are exploitable, but it is especially the quotations which are rich in teaching. R. Gryson, in his edition of Isaiah<sup>89</sup>, had pointed out that Quodvultdeus occasionally used Jerome's translation. This observation is verified in the case of Daniel, but especially at the end of the biblical book.

One finds in the two allusions to 2:34 *lapis abscisus de monte sine manibus concidentium* (QU Jud 12,4; pro 2,74), the *concidentium* attested by Tertullian (TE Jud 3), Cyprian (CY te 2,17), but without correspondent in Greek.

The quotation of 3:92 (QU Jud 15,6) *ecce ego video quatuor viros solutos deambulantes in medio ignis, et corruptio in illis nulla est, et aspectus quarti similitudo est filii dei*, corresponds almost word for word (except for the transposition *in illis nulla est*) to the text of 300 (*ecce video ego quatuor viros solutos et deambulantes in medio ignis et corruptio nulla est in illis et aspectus quarti similitudo est fili dei*), witness of the text C. Of particular note is the noun *similitudo* which corresponds to the o' text ὁμοίωμα (θ' uses the adjective ὁμοία).

<sup>87</sup> CONDUCHÉ 2013.

<sup>88</sup> CONDUCHÉ 2013, pp. 228-233.

<sup>89</sup> GRYSOY 1987-1997, pp. 1661-1662.

For 5:26-28, quoted in QU pro 2:76 (*mane, numeravit deus regnum tuum et implevit illud, thecel, ponderatum est in statera et inventum est minus habens, fares, divisum est et datum est Medis et Persis*), there is unfortunately little point of comparison available beyond 176 and the Vulgate (**H**). QU reads for ἐμέτρησεν *numeravit* with **H** against *mensus est* (176), for ἐστάθη *ponderatum est* against *stetit* (176) and *appensus es* (**H**); he renders ὑστεροῦσα as *minus habens* with **H** against *egens* (176).

The surprise comes from 9:24-27: <sup>(21)</sup> *oranti Gabriel adsistit archangelus eique futura misteria revelavit* <sup>24</sup> *LXX ebdomadas breviatas esse in populo eius et in civitate sancta ut consummentur peccata, et ut signentur delicta, et ut finiatur iniustitia, et ut adducatur iustitia sempiterna; impleri quoque visus prophetarum, et ungeri sanctum sanctorum.* <sup>25</sup> *ab exitu sermonis in respondendo, et iterum aedificabitur Hierusalem, usque ad christum ducem ebdomades septem et ebdomades LXII. et rursus aedificabitur platea et muri in angustia temporum.* <sup>26</sup> *et post ebdomades LXII interiet chrisma, et iudicium non erit in eo, vel sicut Hebraeus interpres habet, occidetur christus et non erit eius. et civitatem et sanctum dissipabit populus cum duce veniente, et finis eius vastitas, et post finem belli statuta desolatio.* <sup>27</sup> *confirmabit autem pactum multis ebdomada una, et in medio ebdomadis deficiet hostia et sacrificium, et in templo erit abominatio desolationis, et usque ad consummationem et finem perseverabit desolatio* (QU pro 2,78). Quodvultdeus begins with a free quotation from v. 24 based on an Old Latin text, as indicated by the words *breviatas, peccata, delicta, finiatur iniustitia*. But from v. 25 onwards, the Vulgate text becomes more and more present. One will notice in particular the incise *vel sicut Hebraeus interpres habet*.

In 10:21 he has an Old Latin text (*et non est qui me adiuvet nisi Michael, princeps vester* QU pro 4,6) almost identical to 177 (except for the inversion *adiuvet me*), but Old Latin quotations of this verse are too scarce to say more.

11:14 is quoted in QU pro 4,17 in a form identical to the Vulgate text (*fili quoque praevericatorum populi tui extollentur ut impleant visionem*); 176 is there very different (*et filii pestilentii populi tui extollentur ad statuum visum*).

In chapters 11 and 12 Quodvultdeus quotes the Vulgate text, sometimes abbreviating it and with some minor differences: 11:20 (*stabit in loco regis* [**x H**] *vilissimus et indignus decore regio, et in paucis diebus conteretur non in furore nec in proelio* QU pro 4,17); 11:31 (*brachia ex eo exsurgent* [*stabunt H*] *et polluent sanctuarium fortitudinis et auferent iuge sacrificium et dabunt abominationem in desolatione* QU pro 4,18) and 11:33-38 (33 *et docti in populo docebunt plurimos, et erunt* [*sic pro ruent*] *in gladio et in flamma et in captivitate et in rapina dierum* 34 *cumque conruerint sublevabuntur auxilio modico* [*parvulo H*], *et applicabuntur eis plurimi fraudulenter.* 35 *et de eruditibus ruent ut conflentur et eligantur et dealbentur sancti* [**x H**] *usque ad tempus praefinitum.* 36 *et faciet iuxta voluntatem suam rex et elevabitur et magnificabitur adversus omnem deum et adversus deum deorum loquetur magnifica et diriget donec compleatur iracundia, perpetrata est quippe definitio.* 37 *et deum patrum suorum non reputabit et erit in concupiscentiis feminarum,* 38 *et deum quem ignoraverunt patres eius colet, et deum Maozi in loco suo statuet* [*~ deum autem Maozi...et deum quem ignoraverunt H*] QU pro 4,17-18); 12:1 (*in tempore illo consurget Michael, princeps magnus qui stat pro filiis populi tui, et veniet tempus quale non fuit ab initio ex quo* [*ab eo quo H*] *gentes esse coeperunt usque ad tempus illud. et in tempore illo salvabitur populus tuus omnis qui inventus fuerit scriptus in libro vitae* [**x H**] QU pro 4,18). Note, however, that 11:31 (*et semina ex eo exsurgent*) is quoted in Old Latin form in QU pro 4:19.

The *Contra Varimadum* transmitted under the name of Vigilus of Thapsus (PS-VIG Var) and written in Africa between 445 and 480, contains a series of quotations, all Old Latin, from Daniel.

Thanks to this work it is possible to reconstruct a major line **C** in 13:42-43: *deus aeternus, qui occultorum cognitor es, qui nosti omnia antequam nascantur, tu scis quoniam falsum testimonium hi dicunt adversum me* (PS-VIG Var 1,40).

In 3:99, his text (*signa et prodigia quae fecit mecum deus excelsus*) corresponds to part of the quotation in vss 98-99 attested by CHRY V,1008, an ancient authentic translation by John Chrysostom (partly quoted by Augustine<sup>90</sup>). Thanks to the quotation from PS-VIG Var 3,16, these verses in CHRY V,1008 can be given the siglum C.

In 4:5 and 15, the quotations of PS-VIG Var 2,12 (*Daniel, cui nomen Baltasar secundum nomen dei mei, spiritum sanctum dei in se habet et omnes sapientes regni mei non potuerunt interpretationem somnii mei declarare mihi, tu autem, Daniel, potes quia spiritus dei sanctus in te est*) make it possible to reconstitute the C-text, which is the only attested Old Latin text of this verse.

His text (*videbam, et ecce quasi sedes positae sunt, et vetus dierum sedebat. et vestimenta eius candida sicut nix, et capilli capitis eius ut lana munda et videbam in visu noctis, et ecce in nubibus caeli quasi filius hominis veniebat et usque ad vetustum dierum pervenit* PS-VIG Var 1,47) is used to make up the major line C in 7:9 and 7:13.

To appreciate the testimony of Fulgentius of Ruspe, it is important to take into account his various works. We read two quotations from Daniel in the *Dicta regis Thrasamundi* (FU AR) written in Carthage around 515, two quotations in the *Ad Scarilam de incarnatione filii Dei* (FU inc) written in Ruspe after 523, and one quotation in the *De veritate praedestinationis* (FU prae), also composed in Ruspe and at the same time. In each of these works, Fulgentius alternates between Old Latin text (FU Ar) and Vulgate text (FU prae and inc).

In his *Dicta regis Thrasamundi*, Fulgentius quotes 12:2-3 in this form: *multi dormientium in terrae fossura, in opterione exsurgunt, hi in vitam aeternam et hi in obprobrium et in confusionem perpetuam. et intellegentes splendebunt ut splendor firmamenti et ex iustis multi sicut stellae in saecula* (FU Ar 9,4). It is exactly the text of 176, representative of the type of text **D** that Fulgentius discovered during his exile in Sardinia. This testimony confirms indirectly the rooting of the text of 176 in the geographical frame of Sardinia of Lucifer of Cagliari (see below).

In FU prae 3,6, he quotes 12:3 according to the Vulgate text: *qui ad iustitiam erudiunt multos quasi stellae in perpetuas aeternitates*.

It is again the Vulgate text which will be taken up in 10:13 (*et ecce Michael, unus de principibus primus (primis H), venit in adiutorium meum* FU inc 48) and in 10:21 (*nemo est adiutor meus in omnibus his nisi Michael, princeps vester* FU inc 48).

The African texts, both ancient and recent, showed, to a more or less variable extent, contacts with the Septuagint text. This will be very exceptional with the European types of text.

### **European text types**

From 350 onwards, types of Old Latin texts of Daniel appear on the European continent, and they are clearly different from the African types of texts. (We have no evidence of this European text from the earlier period: Novatian's allusions to Dan 13:2,44-45 and 3:94 are indeed too general to be able to find a precise wording for the third century.) But this European text is far from being unified. It is in fact a nebulous structure from which the following three main forms emerge: a European text of the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. (**D**), an Italian text of the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. (**I**), and a text attested by Augustine (**A**).

#### *The European text from the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century (D)*

Among the types of European text, one emerges with clarity: that which appears towards the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. (**D**) and which is attested by the manuscripts 175 176 and 177 whose text is close to that of Lucifer of Cagliari.

---

<sup>90</sup> GRYSON 1999, p. 393.



The three manuscripts 175 176 and 177 are fragmentary, but they overlap in places, which allows a comparison of their text. One can compare 175 and 176 in 9:25-27; 10:1-2; 11:16-19.35-39. The mss 176 and 177 can be compared in 13:2-10; 3:36-46.50; 8:5-17.21-27; 9:1-2.6-7; 10:16-21; 11:6.24-28.31-33 and 14:36-42. Only two passages allow for a comparison of the three texts: 10:3-11 and 11:20-23.

Of the 14 verses where 175 and 176 can be compared with each other, there are only two discrepancies, the second being perhaps due to an accident of copy.

In 10:1 σύνεσις ἐδόθη is rendered as *intellectus datus est* in 175, and as *intellectus et prudentia data est* in 176; the addition of *et prudentia* is not authorized by any Greek variant and has all the appearances of a double reading. In 11:36, *et diriget* is omitted in 175 (without support in the Greek tradition).

If one puts aside the divergences without great significance (transpositions, presence or absence of a preposition, choice of another demonstrative pronoun, accidental omissions) or obvious errors (thus *iudicabantur* 177 instead of *videbantur* in 13,5), out of the 72 verses which they have in common, the manuscripts 176 and 177 are distinguished by the readings presented below. The Old Latin quotations are sometimes too few in number to make any meaningful comparisons. Moreover, in section 3:36-46.50, the text of 176 is very lacunous.

13:4 πλούσιος σφόδρα] *locupletior valde* 176 ≠ *locuples valde* 177

13:5 ἀνομία] *iniquitas* 176 (with PRIS, RUF) ≠ *facinus* 177

13:8 ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ] *in concupiscentia* 176 ≠ *in desiderio* 177

13:9 διέστρεψαν] *deverterunt* 177 ≠ *ecce everterunt* 176

3:37 παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] *cete<...>* 176 ≠ *prae omnes nationes* 177. What remains of the word in 176 can be compared to the reading *inter ceteras gentes* which is attested only by 182.

3:40 ἐκτελέσαι ὀπισθέν σου] *<...>re su<bsequentes te>* 176 (with 7 182 250 330 408 460 AU VER) ≠ *perficere sequentes te* 177

8:5 ἀνά μέσον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν] *inter duo oculorum* 176 ≠ *in medio oculorum* 177: the reading *inter duo* could be a copy error for *in medio*.

8:9 κέρας ἐν ἰσχυρόν] *cornu in virtute pusillum* 176 ≠ *cornu in virtute* 177: the Greek numeral adjective has been understood as a preposition; the addition of *pusillum* in 176 is a reference to 7:8.

