

same kind. These two *recensions* (which they were in the proper sense of the term) were much used in the Eastern Churches.

From the fourth century and onward, we know of no definite attempt to revise the text of the Septuagint, or to correct the discrepancies of various copies. It is probable, however, that just as the text of the Greek New Testament became in a great measure fixed into the same form as we find it in the modern copies, something of the same kind must have been the case with the Septuagint. As to the Greek New Testament, this seems to have occurred about the eleventh century, when the mass of copies were written within the limits of the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is probable that certain copies approved at the metropolis, both politically and religiously, of those who used the Greek tongue, were tacitly taken as a kind of standard.

We find amongst the members of the Eastern Churches who use the Greek language, that the Septuagint has been and is still so thoroughly received as authentic Scripture, that any effort to introduce amongst them versions which accurately represent the Hebrew (as has been attempted in modern times) has been wholly fruitless.

Thus the Septuagint demands our attention, were it only from the fact that the whole circle of religious ideas and thoughts amongst Christians in the East has *always* been moulded according to this version. Without an acquaintance with the Septuagint, numerous allusions in the writings of the Fathers become wholly unintelligible, and even important doctrinal discussions and difficulties (such even as some connected with the Arian controversy) become wholly unintelligible.

As the Septuagint was held in such honour in the East, it is no cause for surprise that this version was the basis of the other translations which were made in early times into vernacular tongues. There was, however, also another reason;—the general ignorance of the original Hebrew amongst the early Christians prevented their forming their translations from the fountain itself. The especial exception to this remark is the Syriac version of the Old Testament formed at once from the Hebrew.

The principal translations based on the Septuagint were the following :

The Old Latin.—This version was executed in very early times, probably in the north of Africa. At the end of the fourth century Jerome made his translation direct from the Hebrew—a work of which many expressed alarm, as though it were a dangerous innovation: however, by degrees the version of Jerome obtained such a footing in the Latin Church that (except in the book of Psalms) it displaced its predecessor. The *old Latin* only exists in fragments, which were carefully collected and edited by Sabatier, in 1749.

The Memphitic (or Coptic) version.—This was probably executed at an early period. Many books of the Old Testament in this translation have been printed.

The Thebaic (or Sahidic).—The version into the language of Upper Egypt exists only in fragments.

The Ethiopic.—This was probably made in the fourth century: it has not been all printed.

The Gothic.—This translation was executed by Ulphilas in the fourth century. But few fragments of the Old Testament have been discovered, and a portion of Nehemiah is all that has been printed.

The Armenian.—In the early part of the fifth century Miesrob, the inventor of the Armenian alphabet, undertook the translation of the Scriptures into that tongue. The version has always been in use in the Armenian Church; and as that nation are so scattered through the East, the translation has become known in many countries in which they have settled. The best edition of this version is that of Zohrab (Venice, 1805), formed wholly on the authority of MSS.

In later periods versions, either whole or in part, were formed from the Septuagint into Arabic, Georgian, and Slavonic. The Syriac version from the Hexaplar text has already been mentioned.

These secondary translations, based on the Septuagint, must be taken into consideration if we would estimate the extensive use of that version: they *might* also be turned to good critical account, were any competent scholar to examine them carefully; for they would thus be important witnesses as to the condition of the version at particular times; and also in conjunction with ancient MSS. they would help in the restoration of the text.

These, then, are the principal points in the history of the Septuagint prior to the text having been printed.

The first printed edition of the Septuagint which was published was the Aldine, which appeared at Venice, in 1518, in one volume folio. Appended to it was the Greek New Testament, in which the text was printed from the first edition of Erasmus. It is not certainly known what MSS. were used by Andreas Asulanus, the editor of the Aldine Septuagint. It is probable, however, that they were but few in number; for the fact that the New Testament was simply a text borrowed from Erasmus does not favour the idea of any extensive stock of Greek MSS. being at the editor's disposal. The *character* of the MSS. is a more important question. It appears that the Aldine text pretty fairly represents the text found in the later Greek MSS. of the Septuagint, such in fact as were in circulation in the Greek Church at the time when the taking of Constantinople by the Turks (May 29, 1453) dispersed so many Greeks, who carried their MSS. and the knowledge of their tongue into Western Europe.

