THE GOAT FROM THE SOUTHWEST
IN THEODOTION’S DANIEL TRANSLATION,
THEODORET’S COMMENTARY,
AND THE ALEXANDER ROMANCE*

Abstract: According to Theodotion’s translation of the Book of Daniel, in one of Daniel’s visions a he-goat, interpreted as the king of Greece, is said to attack a ram, the king of Media and Persia, from the southwest, while the Septuagint translation says from the west. Theodoret of Cyrrhus, basing his commentary on Theodotion’s translation, explains this verse as referring to Alexander’s march from Egypt to his final battle against Darius at Gaugamela. In so doing, he must disregard the remainder of Alexander’s campaign against the Persians (of which he is clearly aware). He also eschews as a source the Alexander Romance, which offered a point of origin for Alexander’s attack on the Persian Empire perfectly consistent with Theodotion’s ‘from the southwest’, but was thoroughly unreliable as an historical source. It is possible, nevertheless, that the translation of Theodotion was itself influenced by the Alexander Romance on this point.
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Although some of the broader tendencies of Theodotion’s rendering of Daniel, such as the preference for transliteration over translation of certain Hebrew nouns, have often been noted, I would like to draw attention to a minor discrepancy between Theodotion and the Septuagint. Theodotion’s variant translation called forth a special explanation on the part of Theodoret of Cyrrhus. While this interpretation retains no exegetical value apart from Theodotion’s translation, it still bears testimony not so much to Theodoret’s method, as to his conscientiousness as a Bible commentator. Both Theodotion’s translation and Theodoret’s commentary, moreover, raise questions about the influence of the Alexander Romance.

*) I am very grateful to my colleague, Dr. Christian Djurslev, whose advice and direction have served to immeasurably improve this paper.
In the prophecies of the Book of Daniel a he-goat is said to come from the west “on the face of the whole earth” and to fatally strike the ram who had previously been preeminent. The goat is explained as the king of Greece, that is, Alexander, and the ram as “the king of Media and Persia”. The Septuagint and Theodotion translated this verse and especially the Hebrew phrase in two different ways. The Septuagint (or Old Greek) rendering had the goat come ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, that is, simply ‘from the west’. The translation attributed to Theodotion, however, had him come ἀπὸ λιβός. Λίψ may mean simply south or simply west, but its primary and precise sense was southwest, as in a southwest wind. The variation is minor, but it creates a difficulty for the exegete. Whereas the advance of the goat from the west is easily explicable in terms of Alexander’s invasion of the Persian Empire from Macedon, across the Hellespont, and through Asia Minor, it was not clear how Alexander was to be understood to come at the Persians from the southwest. Nor was the problem found merely in a negligible variant version; Theodotion’s was by far the preferred rendering of the Book of Daniel, at least, for Christian readers in antiquity.
Nevertheless, neither Hippolytus nor Jerome faced this difficulty, since Hippolytus, although he also read ἀπὸ λιβὸς in this verse, was concerned with the personalities intended and did not bother with the direction of march, and Jerome took the goat as coming from the west.  

In his commentary on Daniel (written c. 433)7, Theodoret of Cyrrhus followed Theodotion’s translation and understood ἀπὸ λιβὸς in its precise sense of ‘from the southwest’ and so explained the words as meaning that the goat, Alexander, first conquered Egypt and then proceeded against Persia:

ἀπὸ λιβὸς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐληλυθέναι ἔφη, ἐπειδὴ πρότερον Αἴγυπτον χειροσσεμένος οὕτως εἰς τὴν Περσίαν ἐλήλυθε χώραν. ἐνίκησε μὲν γὰρ τὸν Δαρείου ἐν τῇ Κιλικίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἐκείθεν τὴν Συρίαν, καὶ Φοινίκην, καὶ Πολασσιτίνην διαδραμόν, καὶ τὰς μὲν τῶν πόλεων όμολογία λαβόν, τὰς δὲ βίας ἔλον, εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον ὄρμησεν· εἶτα κακείνην τὴν βασιλείαν παραλαβόν, τὴν Περσίδα καταλομβάνει, καὶ τὴν μεγίστην αὐτῶν καταλύει βασιλείαν.  

