

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology



https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

## **PayPal**

https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\_jbl-01.php

## BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

## A SURVIVAL OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON IN DANIEL

The (אל ירמיה) in Dan. 9 2 is correctly translated in the "Theodotionic" testimonies with λόγος κυρίου. But in the "Septuagintal" tradition of the Chigi MS and the Syro-Hexaplar we read, εγένετο πρόσταγμα τη γη επὶ Ίερ. It has not been noticed that  $\tau \eta \gamma \eta$  is a survival of the presence of the Hebrew Tetragrammaton, i. e. THITH = PIPI, the patristic tradition for the transliteration of הוה. The variation has been obtained probably by a reallocation of the upright lines (as Dr. Bewer has suggested to me). Burkitt in his Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila, p. 15, says that "the more accurate copies" of the Greek to which Origen refers as containing the archaic Tetragrammaton, must be those of Aquila's translation. But while our "Septuagintal" authority is Hexaplaric, the presence of the Tetragrammaton here is hardly due to contamination from Aquila but should be regarded as more archaic and indeed Origen does not necessarily imply Aquila in his έν τοις ακριβεστέροις των αντιγράφων. [See Mercati. Revue Biblique, 1911. 269.] In the form THPH the transliteration made some kind of sense and so has been preserved.

Philadelphia Divinity School James A. Montgomery