Before the Aldine Septuagint had been printed, an impression of this ancient version was inserted by the editors of the Complutensian Polyglot, as one portion of that work. The publication, however, of the Complutensian Polyglot did not take place until 1552. This work was carried on under the direction and at the expense of Cardinal Ximenes, who caused it to be printed at Alcalá (Complutum), where he had founded a University. The Complutensian text of the Septuagint has often been supposed to have been adapted by the editors so as to suit the Hebrew original in some measure. Others however consider that the passages in which this text approaches more closely

to the Hebrew than is the case with other copies of the Septuagint, were not corrupted by the editors, but that the readings were actually taken from Greek MSS. in which Origen's Hexaplar text was contained. These questions might now be mostly answered by any scholar who has the opportunity of examining MSS. at Madrid; for it is now known that the MSS. of the Septuagint used by the Complutensian editors (with the exception of that containing the Pentateuch) are now preserved in that city, together with the rest of the library formerly at Alcalá.

The Aldine text was the first that obtained general circulation, and it was repeated in many editions; so that it seemed probable that it might become the *Textus Receptus* of the Septuagint. This however did not prove to be the fact; a more ancient text, of which we shall immediately speak, almost entirely supplanted it. The Complutensian text, unlike the Aldine, never obtained any general circulation.

It had long been known that an ancient Greek MS. of the Old and New Testaments was preserved in the Vatican Library, and a wish was expressed by many that the text of this MS. might be used as the basis of an edition of the Septuagint. This MS. became the basis of the Roman or Vatican edition of the Septuagint which appeared in 1587.

The edition was edited by Cardinal Caraffa and others, and it appeared with the sanction of Pope Sixtus V., to whom it was dedicated by the cardinal. He says, in the Dedicatory Epistle, that the pope (when Cardinal Peretti da Montalto) had eight years before urged Pope Gregory XIII. to print the Septuagint from the Vatican MS., and that this had been the origin of the edition: he speaks very decidedly of the fidelity with which he and his associates had followed their MS., "verbo ad verbum,"—an expression which goes rather too far: before he had said, "curavi . . . hujus libri editionem ad Vaticanum exemplar *emendandam*," and this more accurately describes the mode of procedure.

In the Preface the editors speak of other MSS. which they consulted; what use they made of them they do not state; they mention, however, that the parts in which the Vatican MS. is defective were supplied from other MSS.

This edition was sanctioned by a "Decretum" of Pope Sixtus V. The pope recites what had been done in the preparation and completion of the edition, and then he goes on to say:—"Volumus et sancimus ad Dei gloriam et Ecclesiæ utilitatem, ut Vetus Græcum Testamentum juxta Septuaginta ita recognitum et expolitum ab omnibus recipiatur ac retineatur, quo potissimum ad Latinæ vulgatæ editionis et veterum sanctorum Patrum intelligentiam utantur. Prohibentes ne quis de hac nova Græca editione audeat in posterum vel addendo vel demendo quicquam immutare. Si quis autem aliter fecerit quam hac nostra sanctione comprehensum est, noverit se in Dei Omnipotentis beatorumque Apostolorum Petri and Pauli indignationem incursum." Of course this sanction would be enough to bind the consciences of all who own the papal authority. It was not, however, considered to extend to minute points; for the printed copies are corrected with a pen in several places, and also discrepancies from the MS. were pointed out very shortly after by Flaminio Nobili

and others. The editions based on the Roman commonly adopt the corrections.

This edition has become the basis of what may be considered the *Textus Receptus* of the Septuagint: it therefore becomes important to know what the value is of the MS. authority from which it sprung, and how far the editors have accurately followed their MS. The editors boast much of the antiquity and value of the Vatican MS.: they seem indeed to have shown considerable critical tact on this subject; for they commend not merely their MS. on the score of its antiquity, but also the *text* which it contains. This latter particular was not grounded on any mere examination of the materials of the MS., the form of the letters, the colour of the ink, etc., but on a comparison of the citations found in early Ecclesiastical writers with this MS., and also with the Aldine text then commonly in use. The researches of scholars for the last two centuries and a half have confirmed the verdict of the Roman editors in favour of the Vatican MS. The text as published appears to present the actual Septuagint version such as it stood before the labours of Origen, with at least but few attempts at correction or revision.