He [Daniel] says that he [the goat, that is, Alexander] came from the southwest, because, having already taken possession of Egypt, he advanced into the land of the Persians. For he had defeated Darius in Cilicia, but from there he hurried through Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, and having taken some of the cities by capitulation and having seized others by force he rushed on to Egypt; then once he had taken possession of that kingdom, he laid hold of Persia and made an end of their superlatively great dominion.

The route described here is the standard itinerary of Alexander’s expedition found in the most reliable historical accounts: Alexander defeated Darius at Issus and proceeded south along the Levan
tine coast to Egypt. It is only the final thrust of the campaign against the Persians, at the end of which Alexander administered the coup de grâce to the armies of Darius at Gaugamela and pene-

---


8) Theodoret, Comm. in Dan. 8.5. PG 81.1441A–B. Migne’s text is reproduced, along with an English translation, in Hill (n. 7 above) 206–9.
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Theodoret’s understanding of the route of Alexander’s expedition is confirmed by his comment on the subsequent verses:

πρώτοις μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ἐκείνου συμβαλὼν στρατηγοῖς ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόποις, πάσαν αὐτῶν ἐκείνην ἀφείλατο τὴν ἀρχήν. εἶτα τοῦ Δαρείου κατὰ τὴν Κιλικίαν μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς στρατείας ἀπαντήσαντος, ἐτέρα γίνεται συμπλοκῆ, καὶ τρέπεται μὲν ὁ Δαρεῖος εἰς φυγήν, πολλοὺς δὲ τῆς στρατείας καταναλώσας ὁ Αλέξανδρος ἔλαβεν αἰχμαλώτους τοῦ Δαρείου τὰς θυγατέρας. εἶτα αὖθις μετὰ τὴν ἐξ Ἐγαλύπτου ἐπανοδον, περὶ τὴν Βαβυλῶνα παραταξάμενος, αὐτὸν τε τὸν Δαρείον ἀνεῖλε, καὶ τὴν Περσικὴν κατέλυσε βασιλείαν.  

For first he joined battle with the generals of that man in the places along Asia and took away all their power. Then, when he encountered Darius with a great army down near Cilicia, another engagement occurred and Darius was put to flight, while Alexander devastated many of the army and took the daughters of Darius prisoner. Then again after his return from Egypt, drawing up his battle lines near Babylon, he destroyed Darius himself and made an end of the Persian dominion.

Asia here is Asia Minor and the region of Alexander’s first victory over the satraps of Darius is at the Granicus; Cilicia, once again, refers to the battle at Issus; coming from Egypt, Alexander is supposed to defeat Darius at a final battle near Babylon, that is, at Gaugamela.

Theodoret can explain Daniel’s he-goat coming from the southwest inasmuch as the final and fatal stroke of Alexander’s campaign against Darius is launched from Egypt. This accounts for the goat’s attack on the ram well enough, but the Biblical text does not indicate any previous movement on the part of the goat or a change of course, rather the goat seems to appear on the scene from the southwest. Theodoret’s explanation requires him to discount the whole of Alexander’s expedition up to his arrival in Egypt, material of which he is obviously aware, as insignificant preliminaries that the prophet was willing to pass over in silence. There was, however, another account of Alexander in circulation in Theodoret’s day that would have provided a narrative rather more consistent with Daniel’s verse as Theodotion renders it. The Alexander Romance (made up of some elements in circulation fifty or a hundred years after Alexander’s death, although we do not have evidence for the composition as a whole until c. AD 270–

9) Theodoret, Comm. in Dan. 8.6–7. PG 81.1441C; Hill (n. 7 above) 208–9.
330\textsuperscript{10}) did not conform to the route of Alexander as it was presented by all of the reliable historical sources, but, in its earliest version, related that Alexander did not make war on the Persians until he had circled round the Mediterranean, adding Rome and Egypt to his kingdom.\textsuperscript{11} His attack on the Persian Empire thus commenced from Egypt and he marched north to meet the Persian army for the first time at Issus.\textsuperscript{12} Even in the later β recension (c. 500) of the Romance, although Alexander did cross the Hellespont and fought the Persians at the Granicus, he broke off after conquering the western seaboard of Asia Minor, made a circuit of the western Mediterranean, and began the war in earnest after he left Egypt.\textsuperscript{13} The best histories require a bit of juggling for them to be used to explain the goat’s approach from the southwest, but the Romance has Alexander initiate his attack on the Persian Empire from Egypt, from the southwest, and so agrees perfectly with Theodotion’s translation of Daniel’s prophecy. That Theodoret did not exploit such a congenial text raises questions about his source selection, particularly in regard to Alexander.

