

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The history of Old Latin or *Vetus Latina* Sus-Dn-Bel<sup>1</sup> runs from the dawn of Latin sacred scriptures at turn of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. in North Africa, to its modification and diffusion throughout the Latin-speaking Mediterranean and Europe, to its eventual displacement by the Vg. Most of this history is lost to us, having perished with the manuscripts no longer appropriate for worship or *lectio divina* and, therefore, no longer copied. This state of affairs imposes an initial limit to any study of VL Sus-Dn-Bel: namely, no complete manuscript has survived to give witness to it. Only fragmentary ones survive, along with citations of it and allusions to it by many Latin Fathers.

Among these Fathers, however, only mid-4<sup>th</sup>-c. Lucifer of Caralis (modern Cagliari) quotes the text at length, providing much of Sus and Dn 7. Prior to him, mid-3<sup>rd</sup>-c. Cyprian of Carthage stands out for his antiquity and reliability in scriptural citation, though he only provides up to a few verses at a time. Cyprian was himself preceded by his fellow Carthaginian Tertullian, who wrote in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> to early 3<sup>rd</sup> c. His handful of citations present numerous difficulties, but must be taken into consideration since they represent the earliest known stage of the development of Latin Sus-Dn-Bel. So too the *Adversus Iudaeos* attributed to Tertullian stands out for its late-2<sup>nd</sup>-c. citations but transmits fewer than ten verses of Dn.

This study will provide textual history of Latin Sus-Dn-Bel during its earliest known stages of development through engaging in text-critical and linguistic analyses for the aforementioned patristic witnesses. In order to furnish the detailed analyses that the witnesses' output deserves, it is necessary to limit the scope of this study to the period from the dawn of the VL to Lucifer's two works citing Sus-Dn-Bel, each of which dates to *ca.* 360. So, the period under study encompasses the works of Tertullian (including the *Adversus Iudaeos* attributed to him), Cyprian and contemporary Pseudo-Cyprianic authors, and Lucifer. Those writings comprise the

---

<sup>1</sup> Sus-Dn-Bel refers to the biblical texts of Susanna, Daniel, and Bel and the Dragon in the Greek Old Testament and in derivative biblical versions, like the *Vetus Latina*. Sus and Bel, absent from the Hebrew Bible, were added to Dn in Greek. The two Latin manuscripts of Sus treated below show that, as in most Greek manuscripts, Sus precedes Dn. The Vulgate, however, has a different order: Dn-Sus-Bel. For a full list of biblical abbreviations, see p. 268.

principal focus of this work. Brief treatment will be given to the works of a small number of Fathers who, writing prior to 360, provide a much smaller quantity of citations of Sus-Dn-Bel: the Letter of Barnabas in its ancient Latin translation, Novatian, Victorinus of Poetovium, Lactantius, Firmicus Maternus, and Fortunatianus of Aquileia.

After the period under consideration, Jerome of Stridon of the late 4<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> c. distinguishes himself for his Vg<sup>2</sup> Dn-Sus-Bel as well as his commentary on the same. During and after Jerome's lifetime, 5<sup>th</sup>-c. authors still often cited the VL version of the biblical book, as his version gradually gained prominence and authority. Nevertheless, a thorough treatment that examines all available evidence without chronological limit would require multiple volumes. Therefore, the present work comprises an initial contribution toward fulfilling the desideratum of a complete history.

Despite the chronological circumscription of the study, the scope of which omits important writers such as Ambrose of Milan, Jerome of Stridon, and Augustine of Hippo, this study makes every effort to relate the material treated to pertinent later material. In doing so, it aims to facilitate an appreciation of the fundamental importance of the principal, early period under consideration. It also underscores VL Sus-Dn-Bel's relative textual stability, which was established prior to Lucifer and continued after him, with later witnesses attesting texts from the same *stemma codicum* as Lucifer's rather than independent translations. Hence, although Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine have not been dealt with each in his own right, the reader will find reference to them whenever they shed light on the textual tradition found in the Fathers writing up to 360. Unless a Father was citing Sus-Dn-Bel in a work clearly composed before that year, he has only been treated insofar as his verses cited coincide with the ones up to 360. Therefore, even some contemporaries to Lucifer have been omitted, who nevertheless provide us with no clearly pre-360 citations of Sus-Dn-Bel. Such are Pacian of Barcelona, Optatus of Milevis, Hilary of Poitiers,<sup>3</sup> Zeno of Verona, and the Latin translation of Irenaeus of Lyons's *Adversus haereses*.

The same applies to the anonymous witness of the fragmentary Sus-Dn-Bel manuscripts and liturgical texts. Hence they too, although not treated per se, are highlighted when they agree with the earliest Fathers. Since their relevance for a textual history depends upon their relationships to patristic citations, the present work lays the groundwork for another scholar to more fruitfully study the manuscripts in their own right. The Fathers can be situated in time and space,<sup>4</sup> whereas a manuscript or

<sup>2</sup> "Vulgate" was not clearly used in the sense it is today until the 16<sup>th</sup> c. Nevertheless, throughout this work I use the term for convenience's sake to describe Jerome's new revisions and translations that would later form part of the Vg.

<sup>3</sup> An exception is his partial citation of Sus 42 in the late 350s: HIL *tri* 4,8 (108,36).

<sup>4</sup> Admittedly, variants within the textual tradition of patristic texts sometimes complicate the issue. Even so, the editors of critical patristic editions have helped to minimize this issue. Critical editions are indeed available for most of the patristic works treated in this study. See pp. 19-20.

liturgical book, regardless of its current location, can transmit a text from any stage of transmission and location where the VL thrived.

Before undertaking this study proper, the *status quaestionis* will first be described — a relatively brief section due to a dearth of studies. The pertinent research begins with Pierre SABATIER's monumental work of the mid-18<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>5</sup> and advances notably through the work of German-speaking scholars from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> c. to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup>. No one since SABATIER has systematically treated what remains of VL Sus-Dn-Bel in a study of any length.

After presenting the *status quaestionis*, in the method section I shall describe the custom database used for the collection, manipulation, and viewing of VL Sus-Dn-Bel evidence. I shall then describe the linguistic tools to be employed in the study, divided into text-critical and linguistic sections.

I shall briefly characterize the scriptural citations of each patristic witness. The manuscripts, though not the proper object of this study, are also included here since reference is made to them so frequently. The reader will thus be free to refer back to this section as the authors' citations are treated in detail.

Then comes the heart of this study, a treatment of the early Fathers' VL Sus-Dn-Bel. For each Father, I shall begin with a text-critical analysis, taking into account the Greek *Vorlage(n)* of the Father's scriptural texts as well as the other Latin witnesses. For this enterprise, the critical texts and apparatuses of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen's Sus-Dn-Bel are crucial; I shall frequently reference its reconstructed texts and their variant readings.<sup>6</sup>

The text-critical section will additionally compare each author to other VL witnesses, with special attention given to his textual affinities. Then, for the same texts, linguistic analysis will be undertaken, subdivided into morphology, lexicon, and syntax. Here, the traits and peculiarities of each author will be highlighted so as to situate them within the broader field of Latin philology. Additionally, any detected theological intervention in the text will be noted and discussed.

All the analysis just described will set the foundation for the concluding, synthetic description of the textual history of VL Sus-Dn-Bel from Tertullian to Lucifer. It will also provide the context for responses to questions concerning the unity or diversity of the VL evidence as well as which textual types can be discerned (if any). This will comprise the first thorough characterization of this material ever achieved. It is an essential step toward writing the full textual history and an eventual critical edition, whose publication will, it is hoped, be hastened by this study.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Biblorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae, seu Vetus Italica* (Remis 1743-1749, Turnholti 1991) I-III.

<sup>6</sup> J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Sept. 16/2; Göttingen 21999).

2. *STATUS QUAESTIONIS*

Relatively little has been written on VL Sus-Dn-Bel, and no critical edition has collected the surviving material for publication since the mid-18<sup>th</sup> c. At that time, it was SABATIER who printed the variants known to him in his *Vetus Italica*.<sup>7</sup> Except for the canticles of Dn 3, he adduces no manuscript evidence for the *versio antiqua*. He draws the most material from Lucifer and includes most of the Cyprianic citations, though these latter are sometimes relegated to the notes in favor of more extended witnesses. An extended citation of Dn 9 from Augustine's *Epistula* 111 stands out, as do the canticles of Dn 3 from VL 250 and VL 7,<sup>8</sup> for which there are ample notes adducing further witnesses. SABATIER frequently prints his Greek text for the variant in question. Though outdated and now incomplete, his work is still a useful reference to quickly and easily identify which Fathers cite which verses, and how their texts relate to the Greek.

In 1896 Francis BURKITT treated a few of the earliest Latin patristic witnesses to Dn, considering their principal importance to be their witness to their Greek *Vorlage(n)* rather than contributing to the knowledge and understanding the VL itself.<sup>9</sup> He is keen to point out any alignment of these texts with the more primitive text of Greek Dn, LXX<sup>o</sup>,<sup>10</sup> which leads him to treat Tertullian most thoroughly, followed by Cyprian and Victorinus of Poetovium. Overlooking Tertullian's agreements with the Theodotonic text (LXX<sup>o</sup>)<sup>11</sup> against LXX<sup>o</sup>, he concludes that the primitive North African text of Dn, represented by Tertullian, was a translation of LXX<sup>o</sup>. In his groundbreaking study BURKITT does point out some of Tertullian's agreements with LXX<sup>o</sup>.<sup>12</sup> He fails, however, to point out other such agreements among his citations of Tertullian,<sup>13</sup> claiming that the African generally follows LXX<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> *Italica*, II, 855-889.

<sup>8</sup> The Latin manuscript enumeration of the Vetus Latina-Institut is followed throughout the present work. See R. GRYSO – H. J. FREDE, *Altlateinische Handschriften = Manuscrits vieux latins. Répertoire descriptif*. I. Mss 1-275. II. Mss 300-485 (manuscrits du Psautier) (VL 1/2; Freiburg im Breisgau 1999, 2004) I-II. See also pp. 26-31 in the present work. The reprint of SABATIER adds an index that correlates his nomenclature with the current system, in *Italica*, III, appendix [s.p.].

<sup>9</sup> *The Old Latin and the Itala*. With an appendix containing the text of the S. Gallen Palimpsest of Jeremiah (ed. J. A. ROBINSON) (TaS IV/3; Cambridge, England 1896) 4.

<sup>10</sup> LXX, representing the number seventy (Latin *septuaginta*) in Roman numerals, refers to the Greek Old Testament text which was thought to be the work of seventy translators, that is, the Septuagint. In the abbreviation "LXX<sup>o</sup>," the superscript omicron prime (°) indicates the more primitive form of this text of Dn and its Greek additions, prior to a revision attributed to a certain Theodotus. The Greek letter omicron, like Latin "LXX," represents seventy. LXX<sup>o</sup> stands in contrast to the later, Theodotonic text, which bears the first letter of his name, theta, in superscript: LXX<sup>θ</sup>. See p. 266 for a list of such abbreviations.

<sup>11</sup> See the previous note for an explanation of "LXX<sup>o</sup>."

<sup>12</sup> See Dn 2:34, 44 in *Old Latin*, 20; Dn 10:1 *tertio* in *ibidem*, 24.

<sup>13</sup> See Dn 3:17 *potens eruere nos*, and Dn 7:10, in *Old Latin*, 20-22. Concerning this latter verse, see the correction of BURKITT by J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 96-97. Furthermore, for Dn 7:10 the transposed LXX<sup>o</sup> variant of Greek 230 should be taken into consideration; see p. 73 of the present work. The rest of the agreements with LXX<sup>o</sup> are: Dn 9:21 *in oratione... uolans... quasi*; 10:2 *illis*; and 10:3 *consummarentur*; in BURKITT, *Old Latin*, 24-25. Of these, Dn 9:21 has multiple elements particular to LXX<sup>o</sup>.

For BURKITT, Cyprian's mixed LXX<sup>o'</sup>-LXX<sup>0'</sup> citations represent the transition to LXX<sup>0'</sup> underway but not yet complete.<sup>14</sup> The Pseudo-Cyprianic *De pascha computus*, on the other hand, shows that besides Cyprian's mixed text there was also a pure translation of LXX<sup>0'</sup> circulating in the same milieu. Because BURKITT's theory does not account for the numerous agreements of Tertullian with LXX<sup>0'</sup> against LXX<sup>o'</sup>, often overlooked in his study, I cannot accept his conclusion that Tertullian's Dn, with few exceptions, corresponds to LXX<sup>o'</sup>.

