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Abstract

This dissertation examines the consensus view that is based on Hans-Peter Müller’s 1969 and 1972 articles: Daniel was a mantic wise man in the Mesopotamian court, and this was the self-understanding or aspiration of the maskilim of 11:33, 35, 12:3, 10, who wrote the book. Chapter 1 reviews the arguments that make the mantic connection, and Chapter 2 concludes that a direct connection with the Daneks of Aqht, Ezek, and Jub, and with the angel in 1 Enoch, should be rejected. There is evidence that the tradition of a priest in Ezra 8:2 and Neh 10:7, and found also in the superscription to the Old Greek of Bel, and 4 Ezra 12:10-11, suggested the name.

Chapter 3 concludes that the portrayal of the court diviners in Dan 1-6 is wholly negative and includes both the diviners, and the essence of the professions, i.e., the ability to interpret a divine revelation. The critique is conveyed through the story line, explicit criticisms, irony, and humour. Chapter 4 concludes that Daniel, the interpreter of dreams and the writing on the wall, is distinguished from every other character and role. In the final form of Dan, is divinely assisted each time he interprets, just as when he receives help from an interpreting angel in Dan 7-12.

Chapter 5 demonstrates that the portrayal of Daniel as the divinely assisted interpreter makes sense of the reinterpretation of old prophecies against the Assyrians as prophecies against Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Hab 2:2-4 and Isa 52-53 were also understood as predictions about the maskilim themselves. Comparisons are then made with the Teacher of Righteousness, the writers of the Hodayot, and with three Essenes portrayed by Josephus. These too were portrayed as divinely assisted interpreters.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Preamble

The need for this dissertation began to formulate in 1987 when I was reading Christopher Rowland’s *The Open Heaven*. I was interested in investigating the matrix out of which Book of Daniel (*Dan*) and other apocalypses grew. I knew that there were problems with looking to prophecy. Gerhard von Rad’s suggestion of the wisdom tradition, although solving some problems, left others unsolved and created yet more.

Then in one chapter of Rowland’s book I read the following:

"Similarities have been pointed out between apocalyptic and mantic Wisdom. This type of Wisdom is rather different from the experiential Wisdom of Proverbs and includes the interpretation of dreams and the receipt of visions, in other words, exactly what we find in the apocalypses. Indeed, the figure of Daniel as he confronts us in the opening legends of the book of Daniel is very much the ancient seer who interprets dreams and makes a [sic] sense of portents (*Dan 2.31ff.; 4.19ff.; 5.13ff.*). Like Joseph in the book of Genesis, Daniel is one who can interpret the dreams of foreign kings, and as [sic] one who is inspired with the spirit of the holy gods and who can solve all kinds of problems (*Dan 5.14* and 16), and it is not surprising therefore, that he should be the recipient of further divine disclosures in visions which he himself experiences (*Dan 7ff.*). We are thus faced here with a possible background to the apocalyptic literature which does justice to the elements which are contained in it."

This “mantic wisdom” was not something about which I had read in standard works on wisdom. It seemed a known thing to Rowland, however, and as he described it, it did solve major problems concerning the origins of features of apocalypses and their worldview. I chased down two of the authorities he cited. Both used the adjective

---


2 Rowland, *Open Heaven*. 204-205.
“mantic”, which confirmed for me that it was my knowledge of forms of wisdom that was deficient. Despite my deficiencies I could see from the literature that little work had been done on the connection between “mantic wisdom” and “apocalyptic” and I decided it would be worth exploring in depth. From there the research has developed into a critique of what has become the scholarly consensus, *i.e.*, that Daniel (and behind him the writers of the stories and visions) was a mantic. This dissertation is my contribution to our understanding of *Dan*, and the roots of Jewish apocalyptic literature.

This dissertation takes as its starting point the critical assumptions about the book: that it is not a document of the sixth century BCE, but rather developed during the Babylonian and Persian periods until the second century BCE when, during the crisis precipitated by Antiochus Epiphanes, stories about a/some courtiers were melded into a book containing stories followed by visions that pertained to that time of crisis, but seemingly predicted in the sixth century. Who the writers were is that on which we will focus.

In the remainder of this chapter, we will consider how the terms “mantic” and “manticism” have been used by scholars, review the development of the idea that apocalyptic, but especially *Dan*, comes out of a mantic tradition, and then focus upon one of the leading arguments for that connection, the association of the Daniel figure with the mantic Dn’il of Ugarit.

“Mantic” and “Manticism”

In 1969 Hans Peter Müller wrote an article that changed the way scholars have looked at *Dan*. In “Magisch-Mantische Weisheit und die Gestalt Daniels” he argued that Daniel was based upon the Ugaritic figure Dn’il and like that figure was a magic-
mantic wise man. It is now almost impossible to find a new work on Dan that does not refer to the main character as a mantic wise man. Given the frequent occurrence of the term in discussions of the origins of apocalypses and, especially Dan, it would be helpful to clarify the meaning and use of the terms “mantic” and “manticism”.

Both the English and German word groups are derived from the Greek terms μάντις, “diviner, seer, prophet” (LSJ), and μαντικός, -ή, -όν, “propheic, oracular” (LSJ). The phrase τέχνη μαντική was also used to denote “faculty of divination” (LSJ). The two editions of the unabridged Oxford English Dictionary define the adjective “mantic” as “pertaining to divination or prophecy”. “Manticism” is defined as “the practice of divination”. The dictionary even defines “mantic” in its use as a noun meaning “the art or science of divination”. These are rare words in English if the lengths of their entries are an indication of the frequency of their usage. The word Mantik does not occur in the older German Dictionaries such as Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm (1885). It does appear in the newer German dictionaries. Brockhaus Wahrig Deutsches Wörterbuch and Duden both define it as the craft of those who predict the future. Duden also relates it to the art of the seer, which it defines elsewhere as one who has been granted unusual insight through visions or inexplicable intuition.

It seems that the only encyclopaedia article on “manticism” or “Mantik” is in the third edition of Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. There it is the “divination” article. The author E. Stiglmayr writes, “in der Religionswissenschaft,

4 “Kunst der (religiösen) Wahr- u. Weissagung.”
5 “Wahrsage-, Seherkunst.”
bes. in der englischen Literatur, auch Divination genannt. The entry for “diviner”, however, is under the heading *Wahrsager.* Stiglmayr defines “Mantik” as “die Kunst des Wahrsagens.”

What needs to be noticed in these definitions is the ambiguity. Taken together, one cannot be sure whether “Mantik” or “manticism” refers only to prediction of the future as a subset of divination, *i.e.*, prophecy; or to divination in general, which has as part of its purview the determination of the future. Diviners, seers and prophets were not only predictors of the future, they also explained why things had happened or were happening; they gave divine insight into events past, present and future. The confusion may be due to a difference between German and English usage of the words, the former seemingly focusing on the prediction of the future, and the latter on divination in general. This lack of clarity about the meaning of the words has led to some confusion in the literature.