It still remains to be inquired whether the editors faithfully followed the MS. before them. To this it may be said, that there appears no ground for supposing that they departed from their MS. *intentionally*, unless in points of mere orthography and the like. But that they did at times desert their MS. is certain. This probably arose from the Vatican MS. not having been copied for the press, but instead of taking that labour they seem to have *corrected* a printed copy of the Aldine so as to represent the Roman Codex; hence, in every place in which they overlooked a reading in the MS., the passage stands as it did in the Aldine. In this there seems to have been no want of good faith on the part of the editors, but merely that kind of oversight to which every eye is more or less liable, especially when occupied with reading MSS. in ancient uncial writing without divisions between the words.

The proof that the Roman edition does sometimes differ from the Vatican MS. is found in the collation of part of the latter which was made for Dr. Holmes.

The Roman text of the Septuagint has become that in general use, as much amongst Protestants as amongst those who might feel bound by the pope's decree. And this was not the result of any mere blind acceptance of a *Textus Receptus*, as had been the case with the Elzevir New Testament, for the Aldine Septuagint *then* held that place: it was rather as if the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament could be dislodged from the place which it occupies in this country, by a text resting on a really ancient basis.

Perhaps the Aldine text as such would have been even more thoroughly forgotten had it not been made (as it stands in the edition of Wechel, 1597) the ground of the Concordances of Kircher and Trommius. The former used the Aldine text before the Roman had altogether taken its place; the latter, as he wrought as a remodeller and amplifier of Kircher, was almost compelled to use the same text, unless indeed he had chosen to encounter a labour for which his years were unfitted.

The Alexandrian MS. has become the basis of a fourth principal text of the Septuagint. Bishop Walton, in his Polyglot Bible, indicated variations

found in this MS. at the foot of the column in which the Roman Septuagint was printed.

The Alexandrian MS. was the basis of an edition which was prepared by Grabe, who lived only to publish two volumes, of which the first appeared in 1707: the two later volumes were edited by Lee and Wigan; the work was completed in 1720.

Grabe, however, did not simply follow the MS. before him; wherever he disapproved of its readings, he placed them in the margin, and gave what he considered a corrected reading in the text in a different type. He also endeavoured to restore the critical marks of Origen; hence he was obliged to make many additions in smaller type of passages which the Alexandrian MS. does not contain: these additions were intended to correspond with the passages which Origen introduced from other versions marked with an asterisk. Grabe took these supplementary passages from the Complutensian or Aldine texts, or from MSS.

It was the intention of this learned editor to publish copious notes in justification of the alterations which he made in the text, and also in explanation of the readings which he added or obelised. All this, however, was prevented by his death.

The text of Grabe was reprinted by Breitinger at Zurich, who added the various readings of the Roman edition; but this text has never acquired any *general* use. The Alexandrian readings, however, have subsequently been *often* an accompaniment of the Roman text.

These, then, are the leading texts of the Septuagint,—the forms in which it has been multiplied by means of the art of printing. No critical text has ever yet been formed, nor is it likely that the obstacles which stand in the way of this will be soon surmounted.

In the latter part of the last century Dr. Holmes, dean of Winchester, drew public attention to the condition of the text of the Septuagint, and to the fact that very numerous MSS. of that version remained uncollated in the principal libraries of Europe.

Dr. Holmes's appeal was responded to by a liberal subscription of many thousand pounds; so that he was able to procure collations of very many MSS. In fact such a mass of various readings were brought together, that it seemed as if patience and attention must alike fail before they could be brought into any arrangement.

The publication of Dr. Holmes's edition commenced in 1798. The death of the editor a few years afterwards threw hindrances in the way of its continuance. After some years, however, the materials were placed in the hands of the late Dr. Parsons, who continued the publication: the last volume appeared in 1827.

This edition thus published by Holmes and Parsons may be regarded as a storehouse of materials for the criticism of the Septuagint. There are, however, several serious defects in the execution, the arrangement is often far from clear, and readings even of important MSS., such as the Alexandrian, are imperfectly stated.

For this edition the Vatican MS. was in part collated; hence there became a manifest proof that the Roman editors did not always accurately follow their MS. This portion of Holmes's critical materials is very valuable: it is much to be regretted, however, that the collation extends to only part of the MS.

Whenever critical industry shall be directed to the revision of the text of the Septuagint, Holmes's collected materials will require to be assorted and used; one portion of these might be comprised in a comparatively small compass, namely, the readings of the uncial MSS. It is a great inconvenience that some of these are not distinguished as such by Holmes and Parsons.