The three non-liturgical manuscripts of Sus-Dn-Bel each came to light gradually as ever more fragments were discovered, a process beginning in the early 1800s and ending in 1940. Friedrich MÜNTER first published a portion of the 5<sup>th</sup>-c. palimpsest VL 177<sup>15</sup> in 1819, complementing Dn fragments from the manuscript of Würzburg, in central Germany, with SABATIER's *versio antiqua*, and with Greek readings.<sup>16</sup> He recognized that more of the original text might be coaxed out by renewed efforts,<sup>17</sup> a task that would be accomplished a half-century later by Ernst RANKE, who applied chemicals to the manuscript.<sup>18</sup> This latter scholar produced much more careful, complete editions and undertook a much broader study of the material. Before superseding MÜNTER's work on VL 177, in 1857 RANKE presented the 5<sup>th</sup>-c. VL 175 of Weingarten (formerly of Constance), Germany, containing about a chapter and a half of Dn.<sup>19</sup> Then, in 1871, he produced the still-current edition of VL 177, now representing about a third of Sus-Dn-Bel.<sup>20</sup> The discovery of two more fragments of VL 175, including six verses of Dn, occasioned Peter CORSEN's edition of the new material and a renewed examination of this manuscript alongside VL 177.<sup>21</sup> His reckoning of the texts' origin as 3<sup>rd</sup>-c. North African has been confirmed by later studies.

---

and, likewise, multiple elements particular to LXX<sup>o'</sup>. BURKITT mistakenly claims that this verse, as well as 10:2-3, simply follow LXX<sup>o'</sup> against LXX<sup>0'</sup>, in *ibidem*, 23.

<sup>14</sup> BURKITT, *Old Latin*, 28.

<sup>15</sup> The Vetus Latina-Institut's text numbers, e.g. VL 177, technically indicate texts rather than manuscripts; multiple numbers are sometimes assigned to diverse biblical texts of a single document. In the present study, for convenience, the numbered texts will sometimes be called "manuscripts". See the section on VL 175, VL 176, and VL 177, pp. 26-31, and the listing of VL manuscripts, p. 269, for more information.

<sup>16</sup> *Fragmenta versionis antiquae Latinae antehieronymianae prophetarum Ieremiae, Ezechielis, Danielis et Hoseae, e codice rescripto Bibliothecae Universitatis Wirceburgensis*. Programma, quo inaugurationem Reverendissimi Episcopi Ripensis Stephani Tetens ... indicit d. Fridericus Münter (Hafniae 1819) 26-33.

<sup>17</sup> MÜNTER, *Fragmenta*, 37.

<sup>18</sup> He applied chemical, for example, to p. 135, containing Dn 8:20-9:2; E. C. RANKE, *Par palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium*. Antiquissimae Veteris Testamenti versionis Latinae fragmenta (Vindobonae 1871) 158. *Wirceburgensis* refers to Würzburg, Germany.

<sup>19</sup> *Latinae Veteris Testamenti versionis antehieronymianae fragmenta*. E codice Fuldensi eruta atque adnotationibus criticis instructa quibus accedit tabula lithographica (Marburgi 1856-1857) fasc. 2, 47-51. He reprinted the text in the second edition of this work, with an altered title, *Fragmenta versionis Sacrarum Scripturarum latinae Antehieronymianae*. E codice manuscripto (Vindobonae 1868) fasc. 2, 47-51.

<sup>20</sup> RANKE, *Par palimpsestorum*, 125-126.

<sup>21</sup> *Zwei neue Fragmente der Weingartener Prophetenhandschrift*. Nebst einer Untersuchung über das Verhältnis der Weingartener und Würzburger Prophetenhandschrift (Berlin 1899).

Advances on the three manuscripts continued into the 20<sup>th</sup> c. as Alban DOLD in 1923 studied and republished VL 175, including fragments unknown to RANKE and CORSEN, and the previously unprinted early 9<sup>th</sup>-c. VL 176 of Saint Gall, Switzerland.<sup>22</sup> DOLD presented the most systematic comparison of VL 175 with patristic sources, ranking each coincidence for its degree of agreement. He concluded that a preponderance of African Fathers agree with it, though by no means exclusively.<sup>23</sup> On the occasion of DOLD's 1940 publication of yet more fragments of VL 176, now representing over half of Sus-Dn-Bel, he investigated its relationship to VL 175; he concluded that 176 most likely descends from a corrected, sister manuscript to 175.<sup>24</sup> In 1940 Arthur ALLGEIER published a study on VL 175, 176, and 177, in which he took stock of the previous scholarship, even DOLD's work of the same year.<sup>25</sup> Among thorough treatments of the three manuscripts, ALLGEIER's contribution not only remains the most up-to-date but also provides a synthesis of his predecessors' contributions. As he is not presenting any new texts, his work is much shorter than DOLD's and more synthetic, a digestible overview. It largely serves to confirm DOLD's findings.

In 1954, ZIEGLER published the Greek critical edition of Sus-Dn-Bel for the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, in which he included VL evidence in the apparatus.<sup>26</sup> In fact, he published the biblical book in the two surviving forms: the better-known recension attributed to Theodotion (LXX<sup>o</sup>) as well as the older, Septuagintal text (LXX<sup>o</sup>). Although he uses the traditional theta (θ) to designate the so-called Theodotionic recension, he explains that his critical text probably has nothing to do with Theodotion himself.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, others have criticized this position, confirming the association between the Theodotionic recension of Daniel and the man whose name it bears.<sup>28</sup> ZIEGLER dedicates just a page to listing VL manuscript evidence for LXX<sup>o</sup>, including only VL 175, 176, and 177.<sup>29</sup> No liturgical manuscripts are used, even for the canticles of Dn 3. There is no treatment of the Latin Fathers as witnesses to

<sup>22</sup> *Konstanzer altlateinische Propheten- und Evangelien-Bruchstücke mit Glossen*. Nebst zugehörigen Prophetentexten aus Zürich und St. Gallen (TAB 1/7-9; Beuron in Hohenzollern – Leipzig 1923). For DOLD, VL 175 is named for Weingarten, previously Konstanz, VL 176 for Sankt Gallen, and VL 177 for Würzburg.

<sup>23</sup> DOLD, *Bruchstücke*, 162-165. Note that most of the evidence comes from material outside of Sus-Dn-Bel.

<sup>24</sup> *Neue St. Galler vorhieronymianische Propheten-Fragmente*. Der St. Galler Sammelhandschrift 1398b zugehörig (TAB 1/31; Beuron in Hohenzollern 1940) 21. Although DOLD dated VL 176 to the late 9<sup>th</sup> c., GRAYSON opts for the first decades of the same. See DOLD, *Propheten-Fragmente*, 1; GRAYSON – FREDE, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, I, 270.

<sup>25</sup> "Die Konstanzer altlateinische Prophetenhandschrift," *JGG* 1939 (1940) 79-95.

<sup>26</sup> *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Sept. 16/2; Göttingen 1954).

<sup>27</sup> J. ZIEGLER (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel* (1954), 28, n. 1; J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 121, n. 1.

<sup>28</sup> N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *Introducción a las Versiones Griegas de la Biblia* (TECC 64; Madrid 1998) 157-161.

<sup>29</sup> J. ZIEGLER (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel* (1954), 36-37; J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 129-130.



LXX<sup>0</sup>, just a reference to ZIEGLER's own brief, VL witness list for Ez in the Göttingen LXX series, to which he adds Verecundus of Junca.<sup>30</sup> In other words, ZIEGLER undertakes no systematic study of Latin patristic citations based on LXX<sup>0</sup> Sus-Dn-Bel, nor of those derived from Greek Ez.

In the 1999 second edition, which reproduces ZIEGLER's LXX<sup>0</sup> text and apparatus, MUNNICH adds his own introduction for his thoroughly revised LXX<sup>0</sup>. MUNNICH's contribution concerns LXX<sup>0</sup>, for he prints a photostatic reproduction of ZIEGLER's LXX<sup>0</sup> along with its introduction, correcting only typographical errors. Within his description of sources he dedicates a few pages to VL evidence.<sup>31</sup> He focuses principally on Tertullian, Cyprian, and Victorinus of Poetovium, listing and characterizing their citations. The LXX<sup>0</sup> text is "updated" in the sense that the second edition offers an appendix to the introduction in which Detlef FRAENKEL describes and collates new Greek manuscripts.<sup>32</sup> Since the collations have not been integrated into the apparatus, they can only be consulted separately for each manuscript.

In 2002, the Belgian publisher Brepols made available online by subscription their scans of the Vetus Latina-Institut's notecards of Latin biblical citations within their *Vetus Latina Database*.<sup>33</sup> This collection is impressively complete, given the vast number of authors and works as well as editions of VL manuscripts that are catalogued.<sup>34</sup> There are, nevertheless, some important gaps in the record. For example, DOLD's later fragments of VL 176 and direct citations by Tertullian and Cyprian are misfiled or missing, and the hundreds of notecards of Jerome's *In Danielelem* were made from Jacques-Paul MIGNÉ's 1845 edition rather than François GLORIE's drastically improved one of 1964.<sup>35</sup>

The Vetus Latina-Institut has also long published an essential reference work to accompany their editions and the notecards: Bonifatius FISCHER's 1949 *Verzeichnis der Sigel für Kirchenschriftsteller*.<sup>36</sup> The two successors to this are 1) Roger GRYSOY and Hermann Josef FREDE's two-volume *Altlateinische Handschriften = Manuscripts Vieux Latins*, which appeared in 1999 and 2004,<sup>37</sup> and 2) the Institut's 2007 two-volume *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'Antiquité et du Haut Moyen*

<sup>30</sup> J. ZIEGLER (ed.), *Ezechiel* (Sept. 16/1; Göttingen 1952) 21-23, 84-85; J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 136.

<sup>31</sup> J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 96-100.

<sup>32</sup> J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 170-214.

<sup>33</sup> VETUS LATINA-INSTITUT, "Vetus Latina Database" (2020) <http://apps.brepols.net/vld/Default.aspx>.

<sup>34</sup> Most works were catalogued at least twice, as new editions replaced older ones. See H. J. FREDE, "Bibelzitate bei Kirchenvätern. Beobachtungen bei der Herausgabe der Vetus Latina," *La Bible et les Pères*. Colloque de Strasbourg, 1-3 Oct., 1969 (ed. A. BENOÎT – P. PRIGENT) (BCESS; Paris 1971) 79-96, 85.

<sup>35</sup> DOLD, *Propheten-Fragmente*. The card for Dn 9:23 in TE *je* 7,8 (1264) is misfiled as Dn 10:14, and Dn 3:25 in CY *lap* 31 (238,615) is missing. The two editions of HI *Dn* are: JEROME OF STRIDON, "Commentaria in Danielelem," *Opera Omnia*. Tomus V (ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ) (PL 25; Lutetiae Parisiorum 1845) 491-584; *Opera Exegetica*. V. Commentariorum in Danielelem libri III (ed. F. GLORIE) (CCSL 75A; Turnholti 1964).

<sup>36</sup> *Verzeichnis der Sigel für Handschriften und Kirchenschriftsteller* (VL 1; Freiburg im Breisgau 1949).

<sup>37</sup> *Altlateinische Handschriften*.

*Âge*.<sup>38</sup> The latter work was last updated in 2013, an edition only available online via the *Vetus Latina Database*. All these reference works facilitate VL research by providing quick access to basic information, especially concerning the biblical text, on virtually every patristic composition and manuscript in the early Latin patristic tradition.

This brings us to a summary of the evidence for VL Sus-Dn-Bel that is as current as it is brief: José Manuel CAÑAS REILLO's entry in *The Textual History of the Bible*.<sup>39</sup> He lists the principal manuscripts as well as the most important Fathers and notes the general unity of the tradition, adducing illustrations for this as well as exceptions showing diversity. This is the first systematic treatment of the material since the mid-18<sup>th</sup> c. At just a few pages in length, it serves as an enticement for a more thorough study such as the present one, which takes advantage of print and online resources that are considerably superior to the editions available a quarter-millennium ago.

Finally, I presented and discussed the textual history of VL Sus in my *lectio coram publico* of Oct. 27, 2017 at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome,<sup>40</sup> a prerequisite for full candidacy in the doctoral program of the institute. That 45-page study laid much of the groundwork for the current one. It established VL Sus dependence on manuscripts of the Greek Q (Codex Marchalianus) group. In addition, it characterized the mostly literal translation technique, contextualized the Latin vocabulary, and established VL influence on Vg Sus.<sup>41</sup> Although that work was not published, its results have here been integrated and refined whenever pertinent.

