NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

AN ANCIENT GREEK FRAGMENT OF DANIEL 3: 51b–52

W. BAARS

Like most great libraries the Bavarian State Library at Munich, after the publication of its catalogue\(^1\) which describes the main part of the collection of Greek MSS, has acquired a number of additional items which have not been listed in any catalogue in the proper sense of the word. Only quite recently, Dr. W. Hörmann has given a summary description\(^2\) of the Greek MSS acquired since 1812, but even his account is not easily accessible. Among the 46\(^3\) MSS described, there are also some fragments of the Septuagint all of which are found in MS Gr. 610, a miscellany of loose leaves and fragments. Three of these LXX fragments, viz. MS Gr. 610, Nr. 1–3, were known since 1913 when they were described and published by W. Gerhäusser and A. Rahlfcs.\(^4\) Since 1913 a new LXX fragment has been added. To this fragment, known as MS. Gr. 610, Nr. 7,\(^5\) I would like to call attention here.

MS. Gr. 610, Nr. 7 consists of one small vellum fragment, damaged at all sides, written at one side only, with seven lines of script, not a single of which is complete. Owing to its small size it is not easy to date the fragment with some exactitude, but I think that a date between the fifth and seventh cent. C.E. will not be far off the mark.

In Daniel 3: 51b–52 (which is not represented in the MT, belonging to the “apocryphal” additions to the Book of Daniel) the LXX and the (so-called)

---

3 Nothing is said about MS Gr. 580 but there is a double entry under 579: 579 and 579A.
5 Hörmann’s description (p. 46) runs as follows: “...die linke Hälfte einer Kolumne mit 7 Zeilen, ebenfalls ein Pergamentblatt mit Unzialschrift (Cod. graec. 610, 7), bietet Textreste aus Daniel 3.51–52. Die genaue zeitliche Bestimmung steht für dieses Fragment noch aus...”
version of Theodotion are largely identical. It is, therefore, impossible to ascertain to which of these versions our fragment belongs. The one letter that might have decided the issue, viz. the very first letter of line 1, is scarcely legible. For the time being, I consider the fragment as stemming from Theodotion’s version, and I have set up accordingly the small critical apparatus which is based entirely upon Ziegler’s edition.

In transcribing the text, indicates letters that are damaged or only imperfectly legible.

MUNICH, BAVARIAN STATE LIBRARY, MS Gr. 610, Nr. 7

DAN. 3: 51b–52

(−51) OYN ΤΟ[ν θεόν εν τη καμινο λεγον
ΤΕΣ (52) ΕΥΛΟΓΗ [τος ει κε ο θε ι τον προν
ΗΜΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΥΠ(ερθυμητος και υπερ
ΥΨΩΜΕΝΟΣ ΕΙΣ [τους αιώνας και ευλο
ΓΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΟ ΟΝομα της δοξης σου το
ΑΓΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΥΠΕΡΑΙ[νετον και υπερνοο
μ]ΕΝΟΝ ΕΙΣ ΗΙΑΝ[τας κτλ.

Editio Ziegler, Dan. 3: 52

αινετος] υπ[ερθυμητος] cum 490 233 239
υπερψομενος] υπερψομενος cum B (so Ziegler; more exactly B^ab

υπερψομενος] cum B-26-130 449 La’ Sa Aetho = o’

6. If one supplies a Ι, the text follows Theodotion...δυνουν και ἐδόξαζον και εύλογουν
tοῦν θεόν; but when a Ψ is supplied, the LXX text can be presupposed: δυνουν και
ἐδόξαζον και εὐλόγουν καὶ ἐξίλουν τοῦν θεόν...

7. The variant παντας, though not unknown in the tradition of the Theodotion text,
would perhaps indicate the LXX version, but the remaining traces of the first letter of
line 1 look much more like the lower half of a Ι than like the characteristic foot of the
Ψ of which an example is forthcoming in line 4.