The terms “mantic”, “mantic wise man”, “manticism”, and “mantic wisdom” also are used to draw together a variety of works to support the thesis that Jewish apocalypses arose from mantic circles. Among these works the sphere of “mantics” is

---


said to include the reception and interpretation of dreams and visions, the interpretation of omens, and the use of magic. "Mantics" or "mantic wise men" are described as diviners, courtiers, shamans, and visionaries. Literature from similar professions in Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Africa have been used to explain what mantics might have been like and how they might have functioned in society. "Mantic" influences have been found in Dan in diverse things: the tradition history of the Daniel figure, the courtiers of chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5, the visions and dreams of chapters 2, 4, 5 and 7-12, the Mischwesen (mixed creatures) in chapters 7 and 8, the vaticinia ex eventu in chapters 8 and 11, the reinterpretation of the Jeremiah prophecy in chapter 9, and the maskilím of chapters 11-12. The maskilím, it has even been suggested, were a group of "mantics" that migrated from Mesopotamia to Palestine in the second century BCE. It all seems very impressive. However, as we showed above, it is not always so straightforward due to the different understandings of the terms being used as the common denominator.

Two examples of the studies that have been brought together because of the use of the term “manticism” will illustrate this point. The two works are published doctoral dissertations. The one is by Paul Porter, and is titled *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary-Critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8*. The other is by Stephen Reid, and is titled *Enoch and Daniel: A Form Critical and Sociological Study of the Historical Apocalypses*.

Although Paul Porter did not devote his 1983 monograph specifically to the question at hand, its contribution has been significant. Chapter 2 is a comparison of the animal imagery in *Dan* 7-8 with the Mesopotamian birth omen series Šumma izbu, a product of learned manticism. Its use spanned from the Old Babylonian period (c.a. 2004-1595 BCE) to 100 BCE in the time of the Seleucids. Porter found features in this text that resembled the Mischwesen in *Dan* 7 and 8, *1 Enoch* 85-90, the *T. Joseph*, and the *Rev*. Some examples are more convincing than others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Parallels between <em>Dan</em> and Šumma izbu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:5 And behold, another beast, a second one, like a bear. <em>It was raised up on one side</em> …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

E.g., as was done by Davies, “Social world of the apocalyptic writings”, 251-71.

Porter, *Metaphors and Monsters*.

Reid, *Enoch and Daniel*.


7:5 it had three \textit{ribs in its mouth} between its teeth …

8:5 …and the goat had a \textit{conspicuous horn between his eyes}.

XVII 16’ If an anomaly holds \textit{its lung(s) in its mouth}—a strong king […]

IX 32’ If an anomaly has \textit{only one horn, and it protrudes from its head}—weapon of Sargon; the land of the prince will expand; the weapons will be strong and the king will have no opponent.

Porter believes that “the peculiar physical characteristics ascribed to the various beasts are ultimately traceable to Mesopotamian mantic wisdom traditions”.\textsuperscript{15} To support this contention he refers to various other features of \textit{Dan}: the “author’s sympathies . . . with the \textit{maskilîm} or ‘wise’ of chapters 11 and 12 within whose circles the visions of Daniel probably originated”; Daniel’s functioning as a wise courtier in Babylon, in which function he received visions in chapters 7 and 8; Daniel’s functioning as a dream interpreter; and the resemblance of portions of \textit{Dan} to the so-called Akkadian Prophecies.

Stephen Reid took a different direction with the apocalypses in \textit{Dan} 7, 8, and 10-12, and \textit{1 Enoch} 93 & 91; 83-84, and 85-90. He linked “manticism” in its expression as dream interpretation, with the reception of these visions by real visionaries. To understand the social function of such activity he used various anthropological studies on ecstatic divination and diviners in Africa.

In these two examples we go from the professional court mantic in Mesopotamia, to the ecstatic mantic of Africa, and therein lies a significant problem. The mantics from the courts of Assyria and Mesopotamia were not ecstastics. At most, they sought dreams when all else failed. According to Leo Oppenheim, even that

\textsuperscript{15} Porter, \textit{Metaphors and Monsters}, 15.
seems to have ceased with the Assyrians. The professions of these “mantics” were governed by books in which they found the interpretations, cures and incantations they needed. Ecstatic experiences were only within the domain of men and women on the fringe of Mesopotamian society, such as the dream interpreters who did their work intuitively, i.e., the ša'īlû. So, to combine the two modes of operation under the unclear term “manticism” is misleading.

**Review of research**

This problem of mixing functions that should remain separate seems to arise from the history of the development of the phrase “mantic wisdom” and the use of the terms “mantic” and “manticism” in the English scholarly literature. The phrases seem to have their origins in the confluence of two separate streams in German scholarship. The first stream was that in which the terms הָדָר (“wisdom”) and בִּי (“wise”) were thought to be used in a special sense for divination in the Hebrew Scriptures. For his justification in linking “Mantik” and “Weisheit”, Hans-Peter Müller, who seems to have coined the phrase “mantische Weisheit”, cites three individuals: Hans Meinhold, *Die Weisheit Israels in Spruch, Sage und Dichtung*; Helmer Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*; and Georg Fohrer, “σοφος” in *Theologisches Handworterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. The important citation is the one to Meinhold. Ringgren is just a digest of Meinhold to whom he directs the reader. Although Fohrer does not directly cite Meinhold in the text of the article, the section to which Müller especially draws the reader’s attention seems to digest Meinhold’s work, and that work is cited in the bibliography to the article.

---

Meinhold breaks the relevant section of his monograph into two major sections. The macro section is titled “A. Vorprophetische Fassung der Weisheit in Israel.” The two major subsections are: “Die Weisheit als das Wissen von Gott.”; and “Die Weisheit ist das von den Göttern kommende Wissen.” The distinction between the two is significant. The first, “knowledge from God” is knowledge that is coerced from God by means of the use of the name of God in magical rites. In this subsection he discusses activity in the Hebrew Scriptures in which the name of God is invoked, the magician as medicine man and rain maker (e.g., Elijah and Elisha), and communication with ancestral spirits. The second section on “knowledge that comes from the gods” refers to divine endowment. In this subsection he discusses God-given dreams and dream interpretation, wisdom as the God-given skill of rulers and politicians, the “wisdom” of artists and craftsmen and the gift of wisdom to the Israelite peasant. He does not use “Mantik” or “mantisch” in his work.

The word is introduced by Fohrer in the first subsection of his discussion of human wisdom. The subsection of the article to which Müller refers was titled “Magie und Mantik”. He says that מִפְּקַל in the passages he was discussing “is a term for the one who pretends to know the background of events and also future events”.17 Divination determines the causes of past or present problems or what the future holds; magic spells are used to alleviate or avert the problems.18 The reasons for Fohrer’s choice of the term “Mantik” rather than “Wahrsagung” or “Weissagung” or even “Divination” are unclear, although the use by Stiglmayr is similar.19 That choice,

17 Fohrer, _TDNT_, 483 (emphasis added).


however, has played a significant part in the use of “mantic” in English, because in the English edition of “Kittel” the title of the subsection is translated “Magic and Manticism”. The translator may have chosen “Manticism” because of the derivation of the word from µαντίς, meaning “prophet”, a person with whom we associate the telling of the future. This could conceivably have been chosen because of Fohrer’s selection of examples from passages that talk about foreknowing the future. He also states that the magicians (מִסְרָא) of Gen are “men who practise the mantic [divinatory?] technique of knowing the future through interpretation of dreams”.20 There is within Fohrer’s article, then, some unclarity about what he meant by Mantik, a problem that is common to the use of the words.