### 3. METHOD

#### 3.1. *Basic approach to material*

The method here employed begins with the collection of witnesses to VL Sus-Dn-Bel and ends with their text-critical and linguistic analysis in order to trace their textual history. Perhaps what most distinguishes my approach is my construction of a custom database for collecting, manipulating, and viewing the Latin citations. The fundamentals of the analysis of the data, however, remain the same as they have long been: use of critical editions, with attention to variant readings, comparison to related Greek and Latin texts, and contextualization of phenomena in time and space.

<sup>38</sup> R. GRYSON – H. J. FREDE – B. FISCHER, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut Moyen Âge* (VL 1/1; Freiburg im Breisgau 2007) I-II.

<sup>39</sup> "Daniel. Vetus Latina," *ThiB. Writings* (ed. A. LANGE – E. TOV) (1C; Leiden – Boston 2017) 575-578; Cf. *Idem*, "Daniel, Additions to. Latin," *ThiB. The Deuterocanonical Scriptures* (ed. F. Feder – M. Henze) (2B; Leiden – Boston 2019) 153-157.

<sup>40</sup> K. ZILVERBERG, *The Textual History of Old Latin Susanna* (Opusculum ad lectionem coram publico, Pontifical Biblical Institute; Rome 2017).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. G. HOBERG, *De Sancti Hieronymi ratione interpretandi* (Friburgi Brisgoviae 1886) 38.



The method's application will be adapted to the material and, therefore, fluctuate modestly. Whereas Tertullian provides a handful of citations and some important allusions, Lucifer presents us nearly two biblical chapters. Whereas the former is difficult to align with the Greek, the latter is easily aligned. Between these two extremes of Tertullian and Lucifer lies Cyprian, both in quantity of citations and difficulty of analysis. On the one hand Tertullian requires one to extract the maximum of information from his scanty material. On the other hand, Lucifer's extensive citations require a more synthetic approach. Cyprian occupies the middle of this spectrum.

### 3.2. *Data collection, manipulation, and viewing*

The data for this study lie dispersed in myriad publications. They include the Fathers' citations of, and occasionally allusions to, *Sus-Dn-Bel*, the fragmentary manuscripts of the same, and liturgical texts. Many of these latter texts remain unpublished, though a growing number are being digitized and uploaded for online manuscript viewing. The liturgical canticles are attested in a great number of manuscripts, but for the most part these are not the passages needed for comparison with the Fathers of this study.

The subscription-only *Vetus Latina Database*<sup>42</sup> provides an excellent starting point for collecting such disparate data, offering a rather thorough collection of scanned notecards. They are grouped by verse cited, and duplicated if they allude to multiple verses. Within each verse's group they are alphabetized by source. Each scan bears a biblical citation from the patristic tradition, the biblical book and verse numbers, an abbreviation of its source, its location in that source, and, sometimes, variant readings from the critical apparatus. Furthermore, the database contains basic information about each author and work (but not the manuscripts); this is more up-to-date than the print edition that it supersedes.<sup>43</sup>

Nevertheless, the limitations of the *Vetus Latina Database* motivated me to create my own, private, custom database using Microsoft Access. The only metadata available beyond each scan is the book, chapter, and verse cited. Therefore, for each of the roughly 7,000 scans I created a corresponding record in the principal table of my database. Each record contains fields for the author, work, page and line in the work, transcription of text, whether or not it is a citation or allusion, notes, etc.

The rest of the database is structured around that principal table of data, providing related data and tools to view and manipulate them. I wrote many hundreds of lines of computer code in Visual Basic for Applications to establish the structure and interaction of the database components, which included tables, forms, queries, reports, and modules.

---

<sup>42</sup> VETUS LATINA-INSTITUT, "Database".

<sup>43</sup> GRYSON – FREDE – FISCHER, *Répertoire général* (c2007).

The database proved a great aid in keeping such disparate information organized and easily sortable and accessible. It provisioned *desiderata* of the Vetus Latina Database, such as the possibility of sorting out all the cards of an author and generally displaying related cards beyond the current one-verse limitation.

With that system in place, I set about transcribing cards, adding missing ones, and consulting critical editions. In many cases the text of a citation could be copied and pasted from the Library of Latin Texts.<sup>44</sup> I marked each file to indicate whether the text was transcribed directly from the card, copied from the Library, or transcribed from the latest critical edition. This allowed me to progressively improve the data by checking them against the best editions, at which point any corrections were introduced and the record marked as matching the edition. Variants from the critical apparatuses, often written already on the card, were incorporated into the transcribed text in parentheses.

### 3.3. *Data analysis*

Once the citations and allusions were transcribed according to the latest critical editions, I generated a Microsoft Word file for each author, working mostly in chronological order. I read through all the author's material and took notes. During this process I made extensive use of the critical apparatuses of Greek texts to determine the most likely *Vorlage* of each citation. Access to the digitized apparatuses through Logos Bible Software allowed me to paste the pertinent data directly into the Word file, leaving out all the irrelevant textual variants. I checked the digitized apparatuses against the printed ones and found the former to be admirably correct; the errors I encountered had to do with spacing and formatting, not the content. I looked for patterns of textual affiliation with Greek witnesses and shared readings with Latin ones, these latter being included in the Word file generated by the database. All lexical features of note were marked so as to later report on the most important ones. The inclusion of the Vg text for each verse served as a point of reference particularly helpful for sorting out the VL material from Vg citations.

### 3.4. *Text-critical analysis*

Although I collected many biblical allusions along with the citations, these latter constitute the principal focus of the study. They are the ones that allow significant insight into the text forms circulating in antiquity. Nevertheless, the allusions are occasionally helpful in establishing dependence on one Greek text type or the other, or in suggesting the Father's knowledge of a key word, especially when the word

---

<sup>44</sup> BREPOLS, "Library of Latin Texts" (2020) <http://clt.brepolis.net/llta/>.

is corroborated by other VL witnesses. So direct citations have been given preference, whereas greater caution has been exercised to the extent that a text departs from literality. Carroll OSBURN provides a helpful scale of patristic verbal fidelity to one's scriptural source: 1) citation, 2) adaptation, 3) allusion, 4) reminiscence, and 5) locution.<sup>45</sup> For him, a citation is "a verbally exact quotation;" an adaptation is a recognizable quotation which has, nevertheless, been adapted to the patristic context; an allusion references the content of a biblical passage but contains only limited "verbal or motif correspondence" to it; a reminiscence "has little or no sustained verbal correspondence" to the biblical passage which it echoes; and a locution contains biblical language but "cannot be identified with a specific text."<sup>46</sup> One will recognize sensitivity to this gradation in the present work, but the simplified terminology of "citation" and "allusion" has been used here, with nuances added in prose when necessary. Preference is given to longer citations over their shorter reprises.<sup>47</sup>

The comparison of each witness studied to the rest allows one to relate the texts to one another and sometimes to determine dependence and priority. Obviously this is essential to a study that seeks to trace the appearance and diffusion of texts. It also gives perspective to those elements which are passed on and circulated widely, and those which are emended over time.

For each witness a text-critical analysis is carried out to identify the Greek *Vorlage* as well as agreements with other Latin witnesses. The determination, as much as possible, of the underlying Greek text not only serves to establish patterns of manuscript affinity but also lays the foundation for the linguistic analysis. VL Sus-Dn-Bel is literal enough, and our knowledge of variant Greek readings broad enough, that one can almost always align the Latin with extant Greek witnesses. I sought patterns of affinity with individual Greek manuscripts and with one or more manuscript groupings.

When presenting two or more texts in parallel columns, I have used a series of typographical conventions to draw attention to their similarities and differences. Usually the Latin biblical text follows at least one Greek text closely enough to make the equivalent words appear in the same row, each in its respective column. If there are more than three columns, those most agreeing with the middle, Latin column flank it, whereas those with fewer agreements are relegated to an outside column. Variant readings, when few, are placed in parentheses along with indications of their sources; when many, they receive their own column under the heading "Var." Furthermore, bolding, font variation, and italics draw attention to agreements between columns. Taking a cue

<sup>45</sup> "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism," *NT* 47/4 (2005) 313-343, 318.

<sup>46</sup> OSBURN, "Methodology", 318.

<sup>47</sup> OSBURN, "Methodology", 322-323; cf. A. PIRAS, "Bibbia e *sermo biblicus* negli scritti luciferiani," *La figura e l'opera di Lucifero di Cagliari: una rivisitazione*. Atti del I convegno internazionale, Cagliari, 5-7 dicembre 1996 (ed. S. LACONI) (SEAug 75; Roma 2001) 131-144, 134-135.

from BURKITT,<sup>48</sup> I have used bold type for agreements with LXX<sup>o'</sup> and italics for agreements with LXX<sup>o'</sup>. The convention is indicated at the top of the column, for instance an italic “*with TE*” for the LXX<sup>o'</sup> column to remind the reader that those words and phrases in italics match Tertullian’s text (TE) but disagree with LXX<sup>o'</sup>. The matching Latin is also italicized. Sometimes a third Greek column is added from a particular manuscript or one of the Fathers. In this case the Calibri font is used for matching words or phrases. Moreover, the manuscript or patristic column may also have some bolded or italicized words if they agree with either LXX<sup>o'</sup> or LXX<sup>o'</sup> and the Latin reading. This helps the reader identify a reading that has been passed from the “original” of a Greek text type, LXX<sup>o'</sup> or LXX<sup>o'</sup>, to both a pertinent secondary Greek witness and the Latin one. Finally, underlining have been used to draw attention to pluses, whereas blank spaces or an “×” have been used for minuses.<sup>49</sup>

### 3.5. *Linguistic analysis*

A linguistic analysis complements the text-critical one just described. Indeed, beyond tracing manuscript affiliations and the spread of Latin textual types, one must contextualize the VL linguistic features in their respective contexts. To trace those features over time and geographically is an integral part of the *textual* history that this study claims to be. Furthermore, the two approaches, text-critical and linguistic, inform one another. For example, Lucifer’s penchant for asyndeton must be taken into account when analyzing the many minuses in his *Sus-Dn* texts. The judgment whether or not he excised words affects his alignment with the Greek witnesses. Conversely, careful attention to the Greek witnesses may present convincing evidence that Lucifer’s minuses simply mirror those of his *Vorlage*. Linguistic peculiarities have been treated, when possible, as part of a broader phenomenon; Hermann RÖNSCH and Edoardo VINEIS provide that context in their much wider VL studies, so footnotes refer the reader to the pertinent sections of their works.<sup>50</sup> Philip BURTON’s study of the *Old Latin Gospels* shows the fruitfulness of the linguistic analysis of VL

<sup>48</sup> *Old Latin*, 25-26.

<sup>49</sup> “Plus” and “minus” belong to the language of textual criticism. The former indicates a textual witness’s additional word(s) vis-à-vis another witness, and the latter indicates a lacking word or words. The convention employed for marking pluses and minuses in the present work is not absolute, for sometimes one can easily identify an omission as literary rather than Greek-based. E.g. at Dn 10:11-12 Tertullian’s *Daniel* (p. 71) is not repeated for the second verse after just being written for the brief introduction from the verse prior. See J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 97. N.B. besides the multi-column tables, underlining has also been used in this work simply to draw attention to a portion of text. When parallel texts are presented it should be clear when the underlining is aligned with a blank space or an “×”, in which case the relationship is that of plus to minus.

<sup>50</sup> H. RÖNSCH, *Itala und Vulgata*. Das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata, unter Berücksichtigung der römischen Volkssprache (Marburg 1875); E. VINEIS, “Studio sulla lingua dell’Itala,” *ItD* 34 (1971) 136-248; 36 (1973) 287-372; 37 (1974) 154-166.

text and provides categories valid for Old Testament texts as well.<sup>51</sup> Studies on so-called “vulgar” Latin and those attentive to texts pertaining to the lower social strata sometimes shed light on VL texts as well.<sup>52</sup>

VL texts preserve morphological peculiarities, which have been documented for each witness. Sometimes the reader must be familiar with the vulgarisms typical of non-literary Late Latin in order to spot them. For example, Pseudo-Cyprian’s *et ciuitatem et illum sanctum corrumpet* at Dn 9:26 could pass as a reference to a holy one, \*ille sanctus in the nominative case, when in fact *illum* is here neuter; classical Latin would have \*illud. It is a reference to the Jerusalem Temple, which is made clearer when one recognizes that the neuter *illum* is a common vulgarism found in VL texts and appears elsewhere in the Pseudo-Cyprianic corpus. The Greek texts are also a helpful reference in such cases; all but one of them have the neuter τὸ ἅγιον in this instance.