Other valuable materials have been brought to light by Tischendorf: this learned examiner of ancient MSS. published the text of the valuable Palimpsest MS. at Paris, the Codex Ephraemi; he has since discovered and published other fragments of the Septuagint (the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, now at Leipzig) of extreme antiquity.

In the edition which has recently appeared under his care, the variations of these MSS., together with the more important of the Alexandrian, have been subjoined to the Roman text.

APOCRYPHA.

As the Apocryphal books are an almost necessary adjunct to the Septuagint, a few words should be devoted to an account of what these writings are.

The Alexandrian Jews possessed a sacred literature in the Septuagint translation, and where other works of the same national character were either written in Greek or translated from the Hebrew, these also were appended to the sacred books which they before possessed. But we learn plainly from Josephus that they were not regarded as having any canonical authority. The early Christians received them as part of the sacred literature then extant in Greek, and certain of them ignorantly deemed that they possessed some authority; while others, like Melito, exercised a sound discretion in inquiring what books the Jews held as an authoritative and divine Scripture.

The opinions of Christian writers varied much on the subject: Jerome plainly termed them Apocrypha, and often spoke of them very contemptuously: in the Church of Rome, however, they gradually obtained a high standing, until at length the Council of Trent presumed to anathematise any one who would not receive the greater part of them as authoritative Scripture. Many of the Romish Church endeavour to soften the force of this decree, and they thus call these books Deutero-Canonical; it is, however, clear that the council had no thought of applying the term canonical to these writings in any secondary sense, and that they exalted the legend of Tobit and the *fables* (so termed

by Jerome) of Bel and the Dragon to as high an authority as Moses and the Prophets.

ESDRAS.—The book called in the English Apocrypha the first book of Esdras, and in the Latin Vulgate the third book of Esdras (the canonical Ezra and Nehemiah being the first and second), is commonly termed in the Septuagint the *first* book of Esdras, the canonical Ezra being the *second*. This book is simply the canonical Ezra interpreted in a remarkable manner. The Church of Rome even does not receive this book as Holy Scripture, any more than it does the fourth (in the English Bible the *second*) book of Esdras: this latter does not exist any longer in Greek.

TOBIT.—This book is a kind of romance, abounding in anachronism; it has been transmitted in various forms, all of which are considered to have sprung from a Chaldee original: this may have been moulded differently by different copyists. The writer is supposed to have lived from 200 to 150 B. C. The book exhibits the doctrinal system then prevalent amongst the Jews.

JUDITH.—This book is also a romance. It is doubtful whether the Greek is a translation or not. The date of the writing of the book is wholly uncertain. It contains such chronological statements as are quite inconsistent with its being a real history.

ADDITIONS TO ESTHER.—The Apocryphal books previously noticed stand distinct and separate; but here the case is different. It is as though the Greek translation of the real Ezra had not come down to us, and we only had the Apocryphal Esdras with all its interpolations. The book of Esther is in such a state in Greek that it is impossible to separate the text of the real book without breaking and dividing sentences. The old Latin version which was current before the time of Jerome being made from the Greek, of course comprised the interpolations: that Father rejected them unceremoniously, and they have henceforth stood by themselves in the Vulgate at the end of the book. The division of the book into modern chapters has only increased the confusion; for thus, in the Vulgate and in the English Apocrypha, these interpolations stand, separated from the places where they had been introduced, as if they were something consecutive. It is remarkable that the Council of Trent, which canonised the additions, did not restore them to the places in which they would have been (as they are in the Greek) at least intelligible.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON.—This book appears to have been written by an Alexandrian Jew, who personates Solomon, and yet describes the nation of Israel in circumstances wholly unlike any that could apply to the time of that king. Probably no fraud was *intended*, but simply a fictitious clothing was given to the thoughts. This book has linguistic value as showing the Hebraic character of Hellenistic Greek, even when employed in original composition. It is also a proof of the early use made of the Septuagint version, from which there are citations.

ECCLESIASTICUS, or the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach.—This book was translated into Greek from the Hebrew original by the grandson of the author (as is supposed), about the year 130 B. C. The Hebrew has long been lost.

