

Cowe, S. Peter. *The Armenian Version of Daniel*. University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 9. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992. xviii + 490 pp. \$64.95.

The primary purpose of Cowe's work on the Armenian Daniel is to provide a critical edition of the text. In this effort, his work joins earlier volumes in this series in which Michael Stone edited a critical text of the Armenian IV Ezra and Claude Cox studied the Armenian Deuteronomy. While Stone is interested primarily in the critical text itself, Cox attempts to situate the Armenian text in relationship to other translations, chiefly in the Septuagint family. Cowe's work follows the lead of Cox. His analysis of the available texts and his critical text of the Armenian Daniel occupy less than half of his book. The second half of the work (235 pages) analyzes the relationship of the Armenian text to the Georgian text, the Peshitta, and the Greek translations, including a discussion of the translation technique of the Armenian translator.

In the first section of the book, Cowe establishes the textual basis for his critical text. Chap. 1 establishes the textual families, chap. 2 collects data on the source manuscripts (often with colophons), and chap. 3 selects fifteen base manuscripts representing the various families in his critical text. Cowe's purpose in selecting fifteen texts is to keep the textual apparatus manageable. His critical text seems diplomatic, with one text selected as the primary text (M287), and the variations of the other fourteen texts noted in the apparatus. Prior to the critical text, a list of recurrent variants is given (121-137), with the same intent in mind. The critical text itself occupies pp. 141-227, and often the apparatus takes up as much as half a page of text, even after Cowe's efforts to keep it manageable.

In chap. 4, Cowe studies the relationship between the Armenian tradition, the Georgian translation, and the Peshitta, finding that there are two distinguishable phases of the Armenian tradition, with the Georgian translation related to the earlier phase. Chap. 5 aligns the Armenian translation history against the textual history of the Greek translations. Having analyzed the relationship between the Armenian and other traditions, Cowe then discusses the translation techniques of the Armenian Daniel (chap. 6). In chap. 7 is a belated analysis of text fragments as found in patristic and liturgical documents, a section reserved for the end due to its complexity. Though general conclusions are located in the last chapter, important conclusion material is also found in the Introduction (12-14), where Cowe critiques J. Ziegler's use of the Armenian witness in the Göttingen volume on Daniel. Also included are a general bibliography and indexes.

The history of the Armenian translation is complicated by the history of the Syriac versions but partially elucidated by the Georgian version. Cowe accepts that both the Syriac Peshitta and the Armenian Version were preceded by an earlier informal translation, the *vetus Syra* influencing the

old Armenian which, in turn, left significant traces in the Georgian translation. Teasing out reliable traces of the earlier versions requires considerable skill and agility in textual criticism, and Cowe's work seems largely reliable. However, the formidable complexity of the task is such that even excellent work such as this must be used with some caution. Once the influence of the Syriac is understood, Cowe concludes that the primary vorlage for the Armenian version is a Lucianic text, with most Old Greek readings of the Armenian mediated through it. It is interesting that the Greek manuscript which bears the closest resemblance to the Armenian vorlage is itself an eccentric text sometimes placed as a Q satellite, MS 230. In fact, the affinities of the Armenian Daniel are closer to the B family than the Q family.

Chap. 6, on translation technique, is of special interest for Septuagint scholars interested in using the Armenian as a resource in LXX textual criticism. Cowe's comments on Ziegler's use of the Armenian (11-14) should be read in the context of this chapter.

Another excellent aspect of this work is that historical influences are often brought into the discussion. For instance, Cowe notes the political factors which supported the production of numerous manuscripts from the 13th-14th centuries, followed by a two-century dearth of manuscripts (60). Under translation technique Cowe notes the influence of anti-Zoroastrian vocabulary from eastern Armenia, which was under Persian domination at the time of translation (367). Other examples relating both to translation and transmission may be found throughout the book.

In conclusion, it can be stated that this volume by Cowe is the product of massive primary research. It is a thorough study and a solid contribution to the field of Armenian and Septuagint studies.

Madison, WI 53713

JAMES E. MILLER

Freedman, David N., ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 6,700 pp. \$360.

Of these six volumes, it could, facetiously, be claimed that, "the more we learn, the more problems we have!" Indeed, for better or for worse, the recent explosion of knowledge in the humanities, leading to new approaches to the study of the Judaic and Christian Scriptures, has made of *ABD* a child of expansive learning.

Therefore, in accordance with the editorial wishes, the international, interfaith team of contributors has, in general, presented their conclusions in a tentative fashion. The result is a large number of lengthy articles (e.g., "Egyptian Literature," 2:378-399), which present relevant biblical and/or Near Eastern evidence and offer several reasonable conclusions. Though this design offers real scholarly advantages, it does not always, because of its neutral tone, "answer the questions" of the more issue-oriented reader.