VL texts contribute greatly to understanding the vocabulary of the growing Latin church. Their often unpretentious character serves to record vocabulary that otherwise might have remained spoken only. The earliest texts come from the time when Christian Latin was forged, a period that produced many coinages that endured as well as other ones that were quickly displaced. Moreover, besides religious coinages, these texts are full of everyday words that have nothing particularly Christian about them. By analyzing noteworthy vocabulary of Sus-Dn-Bel this study contributes to the larger project of tracing Latin lexical history in general and patristic lexical history in particular.

Several dictionaries are particularly helpful for this analysis: 1) the in-progress *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, unparalleled in its thoroughness, 2) Egidio FORCELLINI’s *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, used in cases where the *Thesaurus* is unfinished, 3) the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, which covers the classical period up to about AD 200, and 4) Albert BLAISE’s *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des Auteurs Chrétiens*, for in-depth coverage of the Fathers.<sup>53</sup> For Greek, preference is given to the in-progress *Diccio-*

<sup>51</sup> *The Old Latin Gospels. A Study of their Texts and Language* (OECSS; Oxford 2000).

<sup>52</sup> V. I. VÄÄNÄNEN, *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (BFR.A 6; Paris <sup>3</sup>1981); J. N. ADAMS, *Social Variation and the Latin Language* (Cambridge 2016).

<sup>53</sup> *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque Germanicarum Berolinensis, Gottingensis, Lipsiensis, Monacensis, Vindobonensis. I. A - Amyzon. II. An - Byzeres. III. C - comus. IV. Con - cyulus. V/1. D - dze. V/2. E - ezoani. VI/1. F - gemo. VI/2. Gemo - gythus. VI/3. H - hystrix. VII/1. I - intervulsus. VII/2. Intestabilis - lyxipyretos. VIII. M - myzon. IX/1. N - (nemo). IX/2. O - ozynosus. X/1. P - porrum. X/2. Porta - pyxis. XI/2. R - (relinquo) (Lipsiae - München - Berlin - Stuttgart 1900-1905, 1901-1906, 1907-1912, 1906-1909, 1910-1934, 1931-1953, 1913-1927, 1929-1934, 1936-1947, 1934-1965, 1956-1979, 1936-1966, 2011-[2018], 1969-1981, 1982-2010, 1980-2009, 2012-[2020]) I-XI; E. FORCELLINI - G. FURNALETTO - V. DE VIT, *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*. Opera et studio Aegidii Forcellini lucubratum et in hac editione post tertiam auctam et emendatam a Josepho Furlanetto alumno Seminarii patavini novo ordine digestum amplissime auctum atque emendatum cura et studio Vincentii De-Vit (Prati 1853-1879) I-X; P. G. W. GLARE (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford <sup>2</sup>2012) I-II; A. BLAISE, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Réimpression anastatique suivie d’addenda et de corrigenda) (Turnhout 1954, 1997).

nario *Griego-Español*, and the *Greek-English Lexicon* where that is lacking; the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* and the *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* have also been useful.<sup>54</sup> Besides these, recourse has been made to specialized literature.

VL syntax depends greatly on that of its Greek *Vorlage*. When the Latin text mirrors it closely, there is little comment to be made. Nevertheless, there are instances of departure from the Greek; these constitute the focus of the syntactical commentary. HOFMANN – SZANTYR's *Lateinische Grammatik: Lateinische Syntax* provides a helpful diachronic treatment of Latin grammar, including writings from late antiquity.<sup>55</sup> An array of literature treating Late and vulgar Latin has also proved useful; these titles can be found in the footnotes.

### 3.6. Conclusion

The method of this study was driven by its aim, the writing of a textual history of VL Sus-Dn-Bel. It is contemporary in its use of technology yet traditional in its dependence on proven text-critical and linguistic scholarship. Its use of the complementary approaches of text-critical and linguistic examinations has resulted in a history more integrated and accurate for the light that these two analyses shed upon one another.

## 4. THE LATIN EVIDENCE

### 4.1. Direct tradition: the manuscripts

CAÑAS REÍLLO lists the principal manuscripts for VL Sus-Dn-Bel, of which the related witnesses VL 175, 176, and 177 transmit the greatest quantity of text.<sup>56</sup> There are also many liturgical manuscripts, some published, containing portions

<sup>54</sup> E. GANGUTIA – J. RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS *et al.*, *Diccionario Griego-Español* (ed. F. RODRÍGUEZ ADRADOS *et al.*) (Madrid <sup>2</sup>2008, 1986, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2002, 2009, 2019) I-VIII; H. G. LIDDELL *et al.*, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9<sup>th</sup> ed. with supplements) (Oxford – New York 1996); W. BAUER – F. W. DANKER, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago <sup>3</sup>2000); T. MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain – Paris – Walpole, MA 2009).

<sup>55</sup> *Lateinische Grammatik*. II. Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik (verbesserter Nachdruck) (ed. H. BENGTSON) (HAW 2/2/II; München 1965, 1972).

<sup>56</sup> “Daniel,” 575. The other two manuscripts in his primary list are VL 182 and VL 191, each containing portions of Dn 3. The former has been partially published, but its VL contents have not been transcribed; cf. MONACHI ABBATIAE PONTIFICIAE SANCTI HIERONYMI IN URBE (ed.), *Liber Danielis*. Ex interpretatione sancti Hieronymi cum praefationibus et variis capitulorum seriebus (BSV 16; Romae 1981) xi. Nevertheless, it was collated for the edition just cited. The other manuscript, VL 191, is an unpublished, barely legible palimpsest.



of Dn 3. I have consulted some of these, but, for the most part, they are unhelpful for the present study since they do not align with the Fathers treated.

The following table presents the basic information on the three principal manuscripts for VL Sus-Dn-Bel: VL 175, 176, and 177. The left column lists each manuscript's sigla according to author and reference work,<sup>57</sup> and then the manuscripts' latest printed editions. Next the holding libraries and shelfmarks are listed. The last three columns provide the century and place of origin, a list of manuscript contents, and more specifically the verses of Sus-Dn-Bel that it contains.

Sigla, edition	Libraries	C.; Origin	Content	Sus-Dn-Bel
VL: 175	Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek 895; 3140 (previously 896) (2 folios)	5 <sup>th</sup> c.; North Italy	fragments of Ez, Dn, Os, Am, Mi, Jl, Jon, Na; 5 <sup>th</sup> -6 <sup>th</sup> c. glosses	Dn 2:18-33, 9:25-10:11, 11:16-23. 35-39
CORSSEN: <i>Weing.</i>				
DOLD: <i>Const</i>				
ALLGEIER: <i>℥</i>	Donaueschingen, Hofbibliothek B. I. 3, previously 191			
STENZEL: <i>cst</i>				
CLA: VIII 1174				
BSV: 175	Fulda, Landesbibliothek Aa la (16 folios)			
edition: DOLD, <i>Bruchstücke</i> , 30-112.	Sankt Paul im Lavanttal (Kamten), Stiftsbibliothek s. n. (4 folios)			
	Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek fragm. 100 (20 folios)			
	<i>formerly</i> : Constance and Weingarten, southern Germany			

<sup>57</sup> The authors are listed in the bibliography (p. 237), and the reference works among abbreviations for modern literature (p. 284).

VL: 176	Sankt Gallen, Stifts- bibliothek 1398b p. 126-175	early 9 <sup>th</sup> c.; Saint Gall, Switzer- land	a Bible, of which fragments of Ez and Sus-Dn- Bel are VL	Sus 1-64, Dn 1:1-9, 3:36-60, 4:20-8:17, 8:21-9:2, 9:6-7. 15-16, 9:22-10:11. 16-21, 11:6- 12:13, Bel 1-42
DOLD: <i>FrS</i>				
ALLGEIER: ☉	Zürich, Zentralbiblio- thek C 184 (389)			
STENZEL: <i>sg</i>	Fragments 23 and 24 (=folios 24 and 25)			
BSV: 176				
edition: DOLD, <i>Bruchstücke</i> , 228-278; <i>Idem</i> , <i>Propheten- Fragmente</i> , 24-75.				

---

VL: 177	Würzburg, Universi- tätsbibliothek M. p. th. f. 64a, pages 17-20, 29-46, 49-50, 97-132, 169-268, 277-280, 295-316	5 <sup>th</sup> c.; Italy (palimp- sest, primary text)	Prophets, of which fragments of Os, Jon, Is, Jr, Ez, Dn remain; later re- used for AU <i>Ps</i> 1-32 <i>en</i> 1	Sus 2-10, Dn 1:15-2:9, 3:15-50, 8:5-9:10, 10:3-11:6. 20-21. 23- 25. 26-28. 31-33 Bel 36-42
CORSSEN: <i>Wirc</i> .				
DOLD: <i>Wirc</i>				
ALLGEIER: ☿				
CLA: IX 1420				
BSV: 177				
edition: RANKE, <i>Par palimp- sestorum</i> , 47-144.				

Within the *Status quaestionis* section I briefly recounted the history of research on Dn in VL 175, 176, and 177,<sup>58</sup> to which more details will be added here. From that initial treatment the reader is already aware of their interrelatedness; since the three non-liturgical manuscripts for Sus-Dn-Bel share a common history they can, therefore, be treated together.<sup>59</sup> It is precisely within Dn that all three manuscripts overlap for seven verses, which serves to illustrate a pattern evident elsewhere as well: VL 175 and 176 agree most closely, whereas 177 represents

<sup>58</sup> See p. 17, n. 15 for information on this manuscript numbering system.

<sup>59</sup> GRYSO, in fact, treats them together in GRYSO – FREDE, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, I, 268.

a different branch of the same tradition.<sup>60</sup> DOLD's 1923 *Konstanzer Bruchstücke* builds upon the 1899 work of CORSEN and restates the latter's thesis that VL 175 represents a text developed in early 3<sup>rd</sup>-c. Africa that underwent significant changes in its multi-century transmission.<sup>61</sup> The same goes, says DOLD, for VL 177,<sup>62</sup> which shares a common heritage with 175 and 176. VL 175 and 176 share more in common with one another than they do with 177, yet neither of the two branches seems to transmit an older text than the other.<sup>63</sup> Roger GRYSO treats the text of the three manuscripts together but has almost nothing to say about Sus-Dn-Bel,<sup>64</sup> surely for lack of publications. CAÑAS REÍLLO presents a selection of interesting readings of all three manuscripts in his brief article.<sup>65</sup> Although remedying the lacuna is beyond the scope of this study, it is hoped that, through this study's highlighting these manuscripts' relations to the earliest VL Sus-Dn-Bel witnesses, the foundation is hereby laid for them one day to be re-examined and situated more precisely within the textual history to which they belong.

Both VL 176 and 177 attest the usual Greek order of Sus-Dn-Bel as opposed to the Hexaplaric and Vg ordering of Dn-Sus-Bel. Sus-Dn-Bel may have been the original Greek order, but our earliest witness to the whole book, the LXX<sup>o</sup> papyrus 967, attests Dn-Bel-Sus.<sup>66</sup> To complicate matters even more, the papyrus also places the chapters we know as 7-8 between 4-5, as in the *Liber promissionum* of mid-5<sup>th</sup>-c. North African Quodvultdeus.<sup>67</sup>

The 5<sup>th</sup>-c., northern Italian, manuscript VL 175 underwent dismemberment and reuse in bindings around the 15<sup>th</sup> c., resulting in its current dispersion among five libraries.<sup>68</sup> Its Dn fragments add up to about two chapters, the least of the three manuscripts.

The VL 176 Saint Gall, Switzerland fragments published by DOLD in 1923 and 1940 are written in Carolingian minuscule by various scribes, some of which were formed in Northern Italy.<sup>69</sup> Besides ample sections of VL versions of Ez, Dn, Bel, and the Twelve Prophets, it contains fragments from the whole of Sus, with some verses entirely legible and others barely so.

<sup>60</sup> ALLGEIER, "Prophetenhandschrift," 88.

<sup>61</sup> CORSEN, *Fragmente*, 38; DOLD, *Bruchstücke*, 158, 163-169.

<sup>62</sup> *Bruchstücke*, 158.