So, there are some scholars who link מִסְרָא with “mantic” practices. There are others, the second stream of scholarship, that link wisdom traditions and apocalyptic traditions.21 According to J. Schmidt22 there was an established tradition beginning as early as Vatke in 1835 of relating these two traditions. Those who followed him were Noack, Ewald, Hölscher, and Pfeiffer. To those we should add Fohrer, who in his σοφός article writes:

In Daniel we have the beginning of the fusion of later wisdom theology with apocalyptic. Daniel’s מִסְרָא differs from that which is proper to man. It does not merely surpass it (2:30); as a divinely given wisdom it is fundamentally different (5:11, 14). The secrets of the future are known by means of it.23

20 Fohrer, TDNT, 438. It should be noted that Fährer did not say “Thus the מִסְרָא of Babylon are a college of soothsayers, magicians, and interpreters of dreams and signs whom the king summons for the interpretation of his dreams...”, as Bromiley translated it, but rather “...interpreters of stars and signs...”, i.e., “Stern- und Zeichendeutern.” Forher does refer to dreams in the discussion, however.

21 I have used these words imprecisely, as they were used at the time of the writing of the works to which reference will be made.


23 Fohrer, TDNT, 489.
The widespread union of the two streams began when Gerhard von Rad wrote that apocalyptic derived exclusively from the wisdom tradition and had nothing in common with the prophetic tradition.\(^{24}\) In Volume Two of his *Theologie*, he argued that the view of history in apocalyptic writings was incompatible with that found in the prophetic writings and that it reflected a wisdom background.\(^{25}\) While the prophets believed God to be acting within history, the apocalyptists saw God acting only at the end of history. The point of reference for addressing the people of God was the present for the prophets, but in apocalypses it was the distant past in the guise of some ancient worthy. Also, the means of revelation was not in clear messages, but in oblique messages that required interpretation. The origins of these are to be found in wisdom traditions wherein the teaching that everything has its time (*Eccl 3:1 ff.*) is developed into a scheme of divinely appointed “times” or aeons. The pursuit of knowledge for the living of life has been extended to take in everything in the universe and those who seek to understand it are presented as experts in these matters, such as the experts in *Dan* 2, 4, and 5.

It is this last point that von Rad makes that is important for our purposes. He states:

> Glaubt man die Apokalyptik von den Traditionen der Weisheit her verstehen zu müssen, so wäre das wohl nur dahin einzuzgrenzen, daß sich in ihr bei all ihrer Stofffülle die Weisheit doch nicht in extenso fortsetzt, sondern nur einige ihre Sektoren, also vor allem die alte Traumdeutungswissenschaft und die Wissenschaft von den Orakeln und den „Zeichen“.\(^{26}\)


\(^{26}\) von Rad, *Theologie des AT*, 331. In von Rad, *Message of the Prophets*, 274. he writes: “But predicting the future was no monopoly of the prophets. We hardly
This was so contrary to the contemporary paradigm, which looked to prophecy
or Zoroastrianism for the roots of apocalyptic, and von Rad was so prominent in the
field of Old Testament studies, that a vigorous debate followed. From the outset of the
debate, however, most scholars rejected von Rad’s proposal, Osten-Sacken’s article
being the most thorough.²⁷ Osten-Sacken wanted to maintain the link with prophecy
and defended that thesis.

Although von Rad sought to answer Osten-Sacken’s criticism in a brief footnote
in his 1970 book *Weisheit in Israel*,²⁸ and expanded his argument greatly, it was
Hans-Peter Müller who successfully defended the thesis in a paper read to the
International Congress at Uppsala in 1971. In that paper he defends von Rad’s thesis
by taking up the connection made by von Rad with dream interpretation and with
oracle and omen interpretation.²⁹ He stated that von Rad’s failure was not his claim
that apocalyptic came from wisdom, but his not distinguishing the type of wisdom from
which it came, *i.e.*, mantic wisdom.³⁰ He argued for the thesis that:

> Weder die Weisheit in ihrer höfisch-pädagogischen Hochform, wie wir sie aus der
> israelitischen Königszeit kennen, noch deren demokratischere Sukzessoren in
>

---
²⁷ Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zu

²⁸ G. von Rad, *Weisheit in Israel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag,
n. 32.

270-71.

³⁰ Müller. “Mantische Weisheit”, 271. This is a distinction that Osten-Sacken
did not make and this seriously weakens his criticism of von Rad.
nachexilischer zeit, sondern die archaische Gestalt einer mantischen Weisheit hat sich in der Apokalyptik fortgesetzt.\textsuperscript{31}

It was this lack of distinction between didactic wisdom and its less rational neighbourly phenomenon that made von Rad's argument faulty, Müller claims.\textsuperscript{32}

Before reviewing that article, however, it is necessary to go back to his 1969 article in which Müller, initially, came to the association of Daniel with the various 'Danels'. There he attempted to show that

in der Gestalt Daniels, wie sie Dan 1 f.; 4 f.; 7 ff. vor uns tritt, zeichnete die späte nachexilische Zeit den mantischen Weisen als Typus. Er hat in dem magisch-mantischen Danel von Hes 14,14.20; 28,3; 1 Hen 6,7; 69,2; Jub 4,20 sowie in dem ugaritischen Dnil als magischem Weisen sein je ein wenig verschieden strukturiertes Vorbild.\textsuperscript{33}

He described a "magical-mantic wise man" as one of those experts "der die den Dingen und Personen innewohnende Macht seinem Willen fügt oder Fernes, Verborgenes und vor allem Zukünftiges zu erkennen vermag".\textsuperscript{34} Daniel, he argued, was such a person and his character was based upon an ancient Ugaritic figure, Dn'l, who also was a magical-mantic wise man.\textsuperscript{35} In the first part of his paper,\textsuperscript{36} Müller focussed on the occurrences of the term $\text{E\:\:\:\:\:\:\:\:H}$ where it was collocated with mantic or magical terms, considered post-Exilic texts in which mantics are portrayed or discussed,\textsuperscript{37} and then examined those passages in which the wise of world powers confronted their

---


\textsuperscript{32} Müller, "Mantische Weisheit", 271.

\textsuperscript{33} Müller, "Magisch-mantische Weisheit", 79.

\textsuperscript{34} Müller, "Magisch-mantische Weisheit", 79.

\textsuperscript{35} Müller relied upon Meinhold, Ringgren and Fohrer for the definition.

\textsuperscript{36} Müller, "Magisch-mantische Weisheit", 79-85.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{E.g.}, \textit{Esth} 1:13; \textit{Ezek} 28:1-10; and \textit{Isa} 44:25-26.
counterparts in Israel. In addition to Daniel, he looked at both Joseph in *Gen* 41, and Moses and Aaron in *Exod* 7-8. From this examination he concluded that the root מדר has both magical and mantic connotations in the Old Testament and that this accords well with actual practice in which mantics wanted not only to know the future, but also to influence it, and in which both offices were joined in one person.

In the next section he considered Daniel in *Dan*, especially chapters 4-5: *Ezek* 14:14, 20, and 28:3; *1 Enoch* 6:7; 69:2; and *Jub* 4:20; as well as the unnamed Jew in *4QprNab*. He believed these figures were all connected, and so he concluded that behind Daniel

> eine sehr alte, ursprünglich nicht-israelitische Überlieferung mit dem Namen Danel bereits den Begriff des urzeitlich-übermenschlichen Weisen verband. Dessen Weisheit ist verschiedener Art: nach Hes 28,3; Jub 4,20 gehört sie in den Bereich mantischer. nach 1 Hen 6,7; 69,2 zugleich in den der technisch-magischen und der mantischen Kunst.