8:9 πρὸς τὸν νότον] *ad austrum* 176 ≠ *ad notum* 177 (see 11,6)

8:10 τῶν ἀστρῶν] *siderum* 176 ≠ *astrorum* 177

8:11 ὁ ἀρχιστράτηγος] *dux militiae* 176 ≠ *dux militum* 177

8:11 θυσία ἐρράχθη] *sacrificium constitutum est* 176 ≠ *sacrificium conturbatum est* 177. The reading ἐρράχθη is attested here only by the Vaticanus, the other witnesses read ἐτάχθη (*constitutum est*) or ἐταράχθη (*conturbatum est*). In the context, the perpetual sacrifice must indeed be removed, not disturbed or set up.

8:15 ἐζήτουν σύνεσιν] *quaerebam intellectum* 176 (with AU) ≠ *quaerebam prudentiam* 177

8:16 συνέτισον ἐκείνον τὴν ὄρασιν] *enarra illam visionem* 176 ≠ *prudentem fac visum illum* 177: 177 corrects 176.

8:17 ἦλθε] *venit* 176 ≠ *accessit* 177

8:25 δόλω διαφθερεῖ πολλούς] *<in abundantia co>piarum cor<rumpet...>* 176 ≠ *dolo corrumpet multos* 177. The rendition *in abundantia copiarum* rests on the testimony of PS-FIR con (*abundantia corrumpet multos*) and perhaps assumes a variant ἐν εὐθηνία (translated in 11:21 and 24 as *in abundantia copiarum*). It is evident that 177 corrects 176.

8:27 ἀνέστην] *exsurrexi* 176 ≠ *surrexi* 177

9:6 πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς] *ad omnem populum terrae* 176 (with AU, singular also by RUF [*omni populo terrae*]) ≠ *ad omnes populos terrae* 177. The reading of 177 is obviously second and facilitating.

9:7 τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν] *habitantibus* 176 ≠ *inhabitantibus* 177. The reading *habitantibus* corresponds to the variant οἰκοῦσιν (attested by the Greek ms 26 alone); we will not give too much importance to this variation, very common in the Latin tradition.

10:18 καὶ προσέθετο καὶ ἤψατό μου] *et adiecit et tetigit me* 176 ≠ *et amplius tetigit me* 177. The text of 177 obviously corrects the Semitic expression which the Greek rendered slavishly.

10:19 μὴ φοβοῦ] *noli timere* 176 ≠ *noli metuere* 177

11:6 τοῦ νότου] *austri* 176 ≠ *noti* 177 (see 8,9)

11:24 λογιεῖται] *excogitabit* 176 ≠ *cogitabit* 177

11:25 ἐξεγερθήσεται] *exurget* 176 ≠ *nobilitabitur* 177: Ranke, in his edition of 177, hypothesizes *ἐξαίρετηθήσεται* as a model that would explain the *nobilitabitur*.

14:37 καὶ ἐβόησεν] *exclamavit autem* 176 ≠ *et clamavit* 177: 177 corrects from the Greek.

14:42 τοὺς δὲ αἰτίους τῆς ἀπωλείας αὐτοῦ] *eos autem qui causae fuerant interitus eius* 176 ≠ *eos autem qui machinati erant interitum ei* 177

There remain 13 verses where a comparison is possible between the three witnesses. It also shows that 175 and 176 are very close to each other, and that 177 is second to these two witnesses whom he corrects or whose translation he improves.

10:3 οὐκ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου] *non intravit os meum* 175 ≠ *non introivit in os meum* 176 177

10:4 Ἐδδεκελ] *tigris et decel* 175 176 ≠ *tigris* 177. The reading *tigris* alone corresponds to the variant of the Lucianic witnesses, Chrysostom and Theodoret, all influenced by the o' text; *tigris et decel* translate the text of the majority of the witnesses of the θ' text (the Göttingen edition retained as a lemma only εδδεκελ).

10:5 ἦρα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου] *elevavi oculos meos* 175 176 ≠ *extuli oculos meos* 177 (with HI ep 29; ep 37)

10:9 ἦμην κατανενυγμένος] *conpunctus eram* 175 176 ≠ *eram conpunctus* 177 (following the order of the words in Greek).

10:10 ἤγειρέ με] *eregit me* 175 176 ≠ *excitavit me* 177

10:11 στηθι] *sta* 175 ≠ *stabis* 176 ≠ *adsta* 177

11:21 ἐξουθενώθη] *contemptus est* 175 176 ≠ *contumelia adfectus est* 177

11:21 ἐν ὀλισθήμασι] *in lapidibus* 175 176 ≠ *in lapsibus* 177 (which corrects the manifest error of 175 176).

Once the relationship between these three witnesses has been established, can we then situate in time and space the text to which they bear witness?

Lucifer of Cagliari, in his *De Athanasio* (LUC Ath, dated 357/8) and his *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus* (LUC par, dated ca. 359), quotes long passages respectively from the story of Susanna and the vision of the four beasts, for which 176 is also attested<sup>91</sup>. It is therefore possible to compare LUC and 176 in 13:20-23.28-49.51-62 and in 7:1.2-27.

In the vision of the four beasts, Lucifer (LUC Ath) and 176 represent essentially the same text which can be classified under the siglum **D**. Of the twenty-seven verses, the following divergences can be noted:

7:3 probably accidental omission of *ascenderunt* in 176     *alter ad alteram* 176 mistake for *altera alteram* LUC

7:4 omission of *pinnae eius ut aquilae videbam quoadusque evulsae sunt* in LUC by passing from the same to the same     *supra* 176 ≠ *super* LUC: abbreviation resolved differently

7:5 *carnem multam* 176 ≠ *carnes multas* LUC = Greek

7:8 *duo oculi* 176 ≠ *oculi* LUC = Greek

7:10 *flumen* 176 ≠ *fluvius* LUC

<sup>91</sup> His allusions to 3:17.24 (for which 177 is attested) and to 6:21 (with 176) are not usable.

- 7:11 *adloquebatur* 176 ≠ *loquebatur* LUC    *interfecta est* 176 ≠ *interiit* LUC  
 7:13 *veniens* 176 = Greek ≠ *veniens venit* LUC  
 7:17 *bestiae quattuor* 176] + *magnae* LUC with ο´    omission of *quae tollentur* LUC  
 7:18 *in saeculum* LUC] + *et saeculum* 176 cf. Greek  
 7:19 *ungues* 176] + *eius* LUC = Greek  
 7:20 *de cornibus decem* 176 = Greek ≠ *de cornu eius decimo* LUC    *cui oculi* 176 = Ϙ θ´ ≠ *cuius oculi* LUC = οῦ Q-230 590 Hippol.<sup>B</sup>  
 7:21 *praevalabat* 176 ≠ *valebat* LUC  
 7:22 *tempus anticipavit* 176 ≠ *anticipavit tempus* LUC  
 7:24 *surget* 176 ≠ *exsurget* LUC    omission of *reges* in LUC by passing from the same to the same (after *tres*)  
 7:27 omission of *quae sub omni caelo sunt*, of *regum* before *sempiternum* and of *potestates* by LUC which seems to give a lighter version of the verse.

These divergences do not exceed what one expects to find in the course of the act of copying a text: errors of reading, accidents by passage from the same to the same, different resolution of an abbreviation, presence or absence of preverb, transpositions. Only two variations of vocabulary have a certain weight: *flumen - fluvius* (v. 10) and *interfecta est - interiit* (v. 11).

On the contrary, in the story of Susanna, we are faced with two different types of text. The variations between 176 and Lucifer (LUC par) are numerous, they do not only look at details and are found in almost every verse (176 is sometimes quite incomplete). Unfortunately, apart from these two witnesses, the chapter is little attested in Old Latin tradition, and that prevents significant comparisons with other Old Latin witnesses.

- 13:20 τοῦ παραδείσου] *paradisi* 176 ≠ *viridarii* LUC (cf. v. 36)  
 13:21 εἰ δὲ μή] *si quominus* 176 ≠ *alioquin* LUC    καταμαρτυρήσομεν] *falsum testimonium dabimus* 176 ≠ *falsum testimonium dicemus* LUC  
 13:22 στενά μοι πάντοθεν] *angustiae mihi adsunt undique* 176 ≠ *angustiae mihi undique* LUC    θάνατός μοι ἐστιν] *mors mihi est* 176 ≠ *mors mihi erit* LUC  
 13:23 ἁμαρτεῖν] *delinquere* 176 ≠ *peccare* LUC  
 13:28 τῇ ἐπαύριον] *alia die* 176 ≠ *die altero* LUC    ὡς συνῆλθεν] *ut veniret* 176 ≠ *ut convenit* LUC    πλήρεις τῆς ἀνόμου ἐννοίας] *pleni iniquis sensibus* 176 ≠ *pleni iniquae mentis* LUC (which corrects from the Greek) κατὰ Σουσάννας LUC] omission in 176    τοῦ θανατῶσαι αὐτήν] *ut morte eam adficerent* 176 ≠ *ut mortificarent eam* LUC  
 13:29 οἱ δὲ ἀπέστειλαν] *qui miserunt* 176 ≠ *et miserunt* LUC  
 13:30 καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς] *et filii eius* 176 ≠ omission in LUC by passing from the same to the same (after *eius*)  
 13:31 σφόδρα] *valde* 176 ≠ *nimum* LUC  
 13:32 ὅπως ἐμπλησθῶσι] *ut satiarentur* 176 ≠ *ut saturarentur* LUC  
 13:34 ἀναστάντες δέ] *adsurgentes autem* 176 ≠ *adsurgentes igitur* LUC  
 13:35 κλαίουσα] *flens* 176 ≠ *lacrimans* LUC    ἀνέβλεψεν] *respexit* 176 ≠ *aspexit* LUC  
 13:36 ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ] *in paradiso* 176 ≠ *in viridario* LUC (cf. v. 20)    εἰσῆλθεν] *introivit* 176 ≠ *intravit* LUC    μετὰ δύο παιδισκῶν] *cum duabus puellis* 176 ≠ *cum puellis* LUC    τοῦ παραδείσου] *paradisi* 176 ≠ *viridarii* LUC (cf. v. 20)  
 13:41 μαρτυροῦμεν] *testificamur* 176 ≠ *contestamur* LUC    κατέκριναν αὐτήν] *damnauerunt eam* 176 ≠ *damnauerunt* LUC  
 13:43 ψευδῆ κατεμαρτύρησαν] *falsum testimonium dederunt* 176 ≠ *falsum testimonium dixerunt* LUC  
 13:45 ἀπαγομένης αὐτῆς] *cum adduceretur* 176 ≠ *cum duceretur* LUC    παιδαρίου νεωτέρου] *iunioris* 176 ≠ *pueri adolescentis* LUC (which corrects from the Greek)

13:47 ἐπέστρεψε δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαός] *conversus est autem omnis populus ≠ et conversa est omnis plebs* LUC which seems to use an older vocabulary

13:48 ὁ δέ] *qui* 176 ≠ *at ille* LUC

13:51 ἀπ' ἀλλήλων] *ab invicem* 176 ≠ *ab alterutro* LUC

13:54 ὀμιλοῦντας] *concumbentes* 176 ≠ *tractantes* LUC (cf. v. 58)

13:55 φάσιν] *nuntium* 176 ≠ *praeceptum* LUC σχίσει] *scindet* 176 ≠ *secabit* LUC

13:56 αὐτόν] *eum* 176 ≠ *illum* LUC ἡ ἐπιθυμία] *desiderium* 176 ≠ *concupiscentia* LUC

13:57 ὀμίλον] *concupuerunt* 176 (with AU = ὀμιλοῦσαν ο') ≠ *concupiebant* LUC οὐ θυγάτηρ Ἰουδα ὑπέμεινε] *filia Iuda non sustinuit* 176 ≠ *non sustinuit filia Iuda* LUC

13:58 ὀμιλοῦντας ἀλλήλοις] *concumbentes invicem* 176 ≠ *invicem tractantes* LUC (cf. v. 54)

13:59 τὴν ῥομφαίαν] *rompheam* 176 ≠ *gladium* LUC which seems to modernize the vocabulary ὅπως ἐξολεθεύσῃ ὑμᾶς] *ut vos perdat alterutrum* 176 ≠ *ut vos perdat* LUC which corrects from the Greek

13:61 ἀνέστησαν] *exsurrexerunt* 176 ≠ *surrexerunt* LUC συνέστησεν] *convicerat* 176 ≠ *conprobaverat* LUC

13:62 αἷμα ἀναίτιον] *sanguis innocens* 176 ≠ *sanguis innocentis* LUC

In the story of Susanna, we are led to distinguish two types of European text. The text represented by 176 will keep the siglum **D**, but the one to which Lucifer (LUC par) bears witness will carry the siglum **R**. It is however difficult to know which of these two types of text is the earlier: corrections from the Greek and modernisation of the vocabulary go sometimes in one direction and sometimes in the other. We would be tempted to consider the text of Lucifer as second<sup>92</sup>. In the schemas we will therefore propose the order **D - R**.