Alexander is seldom mentioned in the extensive surviving writings of Theodoret of Cyrus and none of the references to Alexander is sufficiently detailed or idiosyncratic to allow us to identify a specific source. Most of Theodoret’s references to Alexander occur in the commentary on Daniel and are intended to make sense of the prophecies which, clearly or more obscurely, allude to the Macedonian king. He identifies the third kingdom of bronze in Nebuchadnezzar’s initial vision as the kingdom of Alexander, who de-
estroyed the Persian kingdom.\textsuperscript{14} He deems the representation of Alexander as the beast like a leopard as appropriate because of its speed and swiftness and diversity of appearance.\textsuperscript{15} As we have seen, Theodoret, taking the lead of the text, interprets the he-goat as Alexander.\textsuperscript{16} And he refers to the dissolution of Alexander’s empire after his death in order to explain the division of the kingdom to the four winds in the eleventh chapter.\textsuperscript{17} Theodoret also exploits the imagery of Daniel, which depicted Alexander as a goat, in his commentary on Jeremiah, and indicates in the same work that Alexander destroyed the kingdom of the Egyptians and makes them subservient to the Macedonians\textsuperscript{18} – this is particularly inconsistent with the \textit{Alexander Romance}, in which the Egyptians hail Alexander as their rightful king.\textsuperscript{19} He likewise speaks, in his commentary on the Minor Prophets, of Alexander as the last in a series of foreign conquerors to place Egypt in subjection; Theodoret refers to the visit of Alexander to the Oracle of Ammon at Siwa to explain another verse in the same passage.\textsuperscript{20} Theodoret, moreover, refers, in the \textit{Questions on the Octateuch}, to Alexander’s overthrow of the Persian Empire to indicate the sense in which Chittim shall afflict Asshur in the prophecy of Balaam.\textsuperscript{21} In the commentary on Isaiah he alludes to Alexander’s supposed encounter with the Jewish high priest and how his anger was turned to reverence;\textsuperscript{22} the earliest surviving ac-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Theodoret, Comm. in Dan. 2.43. PG 81.1305C–D; Hill (n. 7 above) 58–9.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Theodoret, Comm. in Dan. 7.6. PG 81.1417B–D; Hill (n. 7 above) 180–83.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Theodoret, Comm. in Dan. 8.5–7, 21–2. PG 81.1440D–1441D, 1449C; Hill (n. 7 above) 206–9, 218–9.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Theodoret, Comm. in Dan. 11.3–4. PG 81.1501D–1504A; Hill (n. 7 above) 278–9. Cf. Theodoret, Comm. in Psal., praef. (PG 80.864A), in which he says that the Septuagint translation was carried out in the time of Ptolemy, who ruled Egypt after Alexander.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Theodoret, Comm. in Jer. 46(26).16, 50(27).8. PG 81.712C, 741A.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Al. Rom. (a) i.3.4–6, 34.3–6. Alexander, moreover, conducts himself as a legitimate king, rather than an oppressive conqueror, by expending the tribute of the Egyptians on ‘their own’ city of Alexandria, and the Egyptians volunteer to help him fight the Persians; Al. Rom. (a) 1.34.9, 2.4.5–8.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Theodoret, Comm. in Naiium 3.8–10. PG 81.1804C–1805B.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Theodoret, Comm. in Is. 60.10. PG 81.468A: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τὴν ἱερατικὴν στολὴν δεισάμενο, καὶ μεταβαλλομένου τὸν θυμὸν εἰς προσκύνησιν.
\end{itemize}
count of Alexander’s visit to Jerusalem is found in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, but by the fifth century it was so widespread that we are not in a position to isolate a source for Theodoret’s reference. And, in order to accentuate the glory and the power of the martyrs and the assiduity with which their graves are visited, he notes, in the Θεραπευτική or *Cure for Pagan Maladies*, that the graves of Alexander and the other great world rulers are lost and forgotten.

There is no indication that Theodoret was aware of the *Alexander Romance*, so we cannot say whether it was discrimination or ignorance that led him to rely upon dependable historical sources, even though this required him to select only one portion of Alexander’s campaign as the subject of Daniel’s reference. What remains remarkable is that although Theodoret makes only a few brief, scattered references to the figure of Alexander, he was conscientious enough to have made himself familiar with the general outline of Alexander’s career from reliable sources before he made those comments he did about him. This is perfectly consistent with the paramount intention Theodoret shared with the whole of the Antiochene exegetical school to reconcile prophecy with history.