He found this older tradition in the Ugaritic Dn‘l of *Aqht* whom scholars then believed to lie behind the ‘Danels’ of *Ezek. 1 Enoch*, and *Jub*. Müller’s concern in the third section of the article was to determine the nature of the wisdom of Dn‘l. This Danel was a wise judge and his children were involved in magic. From these *associations* he argued that Danel’s wisdom was a “magisch-mantische Weisheit”. He also argued it was because of Danel’s association with a form of “wisdom” that the name Daniel was chosen for the wise man of the stories of *Dan* 1-6.

---

38 Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”, 85-89.


40 Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”, 89; *cf. ANET*, 149.

41 Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”, 89-94.
For his choice of the adjective *mantisch* with which he modified *Weisheit*, Müller cited, among others, the section of Fohrer’s article referred to above. Neither of the other two authors that he cites uses the term. What is important is that the four authors, Meinhold, Ringgren, Fohrer, and Müller, represent a stream of scholarship that brought divination and magic under the umbrella of the wisdom traditions. This is important to the matter at hand, for it was due to that connection that “apocalyptic” was later associated with “mantic wisdom”.

When he presented his Uppsala article, Müller went back over some of the material that he covered in 1969 in more depth in order to show that Israel was familiar with magic and divination and their practitioners both within and outwith Israel. First, he examined Daniel. On the basis of his former work, he believed that Daniel was the mantic wise man *par excellence*. This view of Daniel is clearest in chapters 2, 4 and 5, which, he argued, are the oldest parts of the book. In chapters 4 and 5, Daniel is the mantic who is tested in a heathen context. He believed that chapter 2 developed from a misunderstanding of 4:6b, thus forming a complex with the oldest two chapters. In these stories Daniel interprets dreams (2 and 4) and strange oracular writing (5). His counterparts appear in them as *הכלהים*, *ה.Performing occult “wisdom”. They are described in 2:27 as *זנות* (conjurers), *טמשק* (magicians) and *לטפים* (determiners of fate). In 4:3-4 the term *לטפים* is added to the list. Their common function according to 2:27 was the announcement of mysteries (*때), which function is portrayed in a different form in 4:3-4 and 5:7-4. When the Babylonian wise men fail, Daniel steps in for them and as one of them. This inclusion in their number is clear from 2:12-13 and 18 and from the end of the story when he becomes their leader. In 5:11 he is presupposed as *רשב תחתמנים* *טמשק* *לטפים* *Details*.

---

42 Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”. 275-77.
and chapter 2 ends with him elevated to 'וַיְבָאָם צְגֵנָא יִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּית צִוָּא (v. 48). He could give interpretations and ‘loosen knots’ (5:16), but his God gave these abilities (2:23). The content of מִלְדַּת וְזֹא כִּבָּל, according to 2:22, lay in the domain of the mysterious (that which is difficult to understand, the coded) and in that which is hidden in darkness (that which is difficult to get at, which must be revealed). Thus, Müller concluded, “die Weisheit des Daniel von Kapitel ii, iv und v ist also wirklich rein mantischer Art; anders als Joseph hat er mit Bildungsweisheit nichts zu tun.”

Next, he considered the tradition that lies behind Daniel. Müller accepted as lying behind Dan 4, showed him that the basis for Daniel is not found in Dan 4. One reads of an unnamed Jewish seer who interprets Nabonidus’ dream; the name ‘Daniel’ does not appear. Daniel assumed the role of this seer possibly because the cognates of his name traditionally were associated with mantic wisdom. In Ezek 28:3 Danel is an exemplary wise man whose wisdom is defined as insight into the mysterious, so that, in comparison with that Danel, the ruler of Tyre could tauntingly be asked, 71נ tý C1fü ‘7: ). Müller compared this with Dan 2:22 and concluded:

der Dan’el von Hes xxviii 3 scheint also ebenso wie der Daniel von Daniel ii; iv f. mantischer Weiser zu sein. Dabei könnte der Vergleich mit dem Tyrener in Hes xxviii 3 zeigen, daß Dan’el ursprünglich nicht als Israelit gedacht war, worauf vor allem auch der Gottes name El als Bestandteil seines Namens hindeutet.

To this he added references to 1 Enoch 6:7 and 69:2, in which the angel Danel is among those angels who reveal magical and mantic arts to the humans. In Jub 4:20, Danel is the father-in-law of the apocalyptic seer Enoch, who, according to v. 17, “was the first who learned writing and knowledge and wisdom . . . and who wrote in a book

43 Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”, 277.
44 Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”, 277-79.
45 Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”, 278.
the signs of the heaven according to the order of their months . . . "46 Thus, Müller concluded,

\[\text{daß der weise Dan'el von Hes xiv 14:20; 1 Hen vi 7 und lxix 2 (Jub iv 20) mit dem ugaritischen Dnil traditionsgeschichtlich zusammenhängt, wird fast allgemein angenommen; doch ist die Weisheit Dnils—wie die seiner Kinder Aqht und Pgt—magischer Art.}^{47}\]

Müller thought that the introduction to Dan, i.e., chapter 1, tries to unite the mantic character of the wisdom of the (Canaanite) Daniel with court wisdom, as in the Joseph story. Thus the youths had as the aim of their education לְעֹמֵד בְּבֵית הָמָלָךְ (1:4αβ), which had as its content סֵפֶר וְלֵשֶׁנֶם בְּשָׁדָה (1:4β), so that in the end each had at his disposal מָרָדֵד בְּבֵית הָמָלָךְ סֵפֶר וְלֵשֶׁנֶם (1:17). In 1:20 the manticism extends to Daniel’s friends whose wisdom and insight are measured against the Babylonian אֲלַמֶּסָם תְּרֵפָּם and who are found to be ten times better. In Sus, on the other hand, Daniel has lost the mantic trait completely and taken over, as the clever judge, the role of the ‘wise lad’.48

Müller believed that attaching the name of Daniel to the visions of Dan 7-12 was very significant, for in this way the writer of the visions transformed mantic wisdom into apocalyptic.49 He illustrated the progression with developments he found in Dan 4: the focus is on a specific episode in the life of Nebuchadnezzar. Chapter 2 opens the horizons of chapter 4 to world history and to an eschatological perspective. In chapter 7, which is based on chapter 2, the interpreter becomes the receiver of

\[\text{46 OTP, II, 62.}\]
\[\text{47 Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”, 279.}\]
\[\text{48 The ‘wise lad’ presumably is Aqhat who is referred to as an לְעֹמֵד, which among other things means ‘young man,’ and which Müller suggests may have wisdom connotations (Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”, 90).}\]
\[\text{49 Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”, 277-80.}\]
revelations instead of the interpreter. Finally, Daniel has become a full apocalyptic seer in 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{a-c}.