Apart from these witnesses, thanks to which large extracts of the Old European Latin text can be identified, we must admit that we are reduced to identifying scattered vestiges of it in readings or in quotations from later authors, fortunately sometimes long, as in Augustine. It will be possible to identify them by a particular siglum, thus **M** for the readings proper to Ambrose, **I** for the Italian text and **A** for the text of Augustine. In rare cases where no precision can be given (for example in 1:10; 2:37,46; 3:1; etc. or in 4:24 which will be commented on later), the siglum **E** (for European) will be used. Finally, it should be noted that the Old Latin text of a large number of verses is irretrievably lost, as is the case for 1:11,14; 2:9b-18a.36-38.46a.48-49; 3:2.4b-15a.97; 4:1-4.6-13.16.23.25-29.

Hilary's works, especially his *Tractatus super Psalmos* dated around 365, contain about twenty references to the text of Daniel, but only four usable quotations.

The European text of 2:44 is reconstructed on the basis of a quotation from Irenaeus: *et in diebus regum illorum excitabit deus caeli regnum quod in aeternum non corrumpetur, et regnum eius alteri populo non relinquetur. comminuet et ventilabit omnia regna et ipsum exaltabitur in aeternum*. Hilary's text (HIL Ps 144,1) reads *regnum aliud: ἄλλην* is attested only in o'. The transposition *quod numquam corrumpetur usque in saecula* is not based on any Greek variant. At the end of the verse Hilary replaces *ipsum exaltabitur in aeternum* by *hoc regnum in aeternum*, a reading that is also his own.

In the quotation from 7:10 (HIL Ps 67,18), Hilary differs from the **D**-text (attested by 176 and LUC) only by the reading *adstabant ei* instead of *adstabant ante eum*.

For 7:13-14, Hilary (HIL Ps 144,1 and 131,27) largely corresponds to the **D**-text.

On the other hand, it differs from the **D**-text (attested by 176: *veni Danihel quoniam obstructi et signati sermones*) in 12:9: *vade, Danihel, quia clausi sunt signatique sermones* (HIL Ps 118 phe 3) to render δεῦρο Δανιηλ

<sup>92</sup> A cautious opinion to the contrary in ZILVERBERG 2021, pp. 185 and 225 (which appeared after my edition of Daniel).

ὅτι ἐμπεφραγμένοι καὶ ἐσφραγισμένοι οἱ λόγοι. Of the Old Latin witnesses, he is the only one to have translated in this way the verb ἐμφράσσω.

Ambrose makes numerous allusions to the book of Daniel. They are mostly unusable. The quotations are rare; in the story of Susanna, there are three which do not differ much from the text **D**, but there are not many witnesses for this chapter. As for the rest, one might occasionally come across one or another proper reading which has been attributed the siglum **M**.

13:22 *ingemuit Susanna et dixit: angustiae mihi adsunt undique. si autem hoc fecero, morte aeterna peribo; sin autem, non effugiam manus vestras* (AM fu 9,53). When he translates θάνατός μοί ἐστιν by *morte aeterna peribo*, Ambrose allows for some liberty with the Greek; the rest corresponds to the text of LUC.

In 13:43, he uses the expression *falsum testimonium dicere* (AM ep 7,33) with LUC, but in AM Tb 78 he is closer to the Greek text when he reads: *tu scis quia falsa dixerunt de me* (σὺ ἐπίστασαι ὅτι ψευδῆ μου κατεμαρτύρησαν).

The quotation in 13:44-45 (*exaudivit dominus vocem eius. cum duceretur ut periret, et excitavit dominus spiritum sanctum pueri adulescentis cui nomen Danihel* [AM sp 3,39 and 43]) corresponds to that of LUC.

In 2:35, to translate ὁ λίθος ὁ πατάξας, he alone employs the verb *elidere* (*lapis qui elisit* [AM Job 4,17]), and quotations there are numerous. We shall hereby attribute to this proper reading the siglum **M**.

In 7:21, Ambrose's quotation (*videbam et cornu illud quod faciebat pugnam cum sanctis et invalescebat* [AM ps 43,18,1]) contains two remarkable readings: *pugnam* and *invalescebat*, which will also get attributed the siglum **M**.

In 12:1-3 a text is attested that is partly different from the preserved forms: *et in tempore illo salvabitur omnis plebs tua quae scripta est in libro, et multi dormientium in terrae fossu in adapertionem exurgent, hi in vitam aeternam et hi in obprobrium et confusionem perpetuam, et intellegentes splendebunt ut splendor firmamenti, et ex iustis multi sicut stellae in saecula* (AM Sat 2,66). In AM Ps 1,51,5-6, the text varies slightly: *multi qui sedent in tumulto terrae exurgent, isti in vitam aeternam et isti in obprobrium et confusionem aeternam, et intellegentes splendebunt sicut splendor caeli, et de iustis multi sicut stellae lucebunt*. To translate ἐν γῆς χώματι, Ambrose uses two expressions of his own: *in terrae fossu* (absent from the ThLL, for *fossis*?; this hapax has given rise to three variants: *defossi*, *fossa* and *fossi*) and *in tumulto terrae*. The reading *in adapertionem* (and its variant *apertione*) could be a reference to ἐν τῷ πλάτει of ο'. The ms 176 reads *in opertione* (echoes of which can be found in PS-AU spe and FU) which would be a distortion of it. These readings of Ambrose will be identified by the siglum **M**.

### *The Italian text of the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century (I)*

The Old Latin text of the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century is no longer preserved in direct tradition. To reconstitute it, one can only rely on patristic quotations, in particular on those of *Ambrosiaster* (between 366 and 384), of Chromatius (bishop of Aquileia in 388), of Jerome (died in 420) when they are not Vulgate, of the Latin translation of the *Adversus haereses* of Irenaeus (between 380 and 395), of the pseudo-augustinian *Speculum* (beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century)<sup>93</sup> and of Salvian of Marseilles (dead after 470).

The contribution of *Ambrosiaster* and Chromatius of Aquileia will be modest.

The quotation from 2:47 in AMst Col 2,1-3 allows us hear this text **I**: *vere deus vester ipse est deus vivus et aperiens mysteria*. It is corroborated by a quotation from Nicetas of Remesiana: *ipse deus deorum et rex regum qui sacramenta revelat* (NIC sp 11). The two readings *deus deorum* and *deus vivus* correspond to two attested readings in Greek for the text of θ'.

<sup>93</sup> We should also add the testimony of Hesychius in a letter to Augustine (AU ep 198), see below.

Thanks to Chromatius, we can find the Italian text of 2:22 (*ipse revelat profunda et abscondita, sciens quae sunt in tenebris, et lumen cum eo est* CHRO Mt 15,1) and especially of 7:9-10 (*videbam donec sedilia posita sunt, et ecce antiquus dierum sedebat. et vestis eius tamquam nix alba, et capilli capitis eius tamquam lana candida. thronus eius flamma ignis et rotae ignis exurens et flumen ignis currebat ante eum, et milia milium serviebant ei, et decies denum milium assistebant ei. in iudicio sedit, et libri aperti sunt* CHRO Mt 54A,10) Chromatius is the only one to translate θρόνοι by *sedilia*.

On the other hand, Jerome's Old Latin quotations, which appear even in his later works, long after his new translation (which will become Vulgate), contribute significantly to reconstructing in places the Italian text of the second half of the fourth century. Here are some of the most telling examples.

When he translates the 21<sup>st</sup> Easter letter of Theophilus in 404, Jerome is the only witness to the Old Latin text of 1:12-13: *tempta pueros tuos diebus decem, et detur nobis de seminibus, et comedemus et aquam bibemus, et appareant in conspectu tuo vultus nostri et vultus puerorum qui comedunt de mensa regis et, sicut videris, ita facies cum servis tuis* (HI ep 100,7). But does he remember the traditional Old Latin text or is he translating Theophilus' quotation? There is room for doubt.

When he translates around 402 Theophilus of Alexandria, he quotes the Old Latin text of 3:91-92: *nonne tres viros misimus in medium ignis ligatos? et quomodo ego video quatuor viros solutos et ambulantes in medio ignis, et corruptio non est in eis, et visio quarti similitudo filii dei?* (HI Is tr 2). However, the same question can be asked as for the preceding passage.

In his *Dialogues against Pelagius* dated 415/416, he quotes 4:32 and 34b in a text which differs from **D**: *omnes habitatores terrae quasi nihili reputati sunt apud eum. facit enim quodcumque voluerit in caelo et in terris, et nemo est qui resistat voluntati eius aut possit dicere: quare hoc fecisti, cuius universa opera in veritate et viae illius iustitia, et superbientes potest ipse humiliare* (HI Pel 2,30).

Again, in his translation of Theophilus, he quotes 5:11 in this form: *est vir in regno tuo in quo est spiritus dei, et in diebus patris tui vigilantia et sapientia inventae sunt in eo* (HI ep 100,5), which is used to reconstitute the text **I**, which will be found in part in PS-AU spe 3.

Text **I** can be reconstructed through its quotations from 9:24 (*septuaginta hebdomades completae sunt super populum tuum et super civitatem tuam sanctam ut compleantur iniquitates, et finem accipiat peccatum, ut dispareat iniquitas, et reveletur iustitia sempiterna* HI Pel 2,30) and 25-26 (*et scies et intelleges: ab initio sermonis restaurandi et aedificandi Hierusalem usque ad xpi principatum hebdomadae VII et hebdomadae LXII. et post hebdomadas VII et LXII interibit chrisma, et iudicium non erit in eo, et templum et sanctum corrumpet populus duce veniente, et caedentur in cataclysmo belli* HI chr [160,23 et 161,16]).

Two quotations from 10:5 in two epistles dated 384, give a text which differs slightly from **D**: *et extuli oculos meos et vidi: et ecce vir unus vestitus baddim* (HI ep 29,5) and *extuli oculos meos et vidi: et ecce vir unus indutus (vestitus) baddim, et renes eius cincti auro Ofaz* (HI ep 37,1).

Finally, the *Commentary on Jeremiah* (begun in 415, and left unfinished) presents an Old Latin text of 13:56-57 to which we can attribute the siglum **I**: *semen Chanaam et non Iuda, species decepit te et concupiscentia pervertit cor tuum. sic faciebatis filiabus Israhel, et illae metuentes loquebantur vobiscum, sed non filia Iudae sustinuit iniquitatem vestram* (HI Jr 5,67).

Jerome is far from being consistent when he quotes the Old Latin text. To see this, we need only compare the way he quotes the first words of 12:2 (πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων ἐν γῆς χώματι ἐξεγερθήσονται) in the works here arranged chronologically: *multi dormientium in limo terrae consurgent* (HI Eph), *plurimi dormientium de terrae pulvere con/resurgent* (HI Gal), *qui in terrae pulvere dormierunt resurgent* (HI Joan), *multi dormientium de terrae pulvere consurgent* (HI Mt), *multi dormientium in terrae pulvere resurgent* (HI Is) and *multi qui dormiunt in terrae pulvere resurgent* (HI Ez). What wording should be used to write line **I**?

Quotations and allusions to the book of Daniel are frequent in the Latin Irenaeus, from the last decades of the fourth century. I note in particular the following sets of quotations which cover several verses: 2:41-45; 7:21-25; 8:23-25 and 12:3-4.