BARUCH.—It is considered by many that this book is a translation from a Hebrew or Chaldee original. It professes to be from the pen of Baruch, the companion of Jeremiah, but is unquestionably one of the forged prophecies which have made their appearance at various ages. Jerome rejects the book unceremoniously; and it is probable that none would have received it as authentic Scripture, had it not been that it was appended to the Greek copies of Jeremiah.

ADDITIONS TO DANIEL.—Susanna, the Song of the Three Children, and Bel and the Dragon.—These three *fables*, as they are rightly termed by Jerome, probably originated in Greek: they were affixed to the canonical Daniel in spite of all incongruities, and it is remarkable that some of the early objections to the book of Daniel were founded entirely on these Apocryphal accretions. Since they were canonised by the Council of Trent, some Romish authorities have tried, by the supposition of allegory or parable, to avoid the insuperable difficulties.

MACCABEES.—There are four books of Maccabees extant in Greek, of which, however, the Church of Rome receives only the two first as canonical.

The *first* book of Maccabees is an interesting history, originally written in Hebrew, which is no longer extant, but early translated into Greek as we now have it. It contains the best history that we possess of the Maccabean times.

The *second* book of Maccabees is an abridgment of a work written by Jasen of Cyrene: the Greek text is probably the original. The author expressly repudiates the idea of his being inspired: hence it is wonderful that the Tridentine Fathers should have elevated the book to the place of authoritative Scripture.

The *third* book of Maccabees is a history with fictitious embellishments, in order of time prior to the other books which bear the name of Maccabees. It is received by the Greek Church, but not by the Latin. The author and the age are alike unknown.

The *fourth* book of Maccabees is by some supposed to have been written by Josephus: Greek is the original language. This book was omitted in the Roman edition, and hence some have supposed that it was rejected in the Vatican MS.; that Codex, however, does not contain any of the books of Maccabees: why, therefore, the editors supplied *three* books and not all the four does not appear.

These books called Apocrypha, though destitute of all *authority*, have much value in connection with the Hellenistic phraseology of the New Testament. The Septuagint version had been formed on a Hebraic mould, so that Hebraisms

were sure to manifest themselves ; but in those books of the Apocrypha which were originally written in Greek, we find just the same Hebrew cast of thought and expression. Thus the Hellenistic phraseology of the New Testament was not a new thing, even when applied to original composition.

The present edition of the Septuagint may be briefly described. The Publishers have adopted the Vatican text as most suitable for general utility.

The *real* Septuagint of Daniel has been given (though commonly omitted in editions of the Septuagint), as being an integral part of the version, although the Church at an early period substituted for it the version of Theodotion. This has also been given, as it commonly is inserted as part of the Septuagint.

In the Apocrypha the fourth book of Maccabees has been added to the three found in previous reprints of the Vatican text.*

* The Publishers of this edition, in order to meet the wants of biblical students, have caused a selection of the various readings to the Septuagint to be prepared for publication. A description and specimen of this critical apparatus will be found subjoined to this edition.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL,

ACCORDING TO THE TRUE SEPTUAGINT VERSION.

THE real Septuagint text of the Book of Daniel was, at a very early period, neglected by the Church, and the version of Theodotion was substituted in its place. Hence the Book of Daniel contained in almost all manuscripts and printed editions of the Septuagint belongs properly to Theodotion, and not to that version.

Indeed, for many centuries, the real Septuagint of Daniel was supposed to be lost: it was, however, discovered in a manuscript in the palace of Prince Chigi, at Rome. Bianchini transcribed it from this manuscript (known by the name of Codex Chisianus), and from his copy it was published by Simon de Magistris, in 1772. This edition and other separate reprints were, however, not very accurate. The manuscript itself was recollated for Holmes; and in his edition the real Septuagint of Daniel is given, as well as that of Theodotion.

The Publishers have judged it well in this edition to include this book, which is an integral part of the Septuagint version; for, although it was justly rejected in public Ecclesiastical reading, in favour of the more correct translation of Theodotion, an edition of the Septuagint is incomplete without it; and, indeed, this book, in spite of all the imperfections of the translation, affords valuable materials for comparison with New Testament phraseology, diction, and citations.

The recent edition of this book by Hahn has been used as the basis of the text here given. That editor has embodied the results of the recollation of the Codex Chisianus, as well as instituted a comparison of the text with the Milan manuscript, containing the Syriac version of the Hexaplar text, as published by Bugati. Hahn has inclosed in brackets words or sentences which, although in the Codex Chisianus, do not appear properly to belong to the version; he has also added, in a different type, words and sentences found in the Syriac Hexaplar text.