As a closing argument for the connection of manticism and apocalyptic, as opposed to didactic wisdom and apocalyptic, Müller noted that it was the name of the mantic ‘Danel’ that supplied the pseudonym for the oldest apocalypse while, as the obverse of that, the name of Solomon, which was used in contemporary didactic wisdom, is absent from the apocalyptic material. However, in a note he did acknowledge that this was contradicted by a comment in Josephus’ Antiquities 8:45 and by the T. Sol.\textsuperscript{50}

He then showed how this type of wisdom and its worldview affected the way Daniel is portrayed and the worldview of Dan. He concluded that mantic wisdom was the major catalyst behind the development of apocalyptic. It was not the only one, however. The relation of apocalypses with mantic wisdom also allowed elements of didactic wisdom to impact apocalyptic, but the didactic wisdom was not basic to it. There was a prophetic impulse, too, and Hellenistic syncretism accounts for some features as well. Consequently, he thought that von Rad was right to look to wisdom as the major source in the development of Jewish apocalyptic, but was wrong to exclude all other influences.\textsuperscript{51}

In Müller’s 1971 paper, then, we have the confluence of the two streams. The first was the stream in which were joined wisdom, divination, and magic. In the second stream, wisdom and “apocalyptic” were joined. Müller brought them together by arguing that “apocalyptic” had its origins in “mantische [divination] Weisheit”.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{50} Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”, 280 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{51} Müller, “Mantische Weisheit”, 292-93.
The name that is most associated with this theory in English scholarship is that of John Collins. Three years after the publication of Müller's Congress paper, Collins's article on the court-tales in *Dan* appeared in *Journal of Biblical Literature*. He largely accepted the form critical work of Humphreys on the Daniel stories as "court-tales," and he sought to determine their *Sitz im Leben*. That, he argued, was the Diaspora where their development makes most sense. *Dan* 2 was important to his understanding of the setting. This chapter reflects the rise of Jews at foreign courts through the success of an interpreter of dreams. In chapters 1-6 Daniel is portrayed as rising to power in the Babylonian court by his "success as a wise interpreter of dreams, a professional skill of the Chaldeans" although his God enhances that skill. This, Collins argued, was the situation out of which the court-tales arose—they were stories intended to inspire aspiring Jewish courtiers in Mesopotamian courts. It shows: these Jews participated in the life-style and professions of the Gentiles; their success was through the superior wisdom and power of their God; the potential conflict between royal and divine authority was not actualized; and they maintained a generally positive attitude to the king and Chaldeans. Although there was a rise in tension in the other stories, he attributed that merely to different situations, rather than to any historical progression in conflict.

Collins also argued that the dream and its interpretation in chapter 2 were an incorporated Babylonian prophecy in which Nebuchadnezzar's reign was a golden age and which prophesied the establishment of a lasting Babylonian kingdom. The redactor of chapter 2 used this prophecy only to emphasize the superior wisdom of

---

52 Collins, "Court-tales" 218-34.


Daniel and his God. Collins believed the details of the dream and its interpretation are not unimportant, however, as it was chosen because oracles and dream interpretations of this kind were important to the profession of wise men in Mesopotamian courts.

Collins also argued that the Babylonian prophecy played an important role in determining the chronology of *Dan*. A later redactor used the dream and its interpretation to give chapters 1-6 literary unity: the scheme of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius, and Cyrus (6:28) corresponds to the dream’s schema and to the alleged chronology of Daniel’s career. The unevenness of the proportion of material for the various rulers is evidence, he claimed, that the tales were not composed to fit the scheme, but were redacted with the scheme in mind. The collection comprising 1-6 probably was composed, he thought, before 165 BCE, because at chapter 7 the book starts the chronology over, the genre changes from tales to visions, and the person changes from the third to the first. If it were composed as a unit from the beginning, one would expect a more consistent chronology.

This link to Mesopotamian courts, he argued, also gives an insight into the origins of the *Dan* apocalypse: the authors of the tales were in some way related to the later visionaries of chapters 7-12. Thus, the view of revelation — God reveals through oblique signs — is common to both parts of *Dan*.

In his article he relies upon Müller for the distinction between proverbial wisdom and what he calls “mantic wisdom”. Collins is, to my knowledge, the first to use that phrase in English and it comes directly from Müller’s German phrase *mantische Weisheit*. Collins possibly had the aid of Bromley’s translation of Fohrer’s section of the σοφος article, but he does not cite it — he cites only Müller, who cited

55 Collins, “Court-tales”, 228-29.
Fohrer's German article. He does not define "mantic Wisdom" he only describes it as a form of wisdom "practiced by Joseph and Daniel, which includes the interpretation of dreams, signs, and visions." He goes on to say that, if it includes the interpretation of Scripture it "is a phenomenon of basic importance for apocalyptic. Mantic wisdom, however, especially when concerned with political oracles, is closer to prophecy than to proverbial wisdom."\(^{57}\)

Collins also cites A. Leo Oppenheim's work on the Assyrian dream book in his article.\(^ {58}\) In that work, Oppenheim refers to "mantic dreams" as those from which one can prognosticate the future.\(^ {59}\) He uses the adjective "mantic" to refer only to divination that has to do with the future.\(^ {60}\)

In his 1977 monograph, John Collins set forth his understanding of the meaning of *Dan*, i.e., "its world-view, its vision of life and reality".\(^ {61}\) In chapter one, "Composition and editorial devices", he discussed the possible origins of Daniel in the

---

\(^{57}\) Collins, "Court-tales", 232.


\(^{59}\) Leo Oppenheim is the first scholar that used the adjective "mantic" in any relation to *Dan* and then it was only briefly. In his 1956 monograph/article on the Assyrian dream book and later in A. L. Oppenheim, "Mantic dreams in the Ancient Near East," in *The Dream and Human Societies*, eds. von Grunebaum, Gustave Edmund and Cailliois, Roger (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California, 1966), 341-50, Oppenheim refers to "mantic dreams" as those from which one can prognosticate the future, "mantic" referring specifically to divination that seeks to predict. These dreams are discussed with the straightforward "message" dreams to kings or others and with nightmares that required some form of incantation and magic because of their polluting effects.


older Ugaritic tradition of Dn’l. He dismissed as irrelevant the occurrence of the same names as those of the four young men in the books of Ezra and Neh. Those occurrences merely showed that Jews used these names in the fifth century BCE. The occurrence of a Danel in Ezek 14:14 and 28:3 was relevant, he maintained, despite differences in orthography. The Danel of Ezek probably was connected with the righteous judge, Dn’l in Aqht and the antediluvian Danel of Jub 4:20, although he rejected the way Müller made the connection. Despite lacking a “clear view of their relationship or of the tradition history of their legendary figure”, the putative connection served as part of other arguments in the book, as he makes clear in the following statement:

What is important for our purpose is the fact that the name Daniel was associated with a legendary wise man. The hero of the book of Daniel must have inherited some of the associations of this figure. At least the authority and prestige of the name Daniel was increased by the tradition that he was a man of the same status as Noah and Job. Only in view of the reputation of Daniel as a legendary wise man can we understand why a cycle of tales and visions should be attached to the name of Daniel in the post-exilic period.

So, although he differed from Müller on one point, Collins accepted the basic connection made by Müller.

In chapter 2, he maintained that the visionary of chapters 7-12 chose the pre-existing court-tales of Dan 1-6 for self identification, because the visionary and his circle were mantics who possibly returned from Mesopotamia to Palestine in the second century BCE. In chapter 3, “The media of revelation,” Collins discussed two


64 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 2-3. 23 n. 7.

65 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 3.
features of *Dan*: the phenomenon of pseudepigraphical composition, and the idea of revelation as the interpretation of mysteries. Both these relate to foregoing discussions in his monograph: the prestige attached to the name ‘Daniel’ because of its association with the famed wise man of antiquity; and the mantic tendencies of the authors of *Dan*. He argued that pseudepigraphy was a literary device used to enhance the prestige of the work by associating the work with the name of a famous or legendary ancient figure. Also, through the accompanying use of *ex eventu* prophecies, the accuracy of the predictions was guaranteed and a sense of determinism was conveyed. In the discussions about the ‘world-view’ of *Dan*, he further developed arguments from his article on the court-tales. This monograph has the most complete discussion of mantic influences in *Dan*. Although I have criticized it at several points, it still showed many possible links between manticism and *Dan*.