The long quotation from 2:41-45 in IR 5,26,1-2 is the only testimony that allows us to write the major line **I**:<sup>41</sup> *et quoniam vidisti pedes et digitos partem quidem fictilem partem autem ferream, regnum divisum erit, et a radice ferrea erit in eo quemadmodum vidisti ferrum commixtum testo.* <sup>42</sup> *et digiti pedum pars quidem aliqua ferrea pars autem aliqua fictilis pars aliqua regni erit fortis et ab ipsa pars erit minuta.* <sup>43</sup> *quoniam vidisti ferrum commixtum testo, commixtiones erunt in semine hominum, et non erunt adiuncti invicem quemadmodum ferrum non commiscetur cum testo.* <sup>44</sup> *et in diebus regum illorum excitabit deus caeli regnum quod in aeternum non corrumpetur, et regnum eius alteri populo non relinquetur. comminuet et ventilabit omnia regna et ipsum exaltabitur in aeternum.* <sup>45</sup> *quemadmodum vidisti quoniam de monte praecisus est lapis sine manibus et comminuit testum, ferrum et aeramentum et argentum et aurum, deus magnus significavit regi quae futura sunt post haec; et verum est somnium, et fidelis interpretatio eius.* Only v. 44 has a more complete attestation and allows for a comparison with the other readings (noted below in parentheses): *excitabit* (*suscitabit* [VICn, IS]), *in aeternum non corrumpetur* (*numquam corrumpetur* [AMst]), *numquam corrumpetur usque in saecula* [HIL], *in aeternum non commovebitur* [IS]).

It is also thanks to the quotation of 7:21-25 in IR 5,25,3 that it will be possible to write a line **I**:<sup>21</sup> *videbam, et cornu illud faciebat bellum adversus sanctos et valebat adversus eos,* <sup>22</sup> *quoadusque venit vetustus dierum et iudicium dedit sanctis altissimi dei, et tempus pervenit, et regnum obtinuerunt sancti.* <sup>23</sup> *bestia quarta, regnum quartum erit in terra quod eminebit super reliqua regna et manducabit omnem terram et conculcabit eam et concidet,* <sup>24</sup> *et decem cornua eius, decem reges exsurgent, et post eos surget alius qui superabit malis omnes qui ante eum fuerunt, et reges tres deminorabit.* <sup>25</sup> *et verba adversus altissimum deum loquetur et sanctos altissimi dei conteret et cogitabit demutare tempora et legem, et dabitur in manu eius usque ad tempus tempus et dimidium tempus.* Here the comparison is possible with **D** (whose readings are noted in brackets below): *valebat* (*praevallebat*), *tempus pervenit* (*tempus anticipavit*), *eminebit super reliqua regna* (*eminebit omnia regna*), *reges tres deminorabit* (*tres reges humiles faciet*), *cogitabit* (*excogitabit*), *demutare* (*mutare*).

The quotation from IR 5,25,4 is used to write an **I**-line in 8:23-25: <sup>23</sup> *et in novissimo regni ipsorum exsurget rex improbus facie valde et intellegens quaestiones,* <sup>24</sup> *et valida virtus eius et admirabilis, et corrumpet et diriget et faciet et exterminabit fortes et populum sanctum,* <sup>25</sup> *et iugum torquis eius dirigitur, dolus in manu eius, et in corde suo exaltabitur et dolo disperdet multos et ad perditionem multorum stabit et quomodo ova manu conteret.* This text is characterized by the following variations from **D**: in v. 23, accidental omission of *impletis peccatis eorum*, addition of *valde, quaestiones* (*propositiones*); in v. 24, *valida* (*fortis*), *admirabilis* (*mirabilia*); in v. 25, *dolus* (*sermone*), *exaltabitur* (*magnificabitur*), *disperdet* (*corrumpet*) *interitum* (*perditionem*).

Vv. 3 and 4 of chapter 12 could possibly lead us to another conclusion. One notes indeed in the quotation of IR 4,26,1 (<sup>3</sup> *intellegentes fulgebunt quemadmodum claritas firmamenti, et a multis iustis sicut stellae in saecula et adhuc.* <sup>4</sup> *muni sermones et signa librum usque ad tempus consummationis quoadusque discant multi et adimpleatur agnitio*) close contacts with the text of v. 4 in Cyprian (*muni sermones et signa librum usque ad tempus consummationis quoad discant multi et inpleatur agnitio* [CY te 1,4, taken up by PS-AU alt 550]): *munire* to translate ἐμφοράσσω (**D** *obstruere*), *sermo*, *discant* (**D** *doceantur*) and *agnitio* (**D** *agnitio, scientia*). In v. 3, *claritas* is not the famous Africanism because it translates λαμπρότης here, not δόξα. R. Gryson<sup>94</sup> points out that the quotations from Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* could date back to the third century because the vocabulary often recalls that of Cyprian. For Daniel, this would be the only passage to support this hypothesis. I would however remain cautious. A counter-example can be found in 2:33-34 where Cyprian and Irenaeus are attested: *pedes, pars quidem aliqua ferrea et pars aliqua fictilis, quoadusque abscissus est lapis sine manibus et percussit imaginem in pedes ferreos et fictiles et comminuit eos usque ad finem* (IR 5,26,1) to be compared with *pedes autem ex parte quidem ferrei, ex parte autem fictiles, quoadusque abscissus est lapis de monte sine manibus concidentium et percussit imaginem super pedes ferreos et fictiles et comminuit eos minutatim* (CY te 2,17).

The Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum* (PS-AU spe) contributes to the reconstruction of the Italian text, especially for the following passages: 13:45; 3:16-18; 4:17-19; 8:4; 12:2-3, and 12:13.

<sup>94</sup> GRYSO 1999, p. 594, and GRYSO 1987-1997, p. 17.

Thus in 13:45: *et cum duceretur Susanna ad mortem, suscitavit dominus spiritum sanctum puero iuniori cui nomen erat Danihel* (PS-AU spe 3), whose text differs from **D** by adding *Susanna*, the expression *ad mortem* (still in Chromatius alone) instead of *ut periret* (= Greek), *suscitavit* instead of *excitavit*, and *puero iuniori* (παιδαρίου νεωτέρου) instead of *pueri adolescentis* (παιδαρίῳ νεωτέρῳ as a variant).

The quotation from PS-AU spe 44 (*et responderunt Sedrac, Misac et Abdenago Nabucodonosor: non habemus causam de hoc sermone respondere tibi. est enim deus in caelo, cui nos servimus, potens ad liberandos nos de camino ignis ardentis et de manibus tuis eripere et salvos facere. scire itaque debes, rex, quia diis tuis non servimus et imaginem quam statuisti non adoramus*) allows to write a line **I** in 3:16-18 characterized in v. 16 by the omission of what corresponds to λέγοντες τῷ βασιλεῖ, in v. 17 by the addition of *in caelo* and by the double reading *eripere et salvos facere*, and in v. 18 by the expression *scire itaque debes* (cf. *scito* in HI Ps h 55).

Line **I** is written in 4:17-19 thanks to the quotation from PS-AU spe 114: *arborem quam vidisti confirmatam et magnificatam, cuius altitudo perveniebat usque ad caelum et latitudo eius in universa terra, et folia eius lata, et fructus eius multus, et cibus omnium in ea, et subtus habitabant bestiae terrae, et in ramis eius aves caeli. tu es, rex, quoniam magnificatus es et potentiam accepisti, et magnitudo tua magnificata est et pervenit usque ad caelum, et dominatio tua usque ad fines terrae*. There is no other Old Latin quotation for these verses.

Thanks to the quotation from PS-AU spe 114 (*vidi arietem cornibus percutientem secundum mare et aquilonem et austrum, et omnes bestiae non stabant in conspectu eius, et non erat qui eriperet de manu eius*), it is possible to reconstruct most of the **I**-text (except for the last words) in 8:4. Note the changes from text **D**: the translation of κρατιζοντα by *cornibus percutientem* versus *ventilantem*, as well as the readings *stabant* instead of *poterant stare* (στήσοντα) and *qui eriperet* instead of *qui possit eripere* (ὁ ἐξαίρουμενος).

In the company of other witnesses, in particular Jerome, he transmits a text **I** in 12:2-3 (*et multi de dormientibus exurgent in opertionem terrae, et exurgent in vitam aeternam. item illi: et hii in opprobrium et confusionem aeternam* [PS-AU spe 27]; *et hi qui intellegunt splendebunt sicut claritas firmamenti, et a iustis multi quasi stellae in saeculo* [PS-AU spe 116]) whose multiplicity of translation was noted above, in the presentation of Jerome's testimony. The readings of the Pseudo-augustinian *Speculum* will help, with those of Jerome, to reconstitute the major line **I** and its variants.

Finally, in 12:13, it gives a text identical to that of **D**: *et exurges in sorte tua in fine dierum* (PS-AU spe 27); in spite of this, a line **I** is written.

For the fifth century, we can finally bring in the testimony of Salvian of Marseilles. He quotes 4:24 in different forms of his own. One of them will be used to constitute a major line **E** (the others will appear as variants).

4:24 is quoted several times in his *Ad Ecclesiam* (dated before 440) and once in the later *De gubernatione Dei*. The complete quotation of the verse in SALV eccl 1,51 will be used to write the major line **E**: *propter quod, rex, consilium meum placeat tibi et peccata tua in misericordiis redime et iniustitias tuas in miserationes pauperum, fortasse erit patiens dominus delictis tuis*. He further quotes the second part of the verse in a different form: *dicens enim: peccata tua in misericordiis redime, et forsitan propitiabitur deus delictis tuis* (eccl 1,62). And it is to this form characterized by the expression *forsitan propitiabitur*, instead of *fortasse erit patiens*, that he will allude twice: *sic erit ut iuxta prophetam propitiatur forsitan deus delictis tuis* (eccl 1,54) and *forsitan, ut scriptum est, propitiaretur deus peccatis nostris* (gu 6,46). The second part of the verse (which translates ἵσως ἔσται μακρόθυμος τοῖς παραπτώμασί σου) is worthy of comment. J.B. Ullrich<sup>95</sup>, who has studied Salvian's quotations, makes a comparison with the text of Cyprian: *et erit deus patiens peccatis tuis* to find that ἵσως is not translated there. He finds this absence in a variant of Optatus of Milevis's *Contra Donatistas: et tu, rex, audi consilium meum et placeat tibi: peccata tua elemosynis redime et iniustitias tuas in miserationibus pauperum (+ et erit deus propitius peccatis G)* (OPT Par 3,3). The ms. G dates from the 15<sup>th</sup> century, but its addition cannot be explained by a correction to the Vulgate (*forsitan ignoscat delictis tuis*). Perhaps the editor should have given it more credit, as Ullrich did. Later, but still in Africa, Ferrand, deacon of Carthage

<sup>95</sup> ULLRICH 1893, pp. 20-21.



(died in 546/547), takes up the passage: *et erit deus parcens peccatis tuis* (FEnd ep 7,15). The variant *patiens - parcens* is explained either by a copying error or as a facilitating reading. But P. Bogaert<sup>96</sup> pointed out that the root *propit-* and *parcens* could be based on a misreading of ἰσως into ἰλεως, which Ullrich had not seen. As a result, the different forms attested in Salvian get an explanation. The quotation from eccl 1,51 (*fortasse...patiens*) follows exactly the Greek text (ἰσως...μακρόθυμος). The other three (with *forsitan* and *propitiari*) are explained by a double reading (ἰσως ἰλεως) that makes it unnecessary to translate μακρόθυμος.

### Augustine's text (A)

Augustine is quoted more than 380 times in the *apparatus testium*, including quotations and allusions. The number of allusions far outweigh the number of quotations. This is particularly true of the Story of Susanna, the second part of chapter 3 (from v. 49 onwards), and the section on the prophecy of the seventy weeks in chapter 9. There are, however, quotations, some of them lengthy, which make it possible to reconstruct a text peculiar to Augustine, and which will be marked **A**. Indeed, rather than noting Augustine's variant readings under a major line **D** or **I** (which we will have to do in some cases), where they risk being drowned out by others, it has seemed preferable to isolate and clearly identify his text.

On the long quotation from the Song of Azariah (3:25-45) in *Epistle 111* (dated 409), see above.

A line **A** will be written for 7:9-10 thanks to the quotation from *De trinitate* (dated 411): <sup>9</sup> *aspiciebam donec throni positi sunt, et vetustus dierum sedebat. et indumentum eius quasi nix album, et capillus capitis eius quasi lana munda. thronus eius flamma ignis, rotae eius ignis flagrans.* <sup>10</sup> *et flumen ignis trahebat in conspectu eius, et mille milia deserviebant ei, et dena milia denum milium assistebant ei. et iudicium conlocavit, et libri aperti sunt* (AU tri 2,33). Notable lessons are *indumentum album* (ἔνδυμα λευκόν), *flagrans* (φλέγον), *trahebat* (εἴλκεν) and *deserviebant* (ἐλείτούργουν).