<sup>63</sup> GRYSO – FREDE, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, I, 268.

<sup>64</sup> GRYSO – FREDE, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, I, 268-269.

<sup>65</sup> CAÑAS REÍLLO, "Daniel".

<sup>66</sup> J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 20-22; L. LAHEY, "The Additions to Daniel," *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. AITKEN) (London – New Delhi – New York – Sydney 2015) 555-567, 563-564.

<sup>67</sup> On the importance of Quodvultdeus as a witness to the alternative chapter ordering, see P.-M. BOGAERT "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante. Ézéchiél et Daniel dans le Papyrus 967" *Bib.* 59 (1978) 384-395, 384-387.

<sup>68</sup> GRYSO – FREDE – FISCHER, *Répertoire général* (s2007), 276.

<sup>69</sup> GRYSO – FREDE, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, I, 270.

The text of VL 177, *codex Wirceburgensis* (Würzburg, Germany), derives from a palimpsest first written in the 5<sup>th</sup> c., which is the only manuscript besides VL 176 that contains material from Sus: the title *DANIEL PROF* followed by a small lacuna and Sus 2b-10a. The hand is an Italian uncial.<sup>70</sup>

Here follows a three-column table for comparison of Dn 10:7-11, one of the few pericopes attested in all three manuscripts.<sup>71</sup> As noted above, VL 175 and VL 176 are generally closer to one another than either is to VL 177. The former two read *istum* at Dn 10:8, but VL 177 reads *hunc*. The same alignment can be seen in *conpunctus eram* (10:9) and *eregit* (10:10), against VL 177 *eram conpunctus* and *excitauit*. Nevertheless, there are other agreements outside this pattern. VL 175 and 177 read *constringens* (10:10) and *statu tuo* (10:11, VL 175 reconstructed) versus VL 176 *contingens* and *tuo <statu>*. VL 176 and 177 read *contrition-* (10:8) versus VL 175 *corruption-*.

VL 175	VL 176	VL 177
Dn 10:7 Et uidi ego, Daniel, solus uisum, et uiri qui mecum erant non uiderunt uisum, sed timor magnus <u>con</u> ruit supra eos, et fugerunt in timore 8 et ego relictus sum solus. Et uidi uisum magnum <u>istum</u> , et non est relicta in me uirtus, et gloria mea conue<r>sa est in <u>con</u> <tri>tionem et n<on> tenui uirtu<tem> meam. 9 Et a<u>diui uocem <uer>borum ei<u>s, et cum audir<em> eum <u>conp</u> <unc>tus eram, <et> facies mea <ad> <sup>72</sup> terram.	Dn 10:7... ego, Dani <u>h</u> el, solus uisum, et uiri qui mecum erant non uiderunt uisum, sed timor magnus <u>cor</u> ruit supra eos, et fugerunt in timore <u>m</u> 8 et ego relictus sum solus. Et uidi uisum magnum <u>istum</u> , et non est relicta in me uirtus, et gloria mea conuersa est in <u>corruptionem</u> et non tenui uirtutem meam. 9 Et audiui uocem <u>u</u> erborum eius, et cum audirem eum <u>conpunctus eram</u> , et facies mea ad terram.	Dn 10:7 Et uidi ego, Daniel, solus uisum, et uiri qui mecum erant non uiderunt uisum, sed timor magnus <u>cor</u> ruit supra eos, et fugerunt in timore 8 et ego relictus sum solus. Et uidi uisum magnum <u>hunc</u> , et non est relicta in me uirtus, et gloria mea conuersa est in <u>corruptione</u> et non tenui uirtutem meam. 9 Et audiui uoce uerborum eius, et cum audirem eum <u>eram conpunctus</u> , et facies mea ad terram.

<sup>70</sup> GRAYSON – FREDE, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, I, 272.

<sup>71</sup> Arthur ALLGEIER selected Dn 10:3-6, 20-22 to collate seven verses extant in all three manuscripts even before addition fragments of VL 176 were published in 1940. See “Prophetenhandschrift,” 88.

<sup>72</sup> The 1923 transcription has the conjecture <in>; DOLD, *Bruchstücke*, 109; cf. RANKE, *Fragmenta* (1868), 51. In light of the parallel VL 176 fragment published in 1940 I have changed it to <ad>. Cf. DOLD, *Propheten-Fragmente*, 55.

10 Et <ec>ce manus  
c<on>tingens m<e>, erigit  
me <su>pra genua <mea>.  
11 Et dixit mi<hi>, “Daniel,  
uir d<esi>deriorum,  
<in>tellege ue<rba> quae  
ego ti<bi> loquor. Et s<ta>  
in sta<tu tuo>...”

10 Et ecce manus  
constringens me, et erigit  
me supra genua mea.  
11 Et dixit mihi, “Danihel,  
uir desideriorum,  
intellege uerba que  
ego tibi l<ocu>or. Et stabis  
<in> tuo <statu>...”

10 Et ecce manus  
contingens me, et excitauit  
me super genua mea.  
11 Et dixit, “Mi<sup>73</sup> Daniel,  
uir desideriorum  
intelle (!) uerba quae  
ego tibi loquor. Et adsta  
in statu tuo quoniam nunc  
missus sum ad te.”

#### 4.2. Indirect tradition: patristic citations

The witnesses to VL Sus-Dn-Bel fall into two broad categories: North African and European. This division, though not an impermeable barrier, has been helpful in VL text criticism.<sup>74</sup> The obvious criterion here is geographical: where was the text produced? Each text known to proceed from Africa helps to establish the textual features proper to it. These can then be compared to other witnesses, such as the manuscripts, to determine how “African” they are. Vocabulary selection is especially helpful here, for the general lexical preferences of the African and European groups have long been acknowledged.<sup>75</sup> There is, of course, variety within that group; even more so can one expect variety for a region as large as Christian, Latin-speaking Europe. Nevertheless, the use of this typical VL division between Africans and Europeans should not deceive the reader into assuming that the two regions produced independent translations of the book.

The geographical criterion does admit of one exception in this study: Firmicus’s text, which he copies from Cyprian. Although the author is Sicilian and therefore European, Firmicus’s direct reproduction of an African’s text places his scriptural witness in the same grouping as his source.

<sup>73</sup> RANKE claims that the scribe of this uncial manuscript, who wrote MIDANIEL (*Mi Daniel*) intended to write \*MIHIDANIEL (*Mihi Daniel*). His basis for the claim is that the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> characters, -ID-, are reduced, which leaves a space large enough for punctuation (to indicate the missing \*-HI-); *Par palimpsestorum*, 396. Notice that, just a few words later, *intelle* similarly lacks its ending. A later hand added -ge; *ibidem*, 158, 396.

<sup>74</sup> BURTON briefly traces its history and applies it to the VL *Gospels*, 14-15; cf. K. ZELZER, “Vetus Latina,” *GRL*. IV. Die literatur des Umbruchs. Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur. 117 bis 284 n. Chr. (ed. K. SALLMANN) (HAW 8/IV; München 1997) 352-367, 353. Each editor of the Vetus Latina-Institut chooses his or her own division of text types, yet the basic African/European framework can frequently be observed, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly. Cf. B. FISCHER (ed.), *Genesis* (VL 2; Freiburg im Breisgau 1951-1954) 2; R. GRYSOEN (ed.), *Esaias*. [I. 1-39. II. 40-66] (VL 12; Freiburg im Breisgau 1987-1993, 1993-1997) I, 31; *ibidem*, II, 1649-1668.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. H. VON SODEN, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians*. Nach Bibelhandschriften und Väterzeugnissen (ed. A. HARNACK – C. SCHMIDT) (TU 33; Leipzig 1909) 324-343; A. V. BILLEN, *The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch* (Cambridge, England 1927); E. VALGIGLIO, *Le antiche versioni latine del Nuovo Testamento*. Fedeltà e aspetti grammaticali (Koin.[N].ST 11; Napoli 1985) 313-318.

The following African witnesses will be considered: Tertullian, the *Adversus Iudaeos* attributed to him, Cyprian and contemporary Pseudo-Cyprian, and, much more briefly the Letter of Barnabas in Latin, Lactantius, and Firmicus. The principal European is Lucifer, preceded by Novatian, Victorinus, and Fortunatianus; these latter three cite much less of Sus-Dn-Bel than Lucifer and, therefore, are treated within the chapter on Fathers who are minor witnesses to the VL book.

### a. *Tertullian of Carthage*

Tertullian's (ca. 160 – ca. 220) biblical citations provide precious witness to VL versions in a very early stage of their development. The question about the extent to which he made use of already existing Latin translations remains very much open. If, on the one hand, he tends to cite the same verse in different words for different occasions, on the other hand he transmits plenty of phrases that reappear in Cyprian and other African authors.<sup>76</sup> To complicate matters, he also makes direct recourse to the Greek scriptures.<sup>77</sup> One must keep in mind the possibility that he made use of partial translations.<sup>78</sup> They may have been partial insofar as certain biblical books were lacking, and also partial insofar as important verses of otherwise untranslated books were orally translated for liturgical and catechetical use. Indeed, use of particular verses within Tertullian's ecclesial circles would bring his attention to them, making him more likely to cite them.

Although we are unlikely to ever have a definitive resolution of this matter, the present study will consider data pertinent to the more limited question of whether Tertullian used a written, Latin translation of Sus-Dn-Bel. His citations of that book will be approached with the points of the previous paragraph in mind: He does transmit VL material, but in many instances it is impossible to determine whether he transmits VL with more or less accuracy or rather translates from Greek himself. The VL critical editions usually print his citations in the **X** line, reserved for 2<sup>nd</sup>- and 3<sup>rd</sup>-c. texts that do not fit the other categories.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>76</sup> P. CAPELLE, *Le texte du Psautier latin en Afrique* (CBLa 4; Rome 1913) 1-21. For a brief, current introduction to the question of whether or not Tertullian used pre-existing Latin biblical texts, see M. GRAVES, "The Biblical Text as Attested in Ancient Literature. The Latin Fathers," *THiB* (ed. A. LANGE – E. TOV) (1C; Leiden – Boston 2017) 759-763, 759. Thomas O'MALLEY provides a more thorough treatment in *Tertullian and the Bible. Language, Imagery, Exegesis* (LCP 21; Noviomagi 1967) 4-8.

<sup>77</sup> CAPELLE, *Psautier*, 20; H. J. FREDE (ed.), *Epistula ad Ephesios* (VL 24/1; Freiburg im Breisgau 1962-1964) \*30; R. GRYSON (ed.), *Esaias*, I, 16.

<sup>78</sup> O'MALLEY, *Tertullian*, 5-7.

<sup>79</sup> Gn, the series' first installment, sees in Tertullian the beginning of the European (**E**) text; see B. FISCHER (ed.), *Gn*, 28\*. Examples of the usual treatment of Tertullian, to be placed on the catch-all **X** line, include: R. GRYSON (ed.), *Esaias*, I, 16; H. J. FREDE (ed.), *Eph*, 30\*; R. GRYSON (ed.), *Apocalypsis Johannis* (VL 26/2; Freiburg im Breisgau 2000-2003) 82.



TE sigla <sup>80</sup>	work	date
<i>car</i>	<i>De carne Christi</i>	206
<i>cor</i>	<i>De corona</i>	208
<i>je</i>	<i>De ieiunio adversus psychicos</i>	210-211
<i>Marc</i>	<i>Adversus Marcionem libri 5</i>	207-211
<i>or</i>	<i>De oratione</i>	198-203
<i>pat</i>	<i>De patientia</i>	before <i>pae</i>
<i>pae</i>	<i>De paenitentia</i>	204
<i>Pra</i>	<i>Adversus Praxean</i>	210-211
<i>res</i>	<i>De resurrectione mortuorum</i>	ca. 211
<i>sco</i>	<i>Scorpiace</i>	ca. 211-212

Dn citation	TE work
3:16-18	<i>sco</i> 8,6 (1083)
7:13-14	<i>Marc</i> 3,7,4 (88,25); 4,39,11 (486,97)
7:13	<i>car</i> 15,1 (272)
9:4. 21	<i>je</i> 10,13 (1269)
9:23	<i>je</i> 7,8 (1264)
10:1-3. 11-12	<i>je</i> 9,3 (1265)

<sup>80</sup> Latin witnesses of the patristic tradition are abbreviated in the present work according to the Vetus Latina-Institut's system as presented in GRYSO – FREDE – FISCHER, *Répertoire général* (°2007). They are cited according to their critical editions as given in the 2013 online update of this work within VETUS LATINA-INSTITUT, "Database". The list of used in this study begins at p. 275.