Thus, in this one article and later in his book, Collins did three things that persist. He introduced the phrase “mantic wisdom” into English scholarly literature on *Dan* and apocalypses; he related the work of Oppenheim (“mantic” is explicitly future oriented), and Müller (“mantik” is used for divination, including prediction); and he argued that the circle responsible for *Dan* was related to, or sought to emulate the “wise men” of Mesopotamia who employed the mantic art of predicting the future through dreams and visions.

Let us sum up whence we have come to this point. There were actually two streams of scholarship brought together in Hans-Peter Müller’s 1972 article. One is represented by Meinhold, who brought under the umbrella of “wisdom” practices we label with the terms “magic” and “divination”. Gerhard von Rad who tried to bring

---


“apocalyptic” into the wisdom fold represents the other stream. It remained for Müller to bring these together by clarifying that the wisdom that lay behind “apocalyptic” was not didactic wisdom, but divination wisdom.

Within this confluence we have the problem of definition and translation. Müller used “mantisch” for “divination” and it may be argued so did Fohrer. Oppenheim used it as a subdivision of divination referring to divination that sought only to ascertain future happenings. Bromiley, and Collins seemed to have missed this distinction and translated “mantisch” as “mantic” rather than “divinatory”. Thus what would have been an understandable phrase, “divinatory wisdom”, became “mantic wisdom”, and “diviners” became “mantics” or “mantic wise men”, and “divination” became “manticism”.

In this history of use of divinatory background and terminology, we see some of the problems that are to arise in work that follows these. Müller was investigating magician-diviners in the hoary past, such as Enoch, Noah and Danel. These were not professional diviners, they were people naturally gifted. Oppenheim, however, was dealing with professional diviners for whom the interpretation of dreams was not a matter of intuition, but rather a science; if dreams were symbolic they were interpreted from lists of dream omens and their accompanying interpretations. Müller, himself, does not make this distinction. He, along with Collins and others assume a close connection, but Oppenheim argues—quite apart from the debate that we have been following—that there is a great gulf between the intuitive interpreter and the trained interpreter. That gulf was social, educational and locational: the intuitive interpreters were women outside the court who were untrained in the omen literature;
the trained interpreters were males who underwent years of training and who worked for the king.

The problem also occurs in the progression from the Ugaritic Danel, an intuitive magician-diviner, to Daniel the successful court diviner, to Daniel the visionary who receives revelations. These are three different types of divination.69

Criticisms

There are various problems with the proposals presented by the scholars who want to locate Daniel and Dan among the mantics. The first is the problem of the orthography of the name. The connection between Daniel and Dn’ll is made through the Danel of Ezek. There is a difference in orthography, however. In Dan the name has a mater lectionis (יָדִנֵל), but in Ezek it does not (יָיָד). Although Collins commented that “the identity of the two names could be disputed, but is accepted by most scholars”,70 that does not make them the same. It is possible, maybe even probable, but they have not been shown to be the same. The Biblical uses of the names occur only in late Biblical Hebrew: 3 times in Ezek, 74 times in Dan, and one time in each of Ezra, Neh and 1 Chr. Of these, the occurrences in Ezek are spelled יָדִנֵל and the others are spelled יָיָד. The former occurrences refer to a figure in distant antiquity and the latter refer to Daniel, a priest(s) of the Exile and an otherwise unknown son of David. Why there should be a difference in orthography is not evident, but the historical period of the referent could be the reason.

A second problem is the historical period in which the characters are found. Dan has as its narrative setting the exilic period, which is the same period as the Ezra


70 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 23 n. 4.
and Neh material in which the name with the same spelling occurs. The 1 Chr occurrence is attached to a person from the early monarchic period. These occurrences all have the mater lectionis. The occurrences in Ezek, which do not have the mater lectionis, Aqht, 1 Enoch and Jub all refer to events in distant antiquity. It is quite possible that they derive from a common tradition. What links them is the connection of distant antiquity and the wisdom of the referent. A different spelling in the Hebrew outside that context of distant antiquity makes any link between the two groups questionable. The attempt of Stone to parallel the development of the Daniel and Enoch figures illustrates this well, for the connections between Enoch and his Mesopotamian counterparts were made because of the setting in distant antiquity, the very factor missing in the Daniel argument. ⁷¹

A third problem is the difference in status that the various ‘Daniels’ have. The 1 Enoch figure is an angel. This makes a connection very problematic, especially when there also is an Ezeqel (6:7) among the group: was Ezekiel also assumed an angel of distant antiquity? The human Danel was a sage. Müller tried to show that his wisdom was mantic wisdom by virtue of his ability to utter magic formulae, but he did this with very little support in the text and, as Collins pointed out, the relevance of this to Daniel is questionable. ⁷² The Daniel(s) of Ezra and Neh was a priest, and the Daniel of Dan 1-6 was a court expert. Thus there is no consistency in the status of the referents of the names.

As the argument is presented, then, the link between the ‘Danels’ and Daniel is tenuous, at best. If there is a connection, then the arguments will need to be greatly


⁷² Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 23 n. 7.
strengthened and clarified. This raises the question of whether there are other possible sources for the character in Dan. We now will turn to that question.

There are at least four other possibilities for the origins of the Daniel of Dan 1-6. These are not mutually exclusive, just as the above are not necessarily mutually exclusive. The first is that the stories could be based loosely on some historical figure named Daniel. As we know from Ezra and Neh, Jews did use the name during the Exile. We also know that Jews did serve in Mesopotamian courts, e.g., Nehemiah was the cupbearer of Artaxerxes (Neh 1:11-2:1). An actual Jew named Daniel could have been successful in court life, won the admiration of other Jews and been held up as an example. Stories, like those in Dan 1-6, could have developed around his name, or they could have developed under another name or with no name (e.g., 4QprNab) and then become attached to his name in some way. Unless new historical documents come to light that would support this, however, it would be difficult to substantiate.

The second possibility is that the name of the exilic priest(s) in Ezra and Neh was used to give a legitimate, common name to a collection of stories. Something similar seems to have been done in the choice of the name Jonah for the character of the book by that name (2 Kgs 14:25). The connection, then, between the priests and the mantic courtier would be the period of the Exile, which they have in common.