In a letter to Augustine (AU ep 198,3, dated between 418 and 420), Hesychius of Salone, today Split in Dalmatia, quotes 7:11b-12 in this form: <sup>11b</sup> *quoadusque interfecta est bestia et periit, et corpus eius datum est ut comburatur.* <sup>12</sup> *et reliquarum bestiarum regnum translatum est, et magnitudo vitae data est eis usque ad tempus.* It differs from line **D** in the readings *interfecta est* (vs *interiit* for ἀνηρέθη), *periit* (ἀπόλωτο, not translated in **D**), and *magnitudo* (vs *longitudo* for μακρότης). Since the text is from Dalmatia, the quotation represents an **I** text, not an **A** text.

In 420, Augustine quotes twice (AU ci 18,34 and AU leg 2,3,12) verses 7:13-14 in an almost identical form which will constitute line **A**: <sup>13</sup> *videbam in visu noctis, et ecce cum nubibus caeli ut filius hominis veniens erat (erat veniens AU leg) et usque ad vetustum dierum pervenit et in conspectu eius praelatus est.* <sup>14</sup> *et ipsi datus est principatus et honor et regnum, et omnes populi, tribus, linguae ipsi servient. potestas eius potestas perpetua quae non transibit, et regnum eius non corrumpetur.* Notable readings are *veniens erat* (vs *veniebat*, for ἐρχόμενος), *praelatus est* (vs *adduxerunt, obtulerunt, oblatus est* for προσήχθη), *ipsi datus est principatus et honor et regnum* (vs *datum est ei regnum et honor et imperium* in **D**, for αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία), *ipsi servient* (vs *servient ei* in **D**, for δουλεύσουσιν αὐτῷ).

Verses 7:15-28 as quoted in AU ci 20,23 (dated after 422) will serve to write an **A**-line. The passage is too long to be repeated here. But here are the main readings that diverge from **D**: *ego Danihel in habitudine mea* (v. 15, vs *in habitu meo ego Danihel*, for ἐν τῇ ἔξει μου ἐγὼ Δανιηλ), *unum de stantibus* (v. 16, vs *unum circumstantium*, for ἐνὶ τῶν ἐστηκότων), *auferentur* (v. 17, vs *tollentur*, for ἀρθήσονται), *erat differens prae omni bestia terribilis amplius* (v. 19, vs *erat praeter ceteras bestias horribilis valde*, for ἦν διαφέρον παρὰ πᾶν θηρίον φοβερὸν περισσῶς, the διαφέρον had been translated neither by 176 nor by LUC), *manducans...comminuens...conculcans* (v. 19 vs imperfects, as in Greek), *regnum dedit* (v. 22, vs *iudicium dedit*, for τὸ κρίμα ἔδωκεν), *praevalebit omnibus regnis* (v. 23, vs *eminebit omnia regna*, for ὑπερέξει πάσας τὰς βασιλείας), *humiliabit* (v. 24, vs *humiles faciet*, for ταπεινώσει, IR reads here *deminorabit*), *suspiciabitur* (v. 25, vs *excogitabit*, for ὑπονοήσει), *principatum removebunt ad exterminandum et perdendum* (v. 26, vs *regnum transferet ut*

<sup>96</sup> Personal email.

*exterminet et perdat*, for τὴν ἀρχὴν μεταστήσουσι τοῦ ἀφανίσαι καὶ τοῦ ἀπολέσαι), *principatus* (v. 27, vs *potestates*, for αἱ ἀρχαί), *multum cogitationes meae* (v. 28, vs *cogitationes meae multum*, the inversion ἐπὶ πολὺ οἱ διαλογισμοί μου is attested by Greek witnesses), addition of *super me* (v. 28, based on a widely attested Greek variant ἐπ' ἐμε), *conservavi* (v. 28, vs *servavi*, for διετήρησα; the Greek preverb is correctly rendered, but a variant ἐτήρησα is attested and matches the LXX text).

A line **A** will be written in 8:15-16 from the quotation of AU Ps 118 s 18,4: <sup>15</sup> *et factum est cum viderem ego Daniel visum et quaerebam intellectum, et ecce stetit in conspectu meo ut visus viri.* <sup>16</sup> *et audiui vocem viri inter Ubal, et vocavit et dixit: fac intellegere illum visionem.* Note the translation of σύνεσιν by *intellectum* (vs *prudentiam*), the omission of Gabrihel after *dixit*, and the reading *fac intellegere illum visionem* (vs *prudentem fac visum illum* or *enarra illam visionem* for συνέτισον ἐκεῖνον τὴν ὄρασιν).

In his epistle 111,4 (dated 409), Augustine is the only author to quote entirely from the text of the prayer in Dan 9:3-20, especially vss 10-20. For the first nine verses, his text can be compared to **D**. Here are the main differences: *sacco* (v. 3, vs *cilicio*, for σάκκῳ), *impie egimus et recessimus* (v. 5, vs *iniurias nocuimus*, for ἡδικήσαμεν καὶ ἀπέστημεν, but the Greek text is confused by many variants here), *propter contumaciam* (v. 7, vs *contumacia*, for ἐν ἀθεσίᾳ), *inprobaverunt* (v. 7, vs *exprobaverunt*, for ἡθέτησαν), *miserationes* (v. 9, vs *miser cordia*, for οἱ οἰκτιρμοί), and an addition of *quoniam recessimus* (v. 9, for ὅτι ἀπέστημεν not translated in **D**).

In Ps 118 s 18,4, Augustine discusses the translation of the Greek expression συνετίσαι σε from 10:14: *nam dixit Danieli: veni intellectum dare tibi. et hoc verbum est in Graeco, quod etiam hic est συνετίσαι σε, tamquam si diceret latinus: sanitatem dare tibi, quod graecus dixisset: sanare te. non enim circumloqueretur latinus interpres dicendo: intellectum dare tibi; si quemadmodum dici potest a sanitate sanare te, ita dici potest ab intellectu intellectuare te.* The words *veni intellectum dare tibi* will form all that remains of the text **A** of this verse, to be compared with **D**: *veni ut aperirem tibi intellectum.*

Finally, verses 12:1-3, quoted in AU ci 20,23 (<sup>1</sup> *et erit tempus tribulationis, qualis non fuit ex quo nata est gens super terram usque ad tempus illud, et in tempore illo salvabitur populus tuus omnis qui inventus fuerit scriptus in libro.* <sup>2</sup> *et multi dormientium in terrae aggere exurgent, hi in vitam aeternam et hi in opprobrium et in confusionem aeternam.* <sup>3</sup> *et intellegentes fulgebunt sicut claritas firmamenti, et ex iustis multi sicut stellae in saecula et adhuc*) will serve to write line **A** of the schema (which will furthermore be rather complicated to constitute). We have pointed out above the many ways in which Jerome had translated the expression ἐν γῆς χώματι; here is Augustine's: *in terrae aggere.*

### *The version of Jerome (V and H) and its editorial apparatus*

In the prologue to his translation of the biblical text of Daniel, carried out between 390 and 393, Jerome begins by recalling that not all the churches read Daniel according to the Septuagint translation, but that they use the text of Theodotion. The reason for this, he says, is that the Septuagint text, being far removed from the truth (*quod multum a veritate discordet*) - from the *veritas hebraica*, that is - was rightly (*recto iudicio*) rejected. The fact that part of the book is written in Chaldean, that is, in Aramaic, is perhaps a second reason. Jerome then recalls his difficulties in the learning of Aramaic before pointing out the inauthenticity of the supplements of chapter 3. He concludes his prologue by mentioning first that the Hebrews place Daniel, not among the prophets, but among the editors of the Hagiographes (*inter eos qui Hagiographa conscripserunt*), then that the book was the object of attacks by Porphyry, and finally that it is dedicated to Paula and Eustochium.

One particular point will be of interest here. Rufinus, in his *Apology against Jerome*<sup>97</sup>, in 401, accuses him of having amputated in his translation the History of Susanna and the Song

---

<sup>97</sup> *Nam omnis illa historia de Susanna, quae castitatis exemplum praebebat ecclesiis Dei, ab isto abscissa est et abiecta atque posthabita. Trium puerorum hymnus, qui maxime diebus solemnibus in ecclesiis Dei canitur, ab*

of the Three Young Men<sup>98</sup>. These sections, he says, were used by the Church respectively to incite to chastity and to be sung on solemnities. For the story of Susanna, he affirms precisely that it was by him *abscissa et abiecta et posthabita* and for the hymn, that it was *e loco suo penitus erasum*. How to understand in particular these last words? Rufinus' reproaches are to be compared with Jerome's own statements. Indeed, in the prologue to his translation of the biblical book of Daniel, where he recalls that the story of Susanna, the canticle of the Three Young Men and the fables (*fabulae*) of Bel and the dragon are absent from the Hebrew text, Jerome adds: *nos, quia in toto orbe dispersae sunt, veru ante posito easque iugulante subiecimus ne videremur apud imperitos magnam partem voluminis detruncasse*. The important word is *subiecimus*, and two interpretations have been given to the sentence. The first is that assumed by Rufinus: "we have placed them after", i.e. removed from their original place (*e loco suo*) and placed at the end of the book, as is usually done for supplements (this is how the supplements to the book of Esther are presented in the Vulgate); R. Courtray translates as follows: "ces passages, parce qu'ils sont répandus sur toute la terre, nous les avons placés à la fin, précédés du signe critique qui les juggle, pour ne pas donner l'impression aux ignorants d'avoir retranché une partie importante du texte"<sup>99</sup>. The problem with this first interpretation is that, in all the direct witnesses of the Vulgate text, as well as in the various series of *capitula*, the canticles are well situated in chapter 3, in the place they have in Greek. Jerome's assertion would therefore apply only to the story of Susanna and the episode of Bel and the dragon, which are indeed placed at the end of the book. Could it be that Jerome was mistaken on this essential question? Perhaps the other interpretation, reflected in the translation by A. Canellis, should be preferred: "...nous les avons placés sous un obèle qui les précède et les juggle..."<sup>100</sup>. What is important, then, is not the place of these pieces of text, but the fact that they are accompanied by obelus that identify them as supplements to the *veritas hebraica*. And that does not contradict the organization of the materials in the Vulgate text: Jerome left the hymn in chapter 3, but moved the stories of Susanna and Bel and the dragon to the end of the book as chapters 13 and 14 respectively. This is what Jerome recalls in the prologue to his commentary on Daniel in 410: "That is why, many years ago, when we translated Daniel, we also preceded these visions (namely Susanna and Bel and the dragon) with an obelus, meaning that they were not found in Hebrew. And I am surprised that some people are indignant with me because I have shortened the book..."<sup>101</sup>. He does not even mention the displacement of these pieces of text, because for him the only important information is the presence of the obelus. But this second interpretation

---

*isto e loco suo penitus erasum est (...) Omnis qui putabat Susannam nuptis et innuptis exemplum pudicitiae praestitisse, erravit : non est verum. Et omnis qui putabat quod puer Danihel Spiritu Sancto fuerit repletus et arguerit adulteros senes, erravit : non erat verum. Et omnis ecclesia per orbem terrarum, sive eorum qui in corpore sunt, sive eorum qui ad Dominum perrexerunt, sive illi sancti confessores fuerunt seu etiam sancti martyres, quicumque hymnum trium puerorum in ecclesia Domini cecinerunt, omnes erraverunt et falsa cecinerunt* (RUF ap H 2,33 + 2,35).

<sup>98</sup> As in many of the manuscript witnesses to the Old Latin text of the Danielic hymns, verses 25-90 of chapter 3 are considered by Rufinus and Jerome as a whole entitled *hymnus trium puerorum*. In reality, the whole is made up of two hymns: that of Azariah (3:25-45) and that of the Three Young Men (3:51-90), with a few narrative verses between the two.

<sup>99</sup> COURTRAY 2009, pp. 120-121. In English: "These passages, because they are spread all over the world, we have placed them at the end, preceded by the critical sign which stops them, so as not to give the impression to the ignorant of having cut out an important part of the text".