Sus-Dn <sup>81</sup> allusion	*TE work
Sus 37 (LXX <sup>o</sup> )	<i>cor</i> 4,3 (73)
1:17	<i>je</i> 9,2 (1265)
Dn 2, 2:17-18	<i>je</i> 7,7 (1264)
2:34. 44	<i>Marc</i> 3,7,3 (86,17)
3:21. 94	<i>or</i> 15,2 (265); <i>res</i> 58,7 (1006)
3:92	<i>Marc</i> 4,10,12 (138,102); 4,21,9 (270,63); <i>Pra</i> 16,6 (190,34)
4:29	<i>pae</i> 12,7 (188,22); <i>pat</i> 13,4 (104,13)
7:13	<i>Marc</i> 3,24,11 (212,89); 4,10,12 (138,102); 4,10,14 (138,117)
9:1-3	<i>je</i> 7,7 (1264); 10,13 (1269)

### b. *The Adversus Iudaeos, attributed to Tertullian*

The *Adversus Iudaeos*, written by an African in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> c. and attributed to Tertullian, is usually signaled as inauthentic in the VL editions from Beuron, for the author's abbreviation is bracketed when referring to "[TE] *Jud.*" When these editors present the work's citations among the principal VL witnesses at the top of the page, they usually assign it to the X line reserved for 2<sup>nd</sup>- and 3<sup>rd</sup>-c. witnesses that do not fit the other categories.<sup>82</sup> Because of the lively debate concerning this work's unity and authenticity, and because it contains our earliest citations of Dn, this witness will be compared to Tertullian's uncontested material. In this context, and from the limited perspective of citations of Dn, the question about the work's authenticity and unity will be raised. The work's first half will also be given its own short chapter as a witness, indeed the earliest to VL Dn. Here follow its citations of and principal allusions to Sus-Dn-Bel:

<sup>81</sup> Tertullian does allude to Bel 31. 39 in \*TE *je* 7,8 (1264) and \*TE *je* 9,5 (1266). These, however, do not follow the Greek text closely enough to include in the study.

<sup>82</sup> E.g. Is 45:1 and Is 66:23 where the *Adversus Iudaeos* provides the X line, and Is 54:15 where it shares the X line with Tertullian's divergent reading. These three examples have been selected from the first half of the *Adversus Iudaeos* since the second half sometimes copies citations from Tertullian.

Dn citation	[TE] <i>Jud</i>
7:13-14	14,4 (39,2)
9:1-2. 21-27	8,4 (15,22)
9:15	8,7 (16,15)
9:25	8,7 (16,15); 8,9 (17,3) <sup>83</sup>
9:26	13,9 (34,13)
Dn allusion	*[TE] <i>Jud</i>
2:34-35	3,8 (8,9); 14,3 (38,22)
2:44	14,3 (38,22)
9:26-27	8,1 (15,13)
9:26-27	8,8 (16,21)
9:24	8,12 (18,5); 11,11 (32,8)
9:26	8,1 (15,13); 8,8 (16,16); 13,9 (34,13)
9:27	8,8 (16,16); 8,17 (19,13)

### c. *Cyprian of Carthage and Pseudo-Cyprian*

Cyprian (*ca.* 200 – 258) is well known as an early transmitter of the VL.<sup>84</sup> Furthermore, he is known to quote the sacred scriptures carefully, as can be seen when he reproduces the same verse word for word in multiple works. One would expect to encounter his usual faithfulness when citing Sus-Dn-Bel, and so it is the case when he cites this material multiple times over multiple works.<sup>85</sup> That is not to say, how-

<sup>83</sup> Jerome reproduces [TE] *Jud* 8,9-13 in HI *Dn* 3 (881,485).

<sup>84</sup> For a recent, brief introduction to Cyprian as witness to the VL, see GRAVES, "Latin Fathers," 759-760.

<sup>85</sup> See Dn 3:16: CY *te* 3,10 (98,13), CY *ep* 58,5 (326,108), CY *Fo* 11 (204,76), CY *ep* 6,3 (35,77). See also Bel 5: CY *ep* 58,5 (327,129), CY *Fo* 11 (204,82).

ever, that these plurally attested verses admit of no variations at all. Rather, as Hans VON SODEN concluded, there are minor differences due to a certain freedom with which he used his biblical text.<sup>86</sup>

By preceding a quotation of Sus by the words *in Danihelum*,<sup>87</sup> Cyprian implies the transmission of Sus-Dn together, in conformity with the evidence from the Greek and Latin manuscript tradition. The same presumption must be made for Bel's transmission along with Sus-Dn in the Cyprianic scriptures. He refers to Daniel, the literary figure, not the book title, when citing Bel. Although this does not explicitly confirm the transmission of the Cyprianic Sus-Dn-Bel all together, it is consistent with that reasonable presumption based on Greek and VL manuscripts.

The editors of the *Vetus Latina*-Institut use a bold **K** to represent the text type(s) of mid-3<sup>rd</sup>-c. Carthage, regardless of their authorship. Here follow, first, the authentic Cyprianic citations of and principal allusions to Sus-Dn-Bel:

CY sigla	work	date
<i>ep</i> 6	<i>Epistula 6: Sergio et Rogatiano</i>	250
<i>ep</i> 58	<i>Epistula 58: Plebi Thibari</i>	253
<i>ep</i> 61	<i>Epistula 61: Lucio fratri</i>	253
<i>Fo</i>	<i>Ad Fortunatum</i>	252-253
<i>lap</i>	<i>De lapsis</i>	251
<i>op</i>	<i>De opere et eleemosynis</i>	253-256
<i>or</i>	<i>De dominica oratione</i>	250
<i>te</i>	<i>Ad Quirinum (Testimoniorum libri 3)</i>	248-250
<i>un</i>	<i>De catholicae ecclesiae unitate</i>	251-256

<sup>86</sup> *Neue Testament*, 105; CAPELLE, *Psautier*, 25; H. J. FREDE, "Die Zitate des Neuen Testaments bei den lateinischen Kirchenvätern. Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte," *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte (ed. K. Aland) (ANTF 5; Berlin – New York 1972) 455-478, 463-464.

<sup>87</sup> CY *te* 3,20 (116,61).

citation	CY work
Sus 1-3	<i>te</i> 3,20 (116,61)
1:1-2	<i>or</i> 25 (106,476)
2:31-35	<i>te</i> 2,17 (53,3)
3:16-18	<i>te</i> 3,10 (98,13); <i>ep</i> 6,3 (35,77); <i>Fo</i> 11 (204,76); <i>ep</i> 58,5 (326,108)
3:25	<i>lap</i> 31 (238,616)
3:37-42	<i>te</i> 3,20 (116,65)
3:51	<i>or</i> 8 (93,115)
4:24 (LXX <sup>o</sup> 4:27)	<i>op</i> 5 (58,95)
6:23-27	<i>te</i> 3,20 (117,77)
7:13-14	<i>te</i> 2,26 (63,3)
9:4-7	<i>lap</i> 31 (239,622)
12:4	<i>te</i> 1,4 (9,10)
Bel 5 (Vg 14:4)	<i>Fo</i> 11 (204,82); <i>ep</i> 58,5 (327,129)

allusion	*CY work
Dn 3	<i>ep</i> 6,3 (34,66); <i>ep</i> 61,2,1 (381,14); <i>ep</i> 61,2,2 (381,20); <i>lap</i> 31 (238,610); <i>un</i> 12 (258,309); <i>or</i> 8 (93,111)
3:25	<i>lap</i> (238,610)
3:50	<i>un</i> 12 (258,306)
12:7	<i>te</i> 1,4 (9,11)

This study also takes into account those Pseudo-Cyprianic works contemporary to Cyprian. Just as these are grouped together with authentic Cyprianic works in the VL critical editions,<sup>88</sup> so too they have been grouped together in the present work. The *De pascha computus* proves particularly valuable for this study, for it provides a four-verse citation followed by almost perfectly matching citations in the subsequent commentary. The *Ad Novatianum* provides just two verses, but these are undoubtedly worth examination. A case will be made for literary or theological intervention in the passage, but that is not to say that it was the author's doing.

The *Ad Novatianum*'s author may well be reproducing these verses as they were generally known in mid-3<sup>rd</sup>-c. Carthage.<sup>89</sup> A cursory examination of the surrounding biblical citations, which are packed densely into the work, shows the literalism typical of the authentic Cyprianic citations. Apc 3:17 provides an excellent initial case study, for it can be compared in its authentic and inauthentic Cyprianic versions.<sup>90</sup> The two citations show literary dependence but are not identical. At 1 Jo 2:11 the Pseudo-Cyprianic work differs from Cyprian only by using *quia* rather than *quoniam*, a fluctuation present in Cyprian's own multiple attestation of 1 Jo 2:16.<sup>91</sup> Nevertheless, more study remains to be done on the relationship of the biblical citations in *Ad Novatianum* to authentic Cyprianic ones.

Here follow Pseudo-Cyprianic citations of and principal allusions to Sus-Dn-Bel:

PS-CY sigla	work	date
<i>mart</i>	<i>De laude martyrii</i>	251-254
<i>Nov</i>	<i>Ad Novatianum</i>	253-256
<i>pa</i>	<i>De pascha computus</i>	243

<sup>88</sup> For PS-CY *Nov*, see W. THIELE (ed.), *Sapientia Salomonis* (VL 11/1; Freiburg im Breisgau 1977-1985) 113; R. GRYSOY (ed.), *Apc*, 84. For PS-CY *pa*, see, e.g. B. FISCHER (ed.), *Gn*, 28\*. For PS-CY *mart*, see, e.g. W. THIELE (ed.), *Sap*, 150-151; W. THIELE (ed.), *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*. [Pars prior] (VL 11/2; Freiburg im Breisgau 1987-2005) 113.

<sup>89</sup> V. SAXER, "Ad Novatianum," *NDPAC* 2, 3550-3551; G. F. DIERCKS, introduction to *Ad Novatianum*, NOVIATIAN, *Opera quae supersunt*. Nunc primum in unum collecta ad fidem codicum qui adhuc extant necnon adhibitis editionibus veteribus (ed. G. F. DIERCKS) (CCSL 4; Turnholt 1972) 130-135, 134-135.

<sup>90</sup> CY *op* 14 (63,269) and PS-CY *Nov* 2,2 (38,4).

<sup>91</sup> W. THIELE (ed.), *Epistulae Catholicae*. Jac, 1-2 Pt, 1-3 Jo, Jud (VL 26/1; Freiburg im Breisgau 1956-1969) 80\*; cf. H. KOCH, "Zur pseudo-cyprianischen Schrift *Ad Novatianum*," *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (AKG[Bo] 4; Bonn 1929) 358-420, 359.



citation	PS-CY work
7:9-10	<i>Nov</i> 17,1 (150,25)
9:24-27	<i>pa</i> 13 (261,2)
9:26	<i>pa</i> 15 (263,1)
9:27	<i>pa</i> 14 (261,22), (262,2), (262,12)
allusion	*PS-CY work
Dn 3	<i>pa</i> 17 (265,4); <i>mart</i> 12,2 (409,180)
3:19	<i>pa</i> 17 (265,4)
3:23	<i>mart</i> 12 (34,18)

#### d. *Minor witnesses to VL Daniel*

The so-called Letter of Barnabas, whose true author is unknown, is the earliest of this study's chapter on minor witnesses to VL Sus-Dn-Bel.<sup>92</sup> The Latin translation (siglum BAR) dates to the late 2<sup>nd</sup> c. or the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c., and has reached us in a *codex unicus*. It is a translation from a Greek text dating back to the very late 1<sup>st</sup> c. or the first few decades of the 2<sup>nd</sup> c.<sup>93</sup> This letter's rather free Greek citations from Dn 7 may even date to a Jewish or Christian source from the 70s of the 1<sup>st</sup> c., which was later incorporated into the letter.<sup>94</sup> Its few Dn citations (or allusions), however, are quite free in both Greek and Latin and therefore less valuable for VL text criticism than are the more numerous Is ones.<sup>95</sup> They include a partial citation of Dn 7:7-8 and allusions to Dn 7:24 and 9:24-25.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>92</sup> The chapter begins on p. 161.

<sup>93</sup> F. SCORZA BARCELLONA, "Barnaba, (epistola di)," *NDPAC* 1, 710-713, 712; P. PRIGENT – R. A. KRAFT, *Épître de Barnabé* (SC 172; Paris 1971) 25-27.