Even if Theodoret did not exploit the *Alexander Romance*, there remains the possibility that Theodotion did. Particularly when we consider the fact that Theodotion’s version had the reputation in antiquity, and with some reservations still does, of being a


revision of the Septuagint rather than a fresh translation,\textsuperscript{26} it would be strange that Theodotion should prefer the problematic \textit{ἀπὸ λιβὸς} to the straightforward \textit{ἀπὸ δυσμῶν} if there were not some influence at work upon his choice. And there is no reason to doubt that the \textit{Alexander Romance}, or its constituent parts, could have been available to Theodotion. On the one hand, the material in the \textit{Romance} connected with Egypt appears to be amongst its very earliest elements, springing from Ptolemaic efforts to legitimize Graeco-Macedonian rule in Egypt and perhaps going back as far as the third century BC.\textsuperscript{27} On the other hand, all of our testimonies to the life of Theodotion, contradictory and dubious as they are, suggest that he lived in the second century AD.\textsuperscript{28} Irenaeus speaks of Theodotion as a Jewish proselyte from Ephesus and seems to suggest that he preceded his fellow proselyte and Bible translator, Aquila of Pontus.\textsuperscript{29} According to Epiphanius, Theodotion lived in the reign of Commodus (180–192) and was a disciple of Marcion (d. c. 160) before his conversion to Judaism, but Epiphanius’ information seems to be confused, since he has Theodotion come, like Aquila, from Pontus.\textsuperscript{30} Jerome says that Theodotion was an Ebionite, that is, he belonged to an early Jewish-Christian sect.\textsuperscript{31}


\textsuperscript{28) See Fernández Marcos (n. 5 above) 148–50; Jobes / Silva (n. 5 above) 41–3; Dines (n. 5 above) 84–7; T. Law, Origen’s Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, Apologetics, or Exegesis, JThS 59 (2008) 6–8. This paper does not attempt to address, let alone solve, the vexed question of the date and identity of Theodotion, or even the problematic ascription of the Theodotion-Daniel to Theodotion, but takes the conservative view that there is some, as yet not ultimately determined, validity to the ancient testimonies to Theodotion. Cf. A. Schmitt, Stammt der sogenannte “β”-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion? (Göttingen 1966).

\textsuperscript{29) Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 3.21.1.

\textsuperscript{30) Epiph. De mens. et pond. 17.

\textsuperscript{31) Jerome, De vir. ill. 54.
The interval between the probable first appearance of the Egyptian elements of the *Alexander Romance* and the second-century date associated with Theodotion allows ample time for the diffusion of the *Romance*’s version of events in which Alexander launches his attack on the Persian Empire from Egypt. There is still time for such a dissemination even if, with some scholars, we discard the patristic evidence and view the so-called Theodotionic version of Daniel as a work predating the New Testament.32 Sadly, we know too little of the life of Theodotion, or the circumstances of his predecessors, to suggest a reason for his possible exploitation of such a source as the *Alexander Romance*. Nor is a single ambivalent word enough to confirm that he revised the Septuagint’s ἀπὸ δυσμῶν to ἀπὸ λιβὸς with the *Romance* in mind, but the odd and troubling sense this choice of words created should compel us to at least entertain the possibility.

Theodotion’s translation of Daniel creates a problem for the exegete inasmuch as it had the goat representing Alexander attack the Persian ram from the southwest, rather than the west. Theodoret tackled this problem by taking Daniel’s prophecy to refer not to Alexander’s campaign as a whole, but to only one portion of it, the departure from Egypt and the march to Gaugamela. To his credit, Theodoret preferred reliable historical sources on Alexander, which required a certain amount of trimming and adjustment in order to be applied to the verse in Daniel, over such a questionable source as the *Alexander Romance*, which, nevertheless, suited Theodotion’s rendering of Daniel perfectly, since it had Alexander commence his invasion of the Persian Empire from Egypt. The possibility remains, however, that Theodotion’s translation itself, which eschewed the straightforward ‘from the west’ for the troublesome ‘from the southwest’, was influenced in this verse in particular by the *Alexander Romance* or some of the components that would one day make it up.
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