The apocryphal "Song of the Three Children" has been allowed to remain in the third chapter: the apocryphal additions, "Susanna" and "Bel," have been subjoined.

ΔΑΝΙΗΛ.

Ι. Ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἰωακείμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
ἔτους τρίτου παραγενόμενος Ναβουχοδο-
νόσορ βασιλεὺς Βαβυλώνα εἰς Ἱερουσα-
λὴμ ἐπολιόρκει αὐτήν. ² Καὶ παρέδωκεν
αὐτὴν Κύριος εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰωακείμ
τὸν βασιλέα τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ μέρος τι
τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἀπήνε-
γκεν αὐτὰ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα [εἰς γῆν Σενναῖρ]
καὶ ἀπηρεύσατο αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ εἰδωλείῳ αὐτοῦ.
³ Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀβιεσδρὶ τῷ ἑαυ-
τοῦ ἀρχιενούχῳ ἀγαγεῖν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν νύων
τῶν μεγιστάνων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ
βασιλικοῦ γένους καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων
⁴ Νεανίσκους ἀμύμονας καὶ εὐειδεῖς καὶ ἐπι-
στήμονας ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ γραμματι-
κούς καὶ συνετούς καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ ἰσχύον-
τας, ὥστε εἶναι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ βασιλέως,
καὶ διδάσκει αὐτοὺς γράμματα καὶ διάλεκτον
χαλδαϊκὴν. ⁵ Καὶ δίδοσθαι αὐτοῖς ἔκθεσιν
ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου βασιλέως καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέ-
ραν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς τραπέζης καὶ
ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου, οὐ πίνει ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ
ἐκπαίδευσαι αὐτοὺς ἑτη τρία, καὶ ἐκ τούτων
στήσαι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βασιλέως. ⁶ Καὶ
ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν νύων Ἰσραὴλ τῶν
ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας Δανιὴλ, Ἀνανίας, Μι-

σαήλ, Ἀζαρίας. ⁷ Καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ
ἀρχιενούχος ὀνόματα, τῷ μὲν Δανιὴλ
Βαλτάσαρ, τῷ δὲ Ἀνανίᾳ Σεδράχ, καὶ τῷ
Μισαήλ Μισάχ, καὶ τῷ Ἀζαρίᾳ Ἀβδε-
ναγῷ.

⁸ Καὶ ἐνεθυμήθη Δανιὴλ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ,
ὅπως μὴ ἀλισγηθῇ ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ τοῦ βασι-
λέως καὶ ἐν ᾧ πίνει οἶνον, καὶ ἤξιώσε τὸν
ἀρχιενούχον, ἵνα μὴ συμμολυνθῇ. ⁹ Καὶ
ἔδωκε Κύριος τῷ Δανιὴλ τιμὴν καὶ χάριν
ἐναντίον τοῦ ἀρχιενούχου. ¹⁰ Καὶ εἶπεν
ὁ ἀρχιενούχος τῷ Δανιὴλ· ἀγωνιώ τὸν
κύριόν μου τὸν βασιλέα τὸν ἐκτάξαντα τὴν
βρῦσιν ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν πόσιν ὑμῶν, ἵνα
μὴ ἴδῃ τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν διατετραμμένα
καὶ ἀσθενῇ παρὰ τοὺς συντρεφομένους
ὑμῖν νεανίας [τῶν ἀλλογενῶν], καὶ κινδυ-
νεύσω τῷ ἰδίῳ τραχήλῳ. ¹¹ Καὶ εἶπε Δα-
νιὴλ Ἀβιεσδρὶ τῷ ἀναδειχθέντι ἀρχιενούχῳ
ἐπὶ τὸν Δανιὴλ, Ἀνανίαν, Μισαήλ, Ἀζα-
ρίαν. ¹² Πείρασον δὴ τοὺς παῖδάς σου ἐφ'
ἡμέρας δέκα, καὶ δόθητω ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν
ὀσπρίων τῆς γῆς, ὥστε κάπτεν καὶ ὕδρο-
ποτεῖν. ¹³ Καὶ ἐὰν φανῇ ἡ ὁψις ἡμῶν
διατετραμμένη παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους νεανί-
σκους τοὺς ἐσθιοντάς ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