<sup>100</sup> CANELLIS 2017, p. 457. In English: "...we have placed them under an obelus which precedes them and curb them... "

<sup>101</sup> *Unde et nos ante annos plurimos, cum verteremus Danielem, has visiones obelo praenotavimus, significantes eas in Hebraico non haberi. Et miror quosdam μεμψιμοίρους indignari mihi, quasi ego decurtaverim librum...* cf. COURTRAY 2019, pp. 130-131.

is also difficult: one would expect *iugulanti* in the dative, complement of a verb with preverb<sup>102</sup>. As the text is presented, the construction *veru...iugulanti* cannot come into the construction of the preverbal verb: it is indeed an absolute ablative. Therefore, one can only attribute to *subiecimus* an absolute meaning, which would give reason to Rufin's interpretation<sup>103</sup>. The problem deserved to be raised, even if the difficulty has remained unresolved.

We have not pursued further the study of the prefaces and *capitula*, which constitute what is usually called the editorial apparatus. Indeed, neither the attested prefaces nor the different series of *capitula* offer elements that can be used in the analysis of the Old Latin versions of the book, as has been the case for others<sup>104</sup>.

In accordance with the use of the collection, the Latin version carried out by Jerome on the Hebrew-Aramaic will receive the siglum **H** and that of the Greek supplements the siglum **V**. We have re-read the text of the Roman edition on the Weber-Gryson edition, and it is the text of the latter that is noted in the schemas.

### *The In Daniele of Jerome*

It is not the intention here to make an inventory of all the questions relating to Jerome's *Commentary on Daniel*. R. Courtray did this masterfully a short time ago<sup>105</sup>, and most of what follows is borrowed from his work. The aim is only to touch on a few points which may have repercussions on the edition and explain the choice of quotations from this commentary in the witnesses' apparatus.

Composed in 407, the commentary on Daniel differs in many ways from Jerome's other commentaries. First of all, it is polemical in tone. Following the works of Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea and Methodius of Olympus, which Jerome quotes several times, the commentary is in fact a refutation of the accusations made by Porphyry against the authenticity of the book and the identity of the Antichrist<sup>106</sup>. Because the wordplay of 13:54 and 58 (ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίνου σχίσει σε ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου πρίσει σε "by the mastic tree God will split you and by the holm oak he will cut you") works better in Greek (σχίνου/σχίσει and πρίνου/πρίσει) than in Hebrew (*quam ἐτυμολογίαν magis graeco sermoni convenire quam hebraeo*), Porphyry had questioned the authenticity and canonicity of the entire book. Jerome was at liberty to point out that since the passage was taken from the Greek supplements, it was by no means covered by the authority of the holy scriptures (*nullam scripturae sanctae auctoritatem praebeant*)<sup>107</sup>. Porphyry interpreted the Jeremian prophecy of the seventy weeks and the coming of the Destroyer (Dan 9:24-27), not as an announcement of the Antichrist who is to come in the last days, but as an interpretation of the events which took place during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Jerome's refutation is long and laborious. We know today that Porphyry was right on this point. The tone is different and so is the way of commenting too. Jerome does not present and explain all the words of the prophet (*proponentes omnia et omnia disserentes*), but only briefly and at intervals clarify those which are obscure (*breviter et per intervalla ea tantum*

<sup>102</sup> In the manuscript tradition of the prologue, no witness has the dative.

<sup>103</sup> I would like to thank my Latinist colleague, Paul-Augustin Deproost, for his judicious remarks.

<sup>104</sup> See *Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem. Liber Danihelis*, Romae 1981; DE BRUYNE 2014; DE BRUYNE 2015.

<sup>105</sup> COURTRAY 2009.

<sup>106</sup> BOGAERT 1986.

<sup>107</sup> Origen had already dedicated his *Letter to Africanus* to this question, see DE LANGE 1983, pp. 522-573.

*quae obscura sunt*)<sup>108</sup>. And indeed, many verses are not commented on. He only makes a departure from the *brevitas* in chapters 11-12 because of the great obscurity in these chapters.

Jerome does not follow the Greek translation of Theodotion, the 'official' text of the churches, but faithful to his *veritas hebraica*, he translates the Hebrew-Aramaic. This however, does not prevent him from relying on Theodotion from time to time. This appears in the supplements to chapter 3<sup>109</sup>, but also in the sections common to the Hebrew and Greek, where a passage can give rise to a discussion. Of the 55 points discussed, Jerome chooses most of the time (45 times) a Hebrew-Aramaic translation, sometimes pointing out that he relies on the hexaplaric translators. On ten occasions, Jerome does not follow the Hebrew-Aramaic, either because he has a faulty manuscript, or because he mistranslates a Hebrew word, or because it is the interpretation of the passage that guides his choice of translation<sup>110</sup>. Sometimes, he not only quotes, but comments on variants of the Septuagint and the hexaplaric translators: the Septuagint (2:29; 6:4; 11:20 and 11:36), Theodotion (12:3 and 12:13), Symmachus (3:92; 7:25; 10:5 and 10:11) and Aquila (11:30 and 37). In 11:37-41, all the translations are called upon to refute Porphyry. The translations of the Septuagint and the hexaplaric translators by Jerome will be identified by the siglum **O**.

One must also question the unity of the book. In his edition published in the *Corpus Christianorum*, Fr. Glorie had assumed that the commentary on Dan 11:21 to 12:13, which he entitled *De Antichristo in Daniele*, had initially circulated in an independent form. It was later included in the commentary as the fourth book. Glorie wanted to solve two difficulties. In 398, Paulinus of Nole had asked Jerome for a commentary on Daniel. But Jerome who was caught up in the translation of Origen's *Peri Archôn*, had not been able to satisfy this request and had then explained himself in *Epistle 85* (dated 400/401). Now, when he completes the commentary in 407, it is not to Paulinus, but to Pammachius and Marcella that he dedicates it. On the other hand, Glorie had observed, in the manuscript tradition which he had retained, the existence of two forms of the commentary: a complete commentary and an abbreviated commentary on *De Antichristo* alone (transmitted by mss W and X<sup>1-2</sup> which bear the titles *Expositio super Daniel de Antichristo sancti Iheronymi presbyteri* and *Explanatio sancti Hieronymi de Antichristo in Danihel prophetam*, respectively). Glorie solved this double difficulty this way: after having addressed his *Epistle 85* to Paulinus, Jerome would have dictated a short treatise, *De Antichristo*, for Paulinus. He would then have added it as a fourth book to his commentary. R. Courtray has shown, however, that what Glorie thought was the primitive form was in reality only medieval excerpts<sup>111</sup>. Jerome would thus not have satisfied the request of Paulinus. He dedicates the work to Pammachius and Marcella because they would ensure its diffusion, and perhaps because the relations between Jerome and Paulinus of Nole had cooled in the context of the origenist dispute, Paulinus having maintained his confidence in Rufinus<sup>112</sup>. The section devoted to the Antichrist is particularly developed, because of the difficulty of the subject, as we have said, but also because he had to refute Porphyry point by point and oppose him to the

---

<sup>108</sup> The two quotations are taken from the prologue of Jerome's commentary.

<sup>109</sup> *Hucusque de Theodotionis interpretatione pauca perstrinximus confessionis et laudum trium puerorum, quae non habentur in hebraeo. Exin sequamur hebraicam veritatem* (HI Dn 1 [807,706]). However, he will comment on them only very briefly: a little more than a page for the canticle of Azariah and 15 lines for the canticle of the Three Young Men, where he will do little more than list the creatures.

<sup>110</sup> A phenomenon already observed in the commentary on Isaiah: HAELEWYCK 1988.

<sup>111</sup> COURTRAY 2004.

<sup>112</sup> COURCELLE 1947.

opinion of the Christians (*Porphyrius...nostri autem*). His treatise on the Antichrist was so successful that medieval copyists produced an abridged version of it at a time when a whole literature on the last ends was developing. There is therefore no book four in Jerome's commentary. This is also what Cassiodorus affirms in his *Institutions*: "And this same Daniel, who, among the Hebrews, is not received among the prophets but is counted among the writers of *Agrapha*, is known to have been explained in three books by Saint Jerome, mentioned above"<sup>113</sup>. With R. Courtray<sup>114</sup>, the conclusive character of the commentary on 12:13 should be noted, which indicates that the body of the work stops after the explanation of chapter 12. What follows is only an appendix containing some notes on chapters 13 and 14 taken from Origen's *Stromata*. This is undoubtedly also one of the reasons which led Glorie to put forward the hypothesis of a writing in successive phases. To remedy the wobbly character of the end of the commentary and to give it a semblance of unity, certain manuscripts (mss C D and A, not used by Glorie) have added a note taken from the Vulgate text: "Up to this point we read Daniel in the Hebrew volume. Everything that follows until the end of the book has been translated from the Theodotion edition"<sup>115</sup>.

R. Courtray, who based his edition-revision on a broader manuscript base than that of Glorie, studied the division of the commentary into visions<sup>116</sup>. His remarks thus complete what had been discussed above. Eight out of ten manuscripts attest to this, but sometimes in an incomplete or faulty manner. Establishing the number of visions and their limits is difficult if one relies only on the manuscript tradition. Fortunately, Jerome's own text provides indications that the whole is divided into ten visions spread over three books.

#### Book I

- Vision 1: chap. 1
- Vision 2: chap. 2
- Vision 3: chap. 3
- Vision 4: chap. 4

#### Book II

- Vision 5: chap. 5
- Vision 6: chap. 6
- Vision 7: chap. 7
- Vision 8: chap. 8

#### Book III

- Vision 9: chap. 9
- Vision 10: chap. 10 - 12
- Appendices: *De Susannae et Belis fabulis*

---

<sup>113</sup> *Idemque Danihel qui, licet apud Hebraeos nequaquam prophetico choro recipitur, sed inter eos annumeratur qui Agriographa conscripserunt, tribus libris a supra memorato sancto Hieronymo noscitur explanatus* (CAr in 1,3 [19,14]). See COURTRAY 2009, p. 56.

<sup>114</sup> COURTRAY 2009, pp. 42-43, and COURTRAY 2019, p. 529.

<sup>115</sup> *Hucusque Danihelem in hebraeo volumine legimus. Cetera quae sequuntur usque ad finem libri de Theodotionis editione translata sunt.*

<sup>116</sup> COURTRAY 2009, pp. 42-61.

The lemmas of the commentary differ only slightly from the text of the Vulgate. Jerome has not, therefore, gone back on his translation. Apart from a few minor differences (concerning preverbs or cases), there are only eight discrepancies worth noting<sup>117</sup>.

	<i>In Daniele</i>	Vulgate (Rome 1981)
3:16	<i>Nabuchodonosor <u>rex</u>, non oportet nos de hac re respondere tibi</i>	<i>dixerunt regi : Nabuchodonosor, non oportet nos de hac re respondere tibi</i>
4:32	<i>iuxta voluntatem enim suam facit <u>tam in caelo quam in terra</u></i>	<i>iuxta voluntatem enim suam facit tam in virtutibus caeli quam in habitatoribus terrae</i>
7:7	<i>dissimilis autem erat ceteris bestiis quas videram <u>prius</u></i>	<i>dissimilis autem erat ceteris bestiis quas videram ante eam</i>
8:10	<i>et usque ad fortitudinem caeli...<u>erexit magnificentiam suam</u></i>	<i>et magnificatum est usque ad fortitudinem caeli</i>
10:16	<i><u>conversa sunt interiora mea in me</u></i>	<i>dissolutae sunt compages meae</i>
11:17	<i>ut evertat <u>illum</u></i>	<i>ut evertat illud</i>
11:30	<i>cogitabit <u>de his</u> qui dereliquerunt testamentum sanctuarii</i>	<i>cogitabit adversum eos qui dereliquerint testamentum sanctuarii</i>
12:9	<i>usque ad tempus <u>consummationis</u></i>	<i>usque ad tempus praefinitum</i>

Table 10: Discrepancies between HI Dn and the Vulgate

The case of 8:10 is a bit different: it is actually a repetition of the lemma in the commentary, which may explain the inversion and the different vocabulary. In 3:16 the presence of the word *rex* comes from the Old Latin (in the four quotations from Cyprian, in CY ep 6,3; ep 58; CY Fo 11; CY te 3,10; and in Jerome in HI Ps h 55 when he translates Origen) and is based on the Septuagint text. The variation in 4:32 does not correspond exactly to any form in the book, but in the *Dialogues against the Pelagians* (HI Pel 2,30, in 415/416), Jerome will again use an abbreviated form (*in caelo et in terris*). The adverb *prius* in 7:7 is to be compared with the adverb *antea* (LUC par 30). In 10:16 he corrects his former translation or, more probably, he has kept in mind a form of the Old Latin text comparable to that attested in VL 177: *conversa sunt intus omnia in me*, perhaps to be compared with the text of Symmachus (εστρεβλωθη τα μελη μου εν εμοι). The text of 11:30 is different, but relies on the same Hebrew preposition 'al rendered as ἐπί. The *consummationis* of 12:9 will be found in Isidore of Seville's *De fide*, composed shortly after 612; the Old Latin, little attested here, reads *usque ad temporis finitionem* (VL 176).