The third possibility is that the transparent meaning of the name, i.e., 'God is judge', or 'my God is judge,' or 'God has judged' is the significant factor. The theme of the judgement of God fits well with themes in both the stories and the visions. This, too, is like the name Jonah ("dove"). which may have been chosen for its meaning. This would go well with the previous suggestion: a meaningful name from records of the correct period was chosen for the character.
Finally, Daniel may be based upon mantic figures in the history of Israel, such as Joseph, Moses and Aaron when they appeared before the Pharaoh, and Elisha. Clearly, this theory does not explain the choice of the name, but it may explain some of the development of the tales. In his first article on Daniel, Müller noted the similarities between Daniel and Joseph, especially in Dan 6, which he believed was a doublet of chapter 3. He believed that the minor role of manticism in the Joseph story differentiated that story from Dan 4-5 and 7-12, as well as 1-2, which he bracketed off from the others. In 1972 he expanded the parallels so that Daniel and Joseph had various similarities: like Daniel, Joseph steps into the place of the Egyptian mantics in chapter 40; he is a receiver of dream revelations himself in chapter 37; he used his abilities in a foreign court; and, as in Dan 1, he combined both mantic and didactic wisdom. The differences, however, are that the Daniel of the earliest material, chapters 2, 4 and 5, does not combine mantic and didactic wisdom, having only the former. The revelations he interprets or receives also have a universal thrust to them, while those of Joseph are restricted to personal and national matters. In a later article that includes digests of much of these two articles, Müller also noted that the Daniel of chapter 5:11 and 2:48, like Joseph in Gen 40-41, outdoes the wise men of the court and is promoted to their head. What he does not note is that the Egyptian derivative אֶלֶף occurs in these two passages, which suggests a literary link, which I will discuss below. He also states that Dan 1 is modeled on the Joseph story. Thus, in the end, he believed that Dan 1, [3], 5 and 6 were based, to some extent, on the Joseph material.

73 Müller. “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”, 85-86.

74 Müller. “Mantische Weisheit”, 274-75.

75 TDOT. IV, 376-77.
Collins also noted the parallels with the Joseph stories. He referred to the extensive literature on the topic and also made genre comparisons of *Dan* 3 and 6 with *Gen* 39, and of *Dan* [2], 4 and 5 with *Gen* 41. In 1977 he also noted the use of the Egyptian derivative דניא in both *Dan* 1 (1:20, but note that it also occurs in 2:2, 10, 27; 4:4, 6; 5:11) and in the Joseph story (*Gen* 41:8, 24). Lacocque also referred, briefly, to the parallel between Daniel and Joseph.

Only Müller and Lacocque refer to parallels between Daniel, and Moses and Aaron. Müller noted that in *Exod* 7:11 the Pharaoh called upon his מנהיגים and משלחתם to do as Moses and Aaron had. Together the Egyptian officials were called the מנהיגים משלחתם. It was within the scope of these officials to deal with the ‘secret arts’ (*Exod* 7:11, 22; 8:3, [7], 14, [18]), from which he concluded: “in the exodus narrative, especially in P, Moses and Aaron are well on their way to becoming archetypes of the Jewish magicians ....” Lacocque also noted the parallel between the characters. What neither noted is that this passage is the third of the three passages in the whole of the Old Testament to use the Egyptian derivative מנהיגים (*Exod* 7:11, 22; 8:3,14,15; 9:112x), the other two being the Joseph story and the Daniel stories (See above).

The significance of these parallels may lie in their being sources for the Daniel figure. Collins agreed with Montgomery that the writer of *Dan* 1 did not have special

---

78 LaCocque. *Daniel in His Time*, 190.
81 LaCocque. *Daniel in His Time*, 190.
knowledge of the ‘Chaldeans’, as the use of terms for courtiers shows.  
This suggests second hand knowledge of these courtiers, at best, not the first hand knowledge expected of those trained in those arts, a possibility posited by Collins and others.  

Significantly, Collins wrote: “this type of royal counsellor was known throughout the Near East, from Egypt to Babylon. Daniel and his friends are presented as trained wise men of this international type.” So, second or third hand knowledge of Babylonian manticism seems quite possible. There also are two lexical links. I have noted already the use of the term ציון only in Dan, Gen, and Exod. It also may be significant that the PSR cognates רעפ (Gen 40-41: 9 times), רעפ (Gen 40-41: 5 times) and רעפ (Dan: 33 times) occur almost exclusively in the Joseph and Daniel stories.

Along with the other parallels among these passages these lexical links may show that there is more than a mere similarity of genre, which is what Collins argued in 1975; there may be literary dependence of the Daniel stories on the others. This would be a possible source for the Daniel stories other than the experiences of Jewish, mantic courtiers within Mesopotamian courts, given that accurate knowledge of their practises and organization is not reflected in the stories. Success in a foreign court or context through the aid of Yahweh would have been a theme relevant to many Jews working for others in the Diaspora, a position in a court being the highest to which they could hope to attain. Fishbane’s work on inner Biblical interpretation lends support to this


83 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 58. He seems to have second thoughts later in the book when he states: “These [the tales in 1-6] in turn reflected Chaldean wisdom as observed by Jews in Babylon ...” (p. 86).

84 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 32.

85 The noun שין occurs once in Eccl 8:1.
theory, *i.e.*, the Daniel stories may be updated versions of the older material contextualized through the inclusion of details from the new situation, Mesopotamia.

What such a scenario means for the relation of *Dan* 1-6 and 7-12 is not clear at this point, although some suggestions can be made. If the stories were not originally based on firsthand experience of the court by learned mantics, then those responsible for them could still have been intuitive or higher mantics, higher manticism being what distinguished Daniel from his colleagues. This could still suggest a genetic link between the original composers and the writer(s) of *Dan* 7-12, if the latter are mantics of some type. Alternatively, the stories could have been used by later mantics unrelated to the writers. Finally, the stories themselves and the experience of the Mesopotamian worldview generally could have led a later person or group to develop further the implications of the view of revelation found in the stories. Clearly, more work has to be done on this.

*Dissertation outline*

In this dissertation we will not be able to undertake an examination of all the points made by Müller and others. Such a wide-ranging critique will have to wait for another day. It is necessary to go back to the beginning point of the whole argument, and undertake a detailed examination of the relationship between the Daniels proffered as the source of the hero of *Dan*, and to look at the relationship between the first half of the book, which developed over a few centuries, and the second half, which was written during the turbulent final years of Antiochus Epiphanes. Behind the examination will be the question: as the narrative face of the group that wrote the visions of chapters 7-12, what does the Daniel character tell us about that group?

This dissertation will therefore proceed along the following lines. In “Chapter 2” we will begin with an examination of the various figures that have been set forth as
part of a “Daniel” tradition. We will be focusing upon whether Daniel can be said to be based upon a mantic wise man tradition, or whether some other tradition deals with the evidence better. The conclusions reached will not be in accord with the scholarly consensus that Daniel is based upon a mantic tradition as set out by Müller and others. Rather, we will conclude that Daniel gets his name from a priest that returns from the exile.

Next, in “Chapter 3”, we will consider the roles of the functionaries in the stories in chapters 1-6. Actually we will have to limit this discussion to chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5, because chapters 3 and 6 are stories about administrators, not court diviners. We will survey the titles given to these functionaries, and then consider how they and their professions are portrayed in the stories. Our interest here is to learn whether the stories reveal any real knowledge of these functionaries, and whether the professions are portrayed positively, even when Daniel is one of their numbers. The research will lead us to conclude that there is no evidence of an accurate knowledge of the professions; the titles chosen seem to have been drawn from other narratives, and for their foreign effect. As well, the very raison d'etre of the professions is seriously critiqued in the stories; they are portrayed as bogus, and it is not just that the professionals are incompetent when compared with Daniel.

In order to complete the examination of the characters in Dan 1-6 we will consider the portrayal of Daniel. “Chapter 4” will look at how the character of Daniel is developed on a chapter-by-chapter basis (again not considering chapters 3 and 6). The focus in this chapter will be upon the functions of Daniel when he actually interprets dreams and the writing on the wall, and upon any commentary that accompanies what he does. Daniel, in contradistinction to the other professionals, is portrayed as a divinely aided interpreter. He is a person who is equally as incapable of interpreting as the others in the kings’ courts, however, due to his faithfulness to his
God, the God of Israel, he is portrayed as being given divine, or at the least heavenly (angelic) assistance to interpret the revelations given by the God of Israel to the kings of Babylon. This, we will contend, is what the writers of the visions wanted to portray for the reader in preparation for the visions that follow. This is the image that they had of themselves i.e., divinely aided interpreters for their day.