<sup>94</sup> PRIGENT – KRAFT, *Épître de Barnabé*, 95, n. 1.

<sup>95</sup> J. M. HEER, *Die Versio Latina des Barnabasbriefes und ihr Verhältnis zur altlateinischen Bibel*. Erstmals untersucht nebst Ausgabe und Glossar des griechischen und lateinischen Textes (Freiburg im Breisgau 1908) xxix-xxxiii; PRIGENT – KRAFT, *Épître de Barnabé*, 95, n. 1.

<sup>96</sup> Dn 7:7-8 in BAR 4,5 (29,12); Dn 7:24 in \*BAR 4,4 (29,6); and 9:24-25 in \*BAR 16,6 (87,4).

Novatian, the Roman theologian and antipope of the mid-3<sup>rd</sup> c. who died sometime after 251, provides a few allusions to Sus and Dn, namely Sus 2. 44-45 in his *De bono pudicitiae* (NO *pud*), and Dn 3:94 in *De Trinitate* (NO *tri*).<sup>97</sup> Although his biblical citations in general deserve careful study,<sup>98</sup> he offers very little for the present study limited to Sus-Dn-Bel.

Victorinus (ca. 260 – ca. 304) of Poetovium (present-day Ptuj in Slovenia) wrote his *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (VICn *Apc*) before 304 and his *De fabrica mundi* (VICn *fa*) probably even earlier. His commentary survived antiquity in a single, corrupt manuscript, which contains remarkable citations of and allusions to Dn. The citations include portions of Dn 2:38-40. 43-44, 7:18, 11:37; he alludes to Dn 2:34-36, 3:1, 7:8, 9:24. 26-27, 11:45.<sup>99</sup>

L. Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius (ca. 260 – ca. 330) was probably born in Africa and, according to Jerome, taught rhetoric in Nicomedia, in Asia Minor.<sup>100</sup> He writes only a handful of citations of VL Sus-Dn-Bel. While in Asia Minor and under the Diocletianic persecution, Lactantius composed the main substance of his *Divinae institutiones* from 306 to 313 (LAC *in*). Once the emperor Constantine gained the eastern Roman empire he called Lactantius to Trier, in Gaul. It was there that he probably gave the *Divinae institutiones* their final form. Eventually he also wrote an abridged version of the same, the *Epitome* (LAC *epit*). These works contain numerous citations of Dn 7:13-14, the passage about the Son of Man coming on the clouds in glory. Lactantius frequently employs biblical allusions rather than direct citations, which has made it difficult for scholars to understand his biblical sources. Nevertheless, he is known to rely on Cyprian and others.<sup>101</sup>

The Sicilian Father Firmicus Maternus (ca. 310 – ca. 360) wrote his *De errore profanarum religionum* in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> c. (FIR *err*). He relies on Cyprian's *Testimonia* for his scriptural citations, and Dn is no exception; he reproduces Cyprian's Dn 2:31-35 and 7:13-14.<sup>102</sup> Although Firmicus is Sicilian, his text is African since he copies it from Cyprian.

<sup>97</sup> Sus 2 in \*NO *pud* 9,2 (121,2); Sus 44-45 in \*NO *pud* 9,5 (121,14); and Dn 3:94 in \*NO *tri* 8 (23,38).

<sup>98</sup> The following review and article reviewed provide a helpful introduction to the matter: P. PETITMENGIN, review of P. MATTEI, "Recherches sur la Bible à Rome vers le milieu du III<sup>e</sup> siècle : Novatien et la *Vetus Latina*," *RBen* 105 (1995) 255-279, "Chronica Tertulliana et Cyprianea" *REAug* 42 (1996) 295-320, 307-308.

<sup>99</sup> The citations are Dn 2:38-40 in VICn *Apc* 21,3 (120,15), Dn 2:43-44 in VICn *Apc* 21,3 (120,19) and VICn *Apc* 21,3 (120,23), Dn 7:18 in VICn *Apc* 21,3 (120,23), and Dn 11:37 in VICn *Apc* 13,3 (106,9). The allusions are Dn 2:34-36 in \*VICn *Apc* 21,3 (118,9), Dn 3:1 (and other verses of this chapter referring to the golden statue) in \*VICn *Apc* 13,4 (108,8) and \*VICn *Apc* 13,4 (108,16), Dn 7:8 in \*VICn *Apc* 13,2 (106,19), 9:24. 26 in \*VICn *fa* 8 (146,7), Dn 9:27 in \*VICn *Apc* 13,4 (108,14), and Dn 11:45 in \*VICn *Apc* 13,4 (108,16).

<sup>100</sup> V. LOI – B. AMATA, "Lattanzio," *NDPAC* 2, 2747-2750, 2747.

<sup>101</sup> Uwe FRÖHLICH provides a helpful introduction to the value of Lactantius's biblical citations for VL textual criticism, along with numerous bibliographical references, in "Einleitung," *Epistula ad Corinthios I* (VL 22; Freiburg im Breisgau 1995-1998) 9-240, 192-193.

<sup>102</sup> Dn 2:31-35 in FIR *err* 20,4 (123), and Dn 7:13-14 in FIR *err* 24,6 (134).

Fortunatianus (*ca.* 310 – *ca.* 368) of Aquileia in northern Italy wrote his *Commentarii in Evangelia* (FO-A) during the reign of Constantius II (337-361). Except for some fragments, it was lost to the world until the recent discovery of a manuscript, published in 2017.<sup>103</sup> Fortunatianus cites a portion of Dn 3:91 and makes free citations of 3:92; he repeats the brief citation of Dn 9:27 from Mt 24:15 and alludes to Sus and Dn 3.<sup>104</sup> All of these are short, none surpassing ten words of biblical text. Nevertheless, one may be surprised how much information is extracted from them.

### e. *Lucifer of Cagliari*

The sheer quantity and length of Lucifer's (*ca.* 320 – 370) citations, along with their clear correspondence to other VL material, show that he copied them from his codices rather than from memory. Of Sus-Dn-Bel he inserts most of two chapters: Sus and Dn 7. That these chapters should be treated together is confirmed when he explains that he is quoting from *Daniel liber* and proceeds to cite Sus.<sup>105</sup>

Gerard DIERCKS summarizes the research on Lucifer's biblical citations, noting that for many books, including Dn, no study has been published.<sup>106</sup> For the books that have indeed been studied, diverse conclusions have been reached, from Lucifer's shared variants with the Lucianic LXX for 3-4 Rg, to his use of Cyprian's text for Sap and Sir, to correlations with various manuscripts for various other books.

Although arguments have been proposed for and against Lucifer himself being the translator of his biblical citations from the Greek,<sup>107</sup> this is unlikely in the case of Sus-Dn-Bel. When comparing his citations to VL 176, a closely related witness, it will be argued that Lucifer represents an older stratum of this text type.<sup>108</sup> Scholars have suggested an early African origin for VL 175, VL 176, and VL 177, well before the Sardinian.<sup>109</sup>

<sup>103</sup> FORTUNATIANUS OF AQUILEIA, *Commentarii in Evangelia* (ed. L. J. DORFBAUER) (CSEL 103; Berlin – Boston 2017).

<sup>104</sup> Dn 3:91 in FO-A (132,486); Dn 3:92 in FO-A (132,488) and FO-A (143,776); Dn 9:27 (from Mt 24:15) in FO-A (212,2386); allusions to Dn 3 in \*FO-A (197,2068) and \*FO-A (157,1110); Sus 2 in \*FO-A (213,2415); and Sus in \*FO-A (217,2494).

<sup>105</sup> LUC *Ath* 2,9 (92,14).

<sup>106</sup> Introduction to LUCIFER OF CAGLIARI, *Opera quae supersunt*. Ad fidem duorum codicum qui adhuc extant necnon adhibitis editionibus veteribus (ed. G. F. DIERCKS) (CCSL 8; Turnholti 1978) i-cxxxi, cvii-cix. There are now the two brief studies of VL Sus-Dn-Bel, including Lucifer's texts, by CAÑAS REÍLLO, in "Daniel. Vetus Latina," and "Daniel, Additions to. Latin". Also postdating the critical edition is Antonio PIRAS's general study of Lucifer's use of sacred scripture; see "Bibbia". More recently, Tuukka KAUKHANEN published *Lucifer of Cagliari and the Text of 1-2 Kings* (SCSt 68; Atlanta 2018).

<sup>107</sup> PIRAS, "Bibbia," 135. For his argument against Lucifer having translated his New Testament, see *ibidem*, 132-134. See also KAUKHANEN, *Lucifer of Cagliari*, 7-8.

<sup>108</sup> See the section beginning at p. 173.

<sup>109</sup> See the treatment of the manuscripts in the *Status quaestionis*, p. 18.

One can look to Lucifer's twice-quoted passages to confirm how faithfully he reproduces the text available to him. Unfortunately, with respect to Sus-Dn, the double citations occur in close proximity to one another. It would be more helpful if it were possible to compare his Sus-Dn citations over multiple works since then he would be less likely, if adapting the text, to change it in the same way each time.<sup>110</sup>

When Lucifer quotes Dn 7:25 soon after the much-longer citation of Dn 7:1-27, he does adapt one word to serve his polemics. Namely, he changes *uerba aduersus altissimum Deum loquetur* from the prior, longer quotation to *aduersus altissimum Domini loquetur* in the shorter one.<sup>111</sup> Since the polemic is against Emperor Constantius II, who is alleged to deny that Christ is true son of the true God, Lucifer needs the ambiguous *altissimum Deum* to refer to one specific person of the holy Trinity, Jesus Christ. By changing this to *altissimum Domini* he accomplishes this, thereby aligning Constantius with the apocalyptic, evil king of Dn 7:24-25.<sup>112</sup> Still, it is noteworthy that he did not change the text in the principal citation. Although the attentive reader was sure to notice the changes, they were modest ones for their day. Furthermore, Lucifer allows the reader to make his own judgment by first giving the version he finds in his manuscript, then ever so slightly adjusting the text as part of his interpretation. Accordingly, for the purposes of the present study, the longer citation is taken as representing the text from which Lucifer copied and, ergo, the one circulating in at least one biblical manuscript.

A few observations on the Greek critical edition should be included here as well. ZIEGLER – MUNNICH follow the now-superseded edition by Wilhelm VON HARTEL.<sup>113</sup> DIERCKS's newer edition improves the text, for example, by abandoning *cuius* at Dn 7:20 in favor of the manuscripts' *cui*, which in turn aligns with different Greek witnesses. Nevertheless, DIERCKS has his critics, and his confident presentation of the relation between the two extant manuscripts as settled has been accepted by some, questioned by others.<sup>114</sup> In the treatment of Lucifer's texts it will be argued that in two other instances the manuscripts should be accepted against all the editions, even DIERCKS's: the manuscripts' *uolucres* at Dn 7:6 and *sedit* at 7:26.

<sup>110</sup> Jer 3:15 constitutes an example outside of Sus-Dn-Bel in which he cites a verse over two works in a textually consistent manner: LUC *Ath* 1,2 (5,26), LUC *Ath* 1,22 (38,9), LUC *Ath* 2,3 (80,12), LUC *par* 11 (216,50) and LUC *par* 22 (237,20).

<sup>111</sup> LUC *par* 30 (253,58) and LUC *par* 30 (254,18), respectively.

<sup>112</sup> On the priority of the longer quotations in these instances see PIRAS, "Bibbia," 134. Cf. OSBURN, "Methodology," 322-323.

<sup>113</sup> LUCIFER OF CAGLIARI, *Opuscula* (ed. W. VON HARTEL) (CSEL 14; Vindobonae 1886).

<sup>114</sup> DIERCKS, introduction to LUCIFER OF CAGLIARI, *Opera*, XLV-LII. Giovanni CASTELLI helpfully summarizes the edition's reception in "Lucifero di Cagliari e la critica," *Koin. (N)* 22/1-2 (1998) 21-65, 31-33. He concludes that the importance of DIERCKS's edition lies more in its thorough introduction than its critical text. By contrast, Michael WINTERBOTTOM considers the text "as near flawless as one could hope to find" in his review of G. F. DIERCKS, *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae supersunt*. Ad fidem duorum codicum qui adhuc extant necnon adhibitis editionibus veteribus (CCSL 8; Turnholti 1978), *JThS n.s.* 31/1 (1980) 209-211, 209. Antonio PIRAS, pointing out the textual complexity of Lucifer's biblical citations in particular, has called for them to be re-edited; "Bibbia," 140.

Another difficult passage of the edition affects Sus 59, where Lucifer first writes the verse awkwardly (according to the edition, following both manuscripts), without a finite verb in the main clause: *manens etenim* (μένει γάρ) *angelus Dei gladium habens ad secandum te medium, ut uos perdat*. After that version from his longer citation, he quotes the verse a second time, where *etenim* has been replaced by the smoother *est*.<sup>115</sup> Michael WINTERBOTTOM advocates for a correction of the edition's *manens etenim*, which he says derived from *\*manens est enim*.<sup>116</sup> Of course, *\*manet enim* matches μένει γάρ perfectly and can also explain a derivation *manens etenim*. In any case, Lucifer's use of the present participle with *sum* is so common that PIRAS considers it an inexplicable tic; he even shows that the idiosyncrasy sometimes contaminates the Father's biblical text.<sup>117</sup> That would explain why he alone among VL and Greek witnesses has *manens (est)* rather than *manet*. In this doubtful case, DIERCKS did well to follow the manuscripts' reading, difficult though it is, for the difficult reading could date back to Lucifer himself.

Here follow Lucifer's citations (there are no helpful allusions) of Sus-Dn-Bel:

LUC sigla	work	date
<i>Ath</i>	<i>De Athanasio libri 2</i>	357-358
<i>par</i>	<i>De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus</i>	357-361

citation	LUC work
Sus 20-21	<i>Ath</i> 2,7 (90,59)
Sus 22-23	<i>Ath</i> 2,8 (91,20)
Sus 28-41	<i>Ath</i> 2,8 (91,36)
Sus 42-49	<i>Ath</i> 2,9 (92,15)
Sus 51-62	<i>Ath</i> 2,10 (94,8)
Sus 52-53	<i>Ath</i> 2,10 (95,7)

<sup>115</sup> LUC *Ath* 2,11 (94,22) and LUC *Ath* 2,11 (96,37), respectively.

<sup>116</sup> Review of DIERCKS, *Luciferi Opera*, 211.

<sup>117</sup> PIRAS, "Bibbia," 143.

citation	LUC work
Sus 55	<i>Ath</i> 2,10 (95,35)
Sus 59	<i>Ath</i> 2,10 (96,37)
7:1-27	<i>par</i> 30 (252,5)
7:25	<i>par</i> 30 (254,18)

#### f. Overview of patristic citations

The following table compiles the works from the preceding sections and orders them chronologically.<sup>118</sup>

sigla	work	date	region
[TE] <i>Jud</i> 1-8	<i>Adversus Iudaeos, 1-8</i>	ca. 197	North Africa
TE <i>or</i>	<i>De oratione</i>	198-203	North Africa
TE <i>pat</i>	<i>De patientia</i>	before <i>pae</i>	North Africa
TE <i>pae</i>	<i>De paenitentia</i>	204	North Africa
TE <i>car</i>	<i>De carne Christi</i>	206	North Africa
TE <i>cor</i>	<i>De corona</i>	208	North Africa
TE <i>Marc</i>	<i>Adversus Marcionem libri 5</i>	207-211	North Africa
TE <i>je</i>	<i>De ieiunio adversus psychicos</i>	210-211	North Africa
TE <i>Pra</i>	<i>Adversus Praxean</i>	210-211	North Africa
TE <i>res</i>	<i>De resurrectione mortuorum</i>	ca. 211	North Africa

<sup>118</sup> A full list of abbreviations for ancient literature is available in an appendix, p. 275.

sigla	work	date	region
TE <i>sco</i>	<i>Scorpiace</i>	ca. 211-212	North Africa
[TE] <i>Jud 9-14</i>	<i>Adversus Iudaeos, 9-14</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> c.?	North Africa
PS-CY <i>pa</i>	<i>De pascha computus</i>	243	North Africa
CY <i>te</i>	<i>Ad Quirinum (Testimoniorum libri 3)</i>	248-250	North Africa
CY <i>ep 6</i>	<i>Epistula 6: Sergio et Rogatiano</i>	250	North Africa
CY <i>or</i>	<i>De dominica oratione</i>	250	North Africa
CY <i>lap</i>	<i>De lapsis</i>	251	North Africa
PS-CY <i>mart</i>	<i>De laude martyrii</i>	251-254	North Africa
CY <i>Fo</i>	<i>Ad Fortunatum</i>	252-253	North Africa
CY <i>ep 58</i>	<i>Epistula 58: Plebi Thibari</i>	253	North Africa
CY <i>ep 61</i>	<i>Epistula 61: Lucio fratri</i>	253	North Africa
CY <i>un</i>	<i>De catholicae ecclesiae unitate</i>	251-256	North Africa
CY <i>op</i>	<i>De opere et eleemosynis</i>	253-256	North Africa
PS-CY <i>Nov</i>	<i>Ad Novatianum</i>	253-256	North Africa
BAR	<i>Letter of Barnabas</i>	late 2 <sup>nd</sup> - mid-3 <sup>rd</sup> c.	North Africa
NO <i>pud</i>	<i>De bono pudicitiae</i>	mid-3 <sup>rd</sup> c.	Rome
NO <i>tri</i>	<i>De Trinitate</i>	mid-3 <sup>rd</sup> c.	Rome
VICn <i>Apc</i>	<i>Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i>	before 304	Balkans
VICn <i>fa</i>	<i>De fabrica mundi</i>	before 304	Balkans
LAC <i>in</i>	<i>Divinarum institutionum</i>	304-311	Asia Minor



sigla	work	date	region
LAC <i>epit</i>	<i>Epitome divinarum institutio- num</i>	314-321	Asia Minor
FIR <i>err</i>	<i>De errore profanarum religio- num</i>	343-350	South Italy
FO-A	<i>Commentarii in Evangelia</i>	337-361	North Italy
LUC <i>Ath</i>	<i>De Athanasio libri 2</i>	357-358	South Italy (but written in exile)
LUC <i>par</i>	<i>De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus</i>	357-361	South Italy (but written in exile)

## 5. THE GREEK *VORLAGEN*

### 5.1. *The two Greek text types*

A brief introduction to the Greek texts of Sus-Dn-Bel is in order since the VL translates these. Only those aspects will be highlighted that most pertain to the present study.<sup>119</sup>

Sus-Dn-Bel is unique among biblical books in that the Greek-speaking Christian church first used the Septuagintal text (LXX<sup>o</sup>) but then almost universally gave it up in favor of the revised one attributed to Theodotion (LXX<sup>o</sup>), a shift that apparently took place around the turn of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. Not surprisingly, manuscripts witnessing to LXX<sup>o</sup> abound, whereas we possess but one (virtually) complete LXX<sup>o</sup> manuscript. So too, the multitude of secondary witnesses swell the LXX<sup>o</sup> apparatus but are scarcer for the ill-fated LXX<sup>o</sup>.

Like the Masoretic text, both Greek text types have twelve chapters for Dn. They differ most in Dn 4-6, where LXX<sup>o</sup> has expansions that have sometimes been explained as midrashic or resulting from an Aramaic original different from the Masoretic one.<sup>120</sup> In any case, it seems that the expansions in Dn 4-6 within our principal

<sup>119</sup> For thorough introductions, see J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 9-169; R. T. McLAY, “Daniel (Old Greek and Theodotion),” *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J. K. AITKEN) (London – New Delhi – New York – Sydney 2015) 544-554; LAHEY, “Additions”.

<sup>120</sup> McLAY, “Daniel,” 545.

witness to LXX<sup>o</sup>, Greek 967, result from interpolation from LXX<sup>o</sup>.<sup>121</sup> For Sus, the additions to Dn 3, and Bel, we have no extant Semitic original. Some believe that such an original existed at least for some of this material, but others dismiss such claims.<sup>122</sup> Of the additions, Sus exhibits the most changes from LXX<sup>o</sup> to the revision in LXX<sup>o</sup>, Bel fewer, and the Dn 3 additions fewer yet.<sup>123</sup> Overall, Sus-Dn-Bel LXX<sup>o</sup>, probably the product of multiple translators' work, uses a smoother Greek style; LXX<sup>o</sup>, itself the completion of proto-Theodotion's work, shows more Semitic interference and concern for literality. Despite the reliance of LXX<sup>o</sup> on LXX<sup>o</sup> for the additions, it shows independence from LXX<sup>o</sup> for Dn.<sup>124</sup>

## 5.2. Editions

The same edition provides the critical text of both types on facing pages: MUNNICH's LXX<sup>o</sup> on the left, and ZIEGLER's LXX<sup>o</sup> on the right.<sup>125</sup> The order is the traditional one for LXX<sup>o</sup>, Sus-Dn-Bel, with the traditional chapter order within Dn. LXX<sup>o</sup> has been aligned with that order even though its principal witness runs Dn-Bel-Sus and has Dn 7-8 inserted between Dn 4-5. LXX<sup>o</sup> has two apparatuses below the critical text: first the primary one, and then the Hexaplaric one below it. The single apparatus of LXX<sup>o</sup> contains more data than the other two combined. LXX<sup>o</sup> variants discovered since ZIEGLER's 1954 elaboration of the apparatus are collated by FRAENKEL and listed in an appendix to the introduction.<sup>126</sup>

The Göttingen edition assigns a capital letter to each uncial manuscript and a number in Arabic numerals to the minuscules and papyri.<sup>127</sup> Most of the manuscripts also contain Ez and are described in that volume, whereas the Sus-Dn-Bel introductions describe those not treated in the Ez volume.<sup>128</sup> The manuscript groupings have also been followed in the present work.<sup>129</sup> For example, Greek 230<sup>o</sup> represents two minuscules, Greek 230-541; Greek *L* represents seven manuscripts of the Lucianic recension, Greek 22-36-48-51-96-231-763. Sometimes manuscripts belonging to the

<sup>121</sup> One can identify these by comparing the manuscript to LXX<sup>o</sup> and the MT. The agreement of these three in Dn 4-6 is R. Timothy McLAY's criterion for interpolations from LXX<sup>o</sup> into the other Greek textual tradition. See "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV-VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel," *VT* 55 (2005) 304-323, 323; *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SCSt 43; Atlanta, GA 1996) 217.

<sup>122</sup> LAHEY, "Additions," 559-560.

<sup>123</sup> J. SCHÜPPHAUS, "Das Verhältnis von LXX- und Theodotion-Text in den apokryphen Zusätzen zum Danielbuch," *ZAW* 83/1 (1971) 49-72.

<sup>124</sup> Heinz-Dieter NEEF calls LXX<sup>o</sup> Dn "eine eigenständige, um Konsistenz in der Wortwahl bemühte, sehr sorgfältige Neuübersetzung von [MT-Dn], vielleicht aus Palästina, nicht jedoch eine Revision von [LXX<sup>o</sup>-Dn]," in "Daniel / Das Buch Daniel. Einleitung," *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare*. Band 2, Psalmen bis Danielschriften (Stuttgart 2011) 3016.

<sup>125</sup> J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 216-407.

<sup>126</sup> J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 170-214.

<sup>127</sup> Those pertinent for this study are listed at p. 271.

<sup>128</sup> J. ZIEGLER (ed.), *Ez*, 7-11; J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 9-20, 121-124.

<sup>129</sup> They are reproduced at p. 273.

same group but without their own abbreviation are referenced, in which case a hyphen signals their general affinity in *Sus-Dn-Bel*. So, if only Greek 36 and Greek 96 of the seven manuscripts in Greek *L* share a reading, they are hyphenated as Greek 36-96. Manuscripts from different groups have no hyphen between them.

A host of secondary witnesses complement the LXX manuscript evidence, not least of which the VL. Besides it, there are translations into Sahidic and Bohairic Coptic, Syriac, Ethiopian, Arabic, and Armenian.<sup>130</sup> The Greek Fathers constitute another important source of data, since they frequently cite the LXX.<sup>131</sup> I have followed ZIEGLER's abbreviation system for Greek Fathers, presented in the *Ez* volume,<sup>132</sup> but have relied on the most recent editions available.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> For the abbreviations, see p. 274.

<sup>131</sup> J. ZIEGLER – O. MUNNICH – D. FRAENKEL (ed.), *Sus-Dn-Bel*, 93-96, 125-129.

<sup>132</sup> J. ZIEGLER (ed.), *Ez*, 84-85.

<sup>133</sup> The abbreviations, along with the edition used, are listed in appendix for ancient literature, p. 275.