In the apparatus of the witnesses of the edition, the pagination and the lineation of the commentary of Jerome are those of the edition of Glorie (CC 75A). But the text is borrowed from the edition-revision of Courtray (Sources chrétiennes 602) which modified in more than one place the text edited by Glorie. The apparatus of the edition of Glorie is taken again, but corrected and supplemented by that of Courtray whose work rests on a broader manuscript base.

### *Vocabulary of European texts*

To propose an analysis of the vocabulary of European texts is a risky undertaking. Unlike other biblical books for which several complete manuscripts made it possible to follow the evolution of the vocabulary, or even to specify the characteristics of each of them in this domain, in the case of the book of Daniel, we are in the presence of vestiges surviving from a

<sup>117</sup> The discrepancy pointed out by COURTRAY 2009, p. 103, about 9:5 does not exist: one reads *inique fecimus* on both sides, if one compares with the Roman edition of the Vulgate and with the edition of Weber-Gryson 1994 (Courtray uses the edition of Weber 1969).

great shipwreck. In a large number of passages, in comparison with the African witnesses (ancient and recent) it is impossible, given the limited attestation of the latter. For their part, the European texts cannot be treated as a whole, as if they formed a unity. Moreover, the existence of Greek variants has obliged us to discard certain examples which suppose a different Greek substratum. The considerations which follow must therefore be taken with greatly required prudence and are at most only indications expressing a tendency.

We have gone through the provisional schemas made for writing this introduction and noted a certain number of examples (here presented in the alphabetical order of the Greek words) which may be significant. The Latin word without any precision on the type of text must be understood as the translation of the European witnesses, including Jerome's translation of the Greek supplements (**V**). One can compare this with what has been said above about the vocabulary of the ancient African text.

αἰνετός (3:52): *laudabilis* ≠ *admirabilis* (**C**)

αἰσχύνη (3:33.40): the late African text, most European witnesses, as well as **V**, have *confusio*; only **D** uses *verecundia* and *turpitude*

ἀποστάτης (3:32): *transfuga*, *praevaricator* ≠ *apostata* (**C**)

βδέλυγμα (9:27): *abominatio* ≠ *exsecratio*, *aspernatio* (**K C**)

γενεά (3:100; 4:31): *saeculum* ≠ *generatio* (**C**)

γένεσις (13:42): *generatio*, *nativitas*, *feri* ≠ *nasci* (**C**)

γινώσκω (3:45; 9:25; 12:7; 14:19): *scire* ≠ *cognoscere* (**K C**)

γνώσις (12:4): *scientia*, *cognitio* ≠ *agnitio* (**K**)

δέησις (9:23): *oratio* ≠ *obsecratio* (**X**)

δόξα (3:52.53): *gloria* ≠ *claritas* (**C**); but the word is rendered by *gloria* in 7:14 (**X**)

ἐκλευκαίνω (12:10): *albescere* ≠ *albus inalbare* (**C**)

ἐκριζόω (7:8): *eradicare* ≠ *deicere* (**X**); clear revision

ἐκτελέω (3:40): *perficere* with **C** ≠ *consummere* (**K**)

ἐλεημοσύνη (4:24): *miserecordia* ≠ *eleemosyna* (**K**)

ἔλεος (3:42; 9:4): European witnesses unanimously translate by *miserecordia*; old and recent African witnesses also use *miserecordia* but especially *miseratio*

ἐμφράσσω (12:4): *obstruere* ≠ *munire* (**K**)

ἔνδυμα (7:9): *vestitus* (with **K**), *vestis*, *indumentum* ≠ *vestmentum* (**C**)

ἔξοδος (9:25): *initium* ≠ *profectio* (**X**), *exitus* (**K**), *proventus* (**C**)

ἐξολεθρεύω (13:59; 9:26): *interire*, *perdere* ≠ *exterminare* (**X**), *disperdere* (**K C**), *interficere* (**V**)

ἐπάγω (3:28[bis].31): *inferre* ≠ *inducere* (**C** with **V**)

ἐπιείκεια (3:42): *tranquillitas*, *mansuetudo* ≠ *clementia* (**K**), *modestia* (**C**)

ἐρήμωσις (9:27[bis]): *interitus*, *desolatio*, *solitudo* ≠ *vastatio* (**X K**)

θυμίαμα (3:38): *supplicatio* ≠ *thus* (**K**), *incensum* (**C** with **V**)

θυσία (3:38.40): *sacrificium* (with **C**) ≠ *hostia* (**K**)

καλός (13:2.31): *bonus*, *pulcher* ≠ *formosus* (**K**)

καταισχύνω (13:27; 3:42): *confundere* (with **C**), *erubescere* ≠ *in obprobrium tradere* (**K**)

καταμαρτυρέω (13:21.49): *falsum testimonium dare/dicere/loqui* ≠ *falsum contestari* (**C**)

κτήνος (3:81): *iumentum* ≠ *pecus* (**C** with **V**)

κτίζω (14:5): *creare*, *constituere* ≠ *condere* (**K**)



λαός (13:5[bis].28[bis].34.41.47.50.64; 6:25; 9:24; 12:1): the **D** and **R** texts render the word generally as *plebs* (10 times, *populus* 2 times); the other European texts use *populus*, but read *plebs* 1 time (13:5 **V**)

λατρεύω (3:17.18): only **X** uses *colere* and *famulari*; the other text types, including **C**, prefer *servire*

μικρός (7:8): *minus*, *pusillus*, *parvus* ≠ *brevis* (**X**)

νοήμων (12:10): *prudens* ≠ *intellector* (**C**); *intellector* does not belong to the classical language

ὄνειδος (3:33): *turpitude*, *obprobrium* ≠ *exprobratio* (**C**)

παιδάριον (13:45; 1:17): *puer* ≠ *adulescens* (**X**)

παλαιός (7:9; 7:13.22): *vetustus* is found in all types of texts, *antiquus* only in European witnesses and *vetus* only in African witnesses

παράδεισος (13:4.7.15.17.18.20.25.26.36[bis].38): Tertullian (**X**) rendered the word by *stadium* in 13:7 but probably under the influence of the text ο' (cf. 13:37); the **D**-text always translates by *paradisus* and the **R**-text by *viridarium* (which appears with *hortus* in the other European witnesses); Jerome (**V**) always uses *pomerium*

πληθος (3:42): *multitudo* (with **C**) ≠ *amplitudo* (**K**)

πληθύνω (3:36; 12:4): *multiplicare* generally ≠ *implere* (**K**), *adimplere* (**C**)

πολιορκέω (1:1): *obsidere* ≠ *expugnare* (**K**)

πρόσωπις (2:31): *effigies* ≠ *contemplatio* (**K**)

ρύομαι (3:88[bis]; 6:27): *eripere*, *liberare*, *eruerere* ≠ *salvus facere* (**K**)

σπονδή (9:27): *supplicatio*, *libamen* ≠ *libatio* (**X K**)

στερέωμα (3:56): *firmamentum* ≠ *solidamentum* (**C**)

τέρας (3:99; 6:27): *ostentum* ≠ *prodigium* (**K C**)

ὑπερφερής (2:31): *excelsus* ≠ *elatus* (**K**)

ὑστερέω (5:27): *egere* ≠ *minus habere* (**C**)

ὑψιστος (4:31): *excelsus* ≠ *altissimus* (**C**)

φθάνω (6:24; 7:13; 7:22): only **D** distinguishes itself by the translation *anticipare* or *tangere*; the other European witnesses read *pervenire* with **K** (who also reads *venire* as **X**) and **C**

χρείαν ἔχω (3:16): *necesse habere*, *habere causam* ≠ *habere necessitatem* (**X**), *opus esse* (**K**)

χρηστός (2:32; 3:89): *suavis* ≠ *bonus* (with **V**)

χρῖσμα (9:26): *chrisma* (with **C**) ≠ *unctio* (**X K**)

ψυχος (3:67): *hiems* ≠ *frigus* (**C** with **V**)

## 6. History of the Old Latin text of Daniel

The first traces of the book of Daniel in the West appear in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century in the form of free quotations in the Latin translations of the *Pastor of Hermas* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*.

At the end of the second century and at the very beginning of the third, the authentic works of Tertullian contain quotations of seventeen verses of which analysis has shown to be essentially based on the Septuagint text, with the occasional influence from the text of Theodotion. The situation is reversed in the case of the quotations from the *Adversus Iudaeos* which is attributed to him: the text of Theodotion prevails; only some of his readings are close to the Septuagint text. This same distribution is found in the analysis of the allusions to the text of Daniel. These first attestations constitute the type of text **X**, to which we must add the later testimony of Victorinus of Pettau (**Y**).

By the middle of the third century, Cyprian's quotations were used to reconstruct in some places, a type of text **K**. They correspond sometimes to the text of Theodotion and sometimes to that of the Septuagint. Cyprian probably used a translation made on the Septuagint, but already corrected on the text of Theodotion. Around the same time, two pseudo-Cyprian works,

the *Ad Novatianum* and the *De pascha computus*, whose African origin remain uncertain, follow exclusively the text of Theodotion.

Quotations from later African authors, from the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century (Optatus of Milevis, Tyconius, Zeno, Hilarianus, the pseudo-Cyprian *Exhortatio de paenitentia*, the *Contra Varimadum* of Pseudo-Vigilius, Quodvultdeus, Fulgentius), have made it possible to reconstitute from time to time a type of recent African text (**C**), based for the most part on the version of Theodotion. But the influence of other types of text begins to appear on African soil: the Vulgate text in Quodvultdeus and Fulgentius, but also, for the latter, the **D** text which he must have known of during his exile in Sardinia.

With the European authors of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, the influence of the Septuagint text disappears. Around 350 AD, the European continent produces text types that are clearly different from the African texts. They are however far from being unified. From this nebula, several types of text could be identified. The European text of the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. (**D**) is attested by fragmentary manuscripts 175 176 and 177, the first two being close to each other and the third, second to them since it corrects or improves the text. Thanks to these three witnesses, 410 of the 529 verses of the book have been preserved in direct tradition. It has especially been shown the great proximity of the text of these witnesses with the quotations of Lucifer of Cagliari, with the exception however of the History of Susanna where a peculiar major line (**R**) gives the text of Lucifer. Towards 365, traces of this type of text **D** have been found alongside in Hilary of Poitiers, however, they are readings which are peculiar to him. Some readings of Ambrose constitute the rare vestiges of a Milanese text (**M**). It is especially the Italian text of the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> c. (**I**) that we have been able to reconstruct, thanks to the quotations from the *Ambrosiaster*, from Chromatius, from Jerome when he does not quote his translation, from the Latin translation of the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus and from the pseudo-augustinian *Speculum*. The quotations, sometimes lengthy, from Augustine have enabled us to write a major line **A**. In rare passages, such as 4:24, it was not possible to specify the type of text: we have attributed to the quotation from Salvian of Marseilles the abbreviation **E**.

Between 390 and 393, Jerome, abandoning the Greek tradition, translates Daniel from Hebrew-Aramaic; he does not, however, forget the Greek supplements: he leaves in place all the supplements in chapter 3, but groups together at the end of the book the Story of Susanna and that of Bel and the Dragon. In 407, he composes a commentary which seeks only to clarify briefly the most obscure passages, with the exception of the interpreted chapters of the Antichrist where he tries laboriously to refute Porphyry.

The Danielic canticles are the only sections of the book to have known a relative fortune thanks to the liturgy. This is especially true of the Cantic of the Three Young Men (3:57-88[90]), which has been transmitted in Old Latin as an appendix to many Psalters, especially in the Roman, Old Gallican, Irish and Milanese series of biblical canticles (it is Vulgate in the other series). In comparison there was a limited distribution of the hymn of Azariah (3:26-45) which however is more interesting from the point of view of the types of text.

Finally, it should be noted that the Old Latin wording of a good sixty verses has been irretrievably lost.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALTBAUER A., 1978: *Psalterium latinum hierosolymitanum. Eine frühmittelalterliche lateinische Handschrift, Sin. Ms. no. 5*, Wien-Köln-Graz.
- ANDRÉS SANZ M. A., 2019: “A New *Vetus Latina* Testimony for Dn 13,39-50 and 53-61. The Manuscript Fragment Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek cod. 1398a I, pp. 16-17”, *Revue Bénédictine* 129, pp. 241-253.
- BERNARD J. H., ATKINSON, R., 1898: *The Irish Liber Hymnorum* (Henry Bradshaw Society 13-14), 2 vol., London.
- BERNARD P., 1993: “Le Cantique des Trois Enfants (Dan. III, 52-90) et les répertoires liturgiques occidentaux dans l’Antiquité tardive et le haut Moyen Âge”, *Musica e storia* 1, pp. 231-272.
- BIANCHINI E., 1740: *Vindiciae canonicarum scripturarum vulgatae latinae editionis...*, Romae.
- BILLEN A. V., 1927: *The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch*, Cambridge.
- BLUDAU A., 1897: *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältnis zum massorethischen Text* (Biblische Studien, II 2-3), Freiburg/Br.
- BOGAERT P., 1978: “Le témoignage de la *Vetus Latina* dans l’étude de la tradition des Septante. Ézéchiël et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967”, *Biblica* 59, pp. 384-395.
- 1986: “La chronologie dans la dernière vision de Daniel (Dn 10,4 et 12,11-12)”, in A. CAQUOT, M. HADAS-LEBEL, J. RIAUD (eds), *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (Collection de la Revue des Études Juives, 3), Leuven, pp. 207-211.
- 1993a: “Daniel 3 LXX et son supplément grec”, in A.S. VAN DER WOUDE (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 106), Leuven, pp. 13-37.
- 1993b: art. “Septante et versions grecques”, in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, XII, Paris, coll. 645-646.
- 2001: *Judith* (*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*, 7/2), Freiburg/Br.
- 2004: “La prière de Daniel (9,4-19) selon le Psautier latin du Sinaï. Un remaniement liturgique”, *Revue Bénédictine* 111, pp. 349-362.
- BURKITT F. C., 1896: *The Old Latin and the Itala. With an Appendix containing the Text of the S. Gallen Palimpsest of Jeremiah* (Texts and Studies, 4/3), Cambridge.
- CANELLIS A., 2017: *Préfaces aux livres de la Bible* (Sources chrétiennes, 592), Paris.
- CAPELLE P., 1913: *Le texte du Psautier latin en Afrique* (Collectanea Biblica Latina, 4), Rome.
- CERIANI A. M., 1874: *Monumenta sacra et profana*, VII, Mediolani.
- CONDUCHÉ C., GUILLAUMIN J.-B., MARQUIS É., REGNAULT-LARRIEU J., PETITMENGIN P., SALAMON A. 2013: “Le *De cursu temporum* d’Hilarianus et sa réfutation (CPL 2280 et 2281). Une querelle chronologique à la fin de l’Antiquité. Édition, traduction, études”, *Recherches augustiniennes et patristiques* 37, pp. 131-267.
- COURCELLE P., 1947: “Paulin de Nole et Jérôme”, *Revue des études latines* 25, pp. 250-280.
- COURTRAY R., 2004: “Nouvelles recherches sur la transmission du *De Antichristo* de Jérôme”, *Sacris Erudiri* 43, pp. 33-53.

- 2009: *Prophète des temps derniers. Jérôme commente Daniel* (Théologie historique, 19), Paris.
- 2019: *Jérôme. Commentaire sur Daniel* (Sources chrétiennes, 602), Paris.
- DE BRUYNE D., 2014: *Summaries, Divisions and Rubrics of the Latin Bible*. Introductions by Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Thomas O’Loughlin (Studia Traditionis Theologiae. Explorations in Early and Medieval Theology, 18), Turnhout (= Namur, 1914).
- 2015: *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*. Introductions by Pierre-Maurice Bogaert and Thomas O’Loughlin (Studia Traditionis Theologiae. Explorations in Early and Medieval Theology, 19), Turnhout (= Namur, 1920).
- DE LANGE N., 1983: *Origène. La lettre à Africanus sur l’histoire de Suzanne*, introduction, texte, traduction et notes (Sources chrétiennes, 302), Paris.
- DE MAGISTRIS S., 1772: *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex Tetraptis Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codice annorum supra DCCC*, Romae.
- DOLD A., 1923: *Konstanzer altlateinische Propheten- und Evangelienbruchstücke mit Glossen nebst zugehörigen Prophetentexten aus Zürich und St. Gallen* (Texte und Arbeiten, 7-9), Beuron.
- 1936: *Lichtbild-Ausgabe des Stuttgarter altlateinischen Unzial-Psalters aus dem VIII. Jahrhundert (Cod. Bibl. Fol. 12 der Württ. Landesbibliothek)*, Beuron (complete fac-simile).
- 1940: *Neue St. Galler vorhieronymianische Propheten-Fragmente der St. Galler Sammelhandschrift 1398b zugehörig* (Texte und Arbeiten, 31), Beuron.
- FERRETTI P., 1937: *Esthétique grégorienne ou Traité des formes musicales du chant grégorien*, Solesmes.
- GEISSEN A., 1968: *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap. 5-12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco sowie Esther Kap. 1, 1a-2, 45, nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 5), Bonn.
- GRYSON R., 1987-1997: *Esaias* (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 12), Freiburg/Br.
- 1999: *Altlateinische Handschriften. Old Latin Manuscripts. Répertoire descriptif* (Vetus Latina, 1/2A), 2 vol., Freiburg/Br.
- 2000-2003: *Apocalypsis Johannis* (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 26/2), Freiburg/Br.
- 2007: *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l’Antiquité et du Haut Moyen Âge* (Vetus Latina, 1/1), Freiburg/Br.
- HAELEWYCK J.-C., 1988: “Le lemme vulgate du commentaire de Jérôme sur Isaïe”, in Y.-M. DUVAL (ed.), *Jérôme entre l’Occident et l’Orient. XVI<sup>e</sup> centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem. Actes du Colloque de Chantilly (Septembre 1986)*, Paris, pp. 391-402.
- 1989: “Le cantique de la vigne. Histoire du texte vieux latin d’Is 5,1-7(9a)”, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 65, pp. 257-279.
- 2003-2008: *Hester* (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 7/3), Freiburg/Br.
- 2013-2018: *Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 17), Freiburg/Br.

- 2020: “Les cantiques daniéliques (Dn 3,26-90) vieux latins et leurs types de texte”, *BABELAO. Electronic Journal for Ancient and Oriental Studies* 9, pp. 95-116.
- 2021-2022: *Danihel* (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 14/1), Freiburg/Br.
- 2021: “Le texte vieux latin du cantique d’Habacuc 3,2-19 dans le psautier de Vérone (VL 300)”, *Revue Bénédictine* 131, pp. 301-320.
- 2022: “Le cantique vieux latin d’Azarias (Dn 3,26-45) dans le manuscrit Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare IV fol. 6. Édition et commentaire”, *Revue Biblique* 129, pp. 341-349.
- HAMM W., 1969: *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap. 1-2 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 10), Bonn.
- 1977: *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap. 3-4 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 21), Bonn.
- HARL M., 2014: *Voix de louange. Les cantiques bibliques dans la liturgie chrétienne*, avec la collaboration de Br. Meynadier et A. Pietrobelli, Paris.
- KENYON F., G., 1937-1938: *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Fasc. VII, 1, *Ezekiel, Daniel, Ester. Text*, London; VII, 2. *Plates*, London.
- MAGISTRETTI M., 1905: *Manuale Ambrosianum ex codice saec. XI olim in usum canonicae Vallis Travaliae* (Monumenta veteris liturgiae ambrosianae, 2-3), 2 vol., Milano.
- MARSH B. J., 2019: “‘Darius Son of Ahasuerus, King of the Persians’: Textuality and Chronology in Jacob of Edessa's Book of Daniel”, *Textus* 28, pp. 67-140.
- MEARNS J., 1914: *The Canticles of the Christian Church Eastern and Western in Early and Medieval Times*, Cambridge.
- MEYER W., 1904: *Das Turiner Bruchstück der ältesten irischen Liturgie* (Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 1903), Göttingen, pp. 163-214.
- RANKE E., 1871: *Par palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium. Antiquissimae Veteris Testamenti versionis latinae fragmenta*, Wien.
- ROCA-PUIG R., 1974: *Daniel. Dos semilofis del còdex 967*, Barcelona.
- ROEDER F., 1904: *Der altenglische Regius-Psalter. Eine Interlinearversion in Ms. Royal 2 B. 5 des Brit. Mus., zum ersten Male vollständig herausgegeben* (Studien zur englischen Philologie, 18), Halle (repr. Walluf bei Wiesbaden 1973).
- SAIANI G. S., 2018: “Un ponte tra Oriente e Occidente: il salterio bilingue greco-latino [Ver. I (1)]”, in M. BASSETTI (ed.), *Nell’anno del Signore 517. Verona al tempo di Ursicino. Crocevia di uomini, culture, scritture. Catalogo della mostra Verona 2018*, Spoleto, pp. 121-127.
- SALMON P., 1944: *Le lectionnaire de Luxeuil (Paris, ms. lat. 9427). I: Édition et étude comparative. Contribution à l’histoire de la Vulgate et de la liturgie en France au temps des mérovingiens* (Collectanea Biblica Latina, 7) Città del Vaticano.
- SANZ P., 1946: *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhalts, I, Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien, IV*, Baden bei Wien.
- SCHNEIDER H., 1938: *Die altlateinischen biblischen Cantica* (Texte und Arbeiten, 29-30), Beuron.

- SCHWARTZ J., 1990: “La Septante de Daniel (1,2-10)”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 81, pp. 275-277.
- STENZEL M., 1955: “Altlateinische Canticatexte im Dodekapropheten”, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 46, pp. 31-60.
- THIBAUT A., GRYSO R., 2010: *Le Psautier latin du Sinäi*. Introduction par R. GRYSO R., édition critique par A. THIBAUT (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel, 39), Freiburg-Basel-Wien.
- THLL: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.
- ULLRICH J. B., 1893: *De Salviani Scripturae Sacrae versionibus*, Neustadt a. Hdt.
- VON SODEN H., 1909: *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians nach Bibelhandschriften und Väterzeugnisse* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 33), Leipzig.
- WARREN F. E., 1893, 1895: *The Antiphony of Bangor. An Early Irish Manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan*, (Henry Bradshaw Society, 4 and 10), 2 vol., London.
- WEBER R., GRYSO R., 1994: *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, Stuttgart.
- WILDHAGEN K., 1920: *Der Cambridger Psalter (Hs. Ff. 1. 23 University Libr. Cambridge) zum ersten Male herausgegeben mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des lateinischen Textes, 1. Text mit Erklärungen* (Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, 7), Hamburg (repr. Darmstadt 1964).
- ZIEGLER J., MUNNICH O., FRAENKEL D., 1999: *Susanna – Daniel – Bel et Draco* edidit J. ZIEGLER. *Editio secunda Versionis iuxta LXX interpretes* textum plane novum constituit O. MUNNICH. *Versionis iuxta « Theodotionem » fragmenta* adiecit D. FRAENKEL (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, XVI/2), Göttingen.
- ZIEGLER J., 1954: *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, XVI/2), Göttingen.
- ZILVERBERG K., 2021: *The textual history of Old Latin Daniel from Tertullian to Lucifer* (Colección de Estudios Bíblicos, Hebraicos y Sefardíes. Serie: Textos y Estudios Cardenal Cisneros, 85), Madrid.

## **ABSTRACT**

The article is an introduction to the edition of the Old Latin versions of the book of Daniel. After a brief presentation of the manuscripts (those of the biblical book and those of the hymns), the Greek texts are presented (Theodotion and LXX). The next chapter studies the division into visions. The hymns are then analyzed: the hymn of the Three Young Men, the hymn of Azariah, and the hymn of the Divine Transcendence. The types of text are the subject of the next chapter: from the origins (**X**) to Jerome's version (**H** and **V**), passing through the ancient African texts (**K**) and the recent ones (**C**), then through the European texts (**D** and **I**), without forgetting Augustine's text (**A**). The article ends with a sketch of the history of the Old Latin text of Daniel.

## **KEYWORDS**

1. Old Latin
2. Vetus Latina
3. Book of Daniel
4. Hymn of the Three Young Men
5. Hymn of Azariah
6. Hymn of the Divine Transcendence