Having considered the background of the Daniel character, the professions of which he is a part, and the actual role that he plays in the stories, we will be in a position to determine whether there is a relationship to the visions and visionaries from the Maccabean era, and if so, what that relationship might be. One of the features of the visions that has been noted by scholars is the use of older prophecies that have been reinterpreted. Given the emphasis upon the role of Daniel in the stories of 1-6 as a divinely aided interpreter, in “Chapter 5” we will examine some of the prophetic passages that the Maccabean era interpreters used to make sense of their day. These will give us insight into their function, some of their beliefs, and how it is that they could attribute to a sixth century BCE character prophecies that they themselves penned.

In the final chapter we will recap the main conclusions at which we have arrived throughout the thesis. We will also propose some future areas of investigation that would further this research.
Chapter 2: The Origins of the Daniel Figure

In this chapter we will investigate the possible origins of the Daniel figure in Dan. Scholars have suggested that several figures with the name Daniel are relevant to this investigation and we will consider each of them. There are two such associations that usually are entertained by modern scholarship: the Dn’il of Ugarit and the Daniel of Ezek 14:14, 20 and 28:3. Other connections have been noted as well, such as the figures in 1 Enoch and Jub, and so these will also be examined for any light they might throw upon the question of the origins of the Daniel figure in Dan.

The Name(s) dn(y) 7

Outside of the materials we will consider in this study, the names dn’l and dny’l are found in various languages at various times in the ancient Near East. In the second millennium BCE they are found, e.g., in Southern Arabic, 1 Amorite, 2 Eblaitic, 3 and later in Assyrian and Old Babylonian. 4

The most common suggestions for the meaning of the name יָדָן are “judge of ’El” 5 and “’El is my judge”. 6 The former understands the yod as the old “genitive”

1 J. J. Stamm, Beiträge zur hebräischen und altorientalischen Namenskunde (Freiburg, Schweiz: 1980), 163.
ending, and the latter understands it as the pronominal suffix. Joüon, however, renders
the name as a verb plus noun, *i.e.*, "God/El has judged".7 This, in our opinion, is the
probable meaning of the name. The noun "judge," in Akkadian, Arabic, Aramaic and
Syriac is *dayyān* or *dayyan* with an historic yod.8 This also occurs in Hebrew at
1 Sam 24:16 [15]; Ps 68:6 [5]; and in Aramaic at Ezra 4:9; 7:22, 25.9 There is no
historic yod in the verbal forms of the root in these languages, however. Thus, it is
more likely the verbal form of the root *dn* that is found in the name, so that the Ugaritic
name Dn’il forms the sentence "El has judged". As Noth explains, the yod also occurs
in these sentence names so that ידוהי = ידוהי,10 but neither is the same as ידוהי.

It may be of importance to our understanding of the use of the name Daniel that
the wife of Dn’il has the name *dnty*.11 Whereas this name is also from *dn* "to

---

7 P. Joüon, "Trois noms de personnages bibliques à la lumière des textes
und Israel: eine Personennamenstudie," BHT 16 (1953): 146; H. B. Huffmon, Amorite
Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study (Baltimore,
Maryland: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), 182-83; Michael Anthony Knibb, The Ethiopic
Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments

8 See Frauke Gröndahl, Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit (Rom:
Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1967), 123 where he notes the following names with this
nominal form of the root: "-dayyānu," "d’niya," "dayyā n-iliu," "d’n-iliu"; cf. B.
Gemser, De Beteekenis der Persoonsnamen voor Onze Kennis van het Leven en
Denken van de Oude Babyloniër in Assyriërs (Wageningen: H. Veenman en Zonen,
1924), 114-16 and the names ידוהי in Gen 30:21, etc. and ידוהי in Dan 2:48, etc.

9 The preferred Hebrew word for this social function is ידוהי (TDOT III, 189).
Another form with the root *dyn* is ידוהי in Dan 4:34; 7:10, 22, 26; Ezra 7:26.

10 Martin Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der
gemeinsemitischen Namengebung (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1928), 35-36.

11 Aght CTA 17 ii, v. 16, 23, 28; "Danatay", so John C. L Gibson, and G. R.
judge", it may be that the names in that epic were chosen because of some element of (divine) judgement in the story. This could show that the meaning of the name Dn’il in this epic is what is significant and not an actual history of tradition about some individual: this could be an isolated story limited to the Ugaritic culture, which would render it insignificant for our investigation. The names lend themselves to being used in contexts where (divine) judgements are narrated or implied (Aqht—judgement of Anat and judgement in the gate; Jub, Dan—judgement of the world; Gen—judgement of the people of Dan).

One of the problems with positing a dependence of Dan upon either the Ugaritic material or upon Ezek is the different orthography of the name. The Biblical occurrences of the names in question occur only in late Biblical Hebrew: 3 times in Ezek, 74 times in Dan, and one time in each of Ezra, Neh and 1 Chr. Of these, the Ezek occurrences are spelled defective לַאֲנָת, and all the others are spelled plene לַאֲנָת. The occurrences of לַאֲנָת refer to a figure thought to come from great

---

12 Gröndahl, Personennamen, 123.

13 Note also that in Jub 4:15, 20, Dan’el’s mother is Dinah and his daughter is ‘Edni. Although the latter is not etymologically from the root dtn, this list of three names with the consonants -dn- is hardly a coincidence. It is possible that folk etymology derived ‘Edni from the root dtn and understood the -’ as prosthetic.

14 Baruch Margalit, The Ugaritic Poem of Aqht: Text, Translation, Commentary (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), 66 n. 2 seems to have a different text from BH83 for he notes that the consonantal text of Ezek 14:14, 20, and of 28:3 are different.

15 E. Lipiński, “Review: Le Livre de Daniel by André, Lacocque,” VT 28 (1978): 233 explains the pointing of the Masoretic Text, which obscures the theophoric element in the name, as a reflection of the pronunciation of the name. In Hebrew an intervocalic ש quiesces (cf. שֶׁנִי, Ezek 1:3; 24:24; I Chr 24:16), which may be why the form לַאֲנָת is found in the Qumran papyrus 6Q7, but see below, n. 168. Francis I Andersen, and A. Dean Forbes, Spelling in the Hebrew Bible: Dahood Memorial Lecture (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 85-90 show that such a dropping of the ש happens even to an etymological ש, as is the case in this Qumran example and, e.g., as in אֵלֵי לַאֲנָת for אֵלֵי לַאֲנָת in I Chr 25:27. Further to this point, in Aramaic a quiescent ש could drop out, as in לַאֲנָת (Ezra 5:11) שֶׁנִי (cf. שֶׁנִי, Dan 2:9; and Franz
antiquity, and those of \( \text{Daniel} \) to the Daniel of \( \text{Dan} \), to a priest or priests of the Exile, and to an otherwise unknown son of David. Thus, it could be argued that the different orthography indicates the difference in the period. At issue here is the question of the relation of these two forms to the Ugaritic form of Dn’il, which some have argued could have been rendered either way in Hebrew. Lipiński, especially, points out that the ketib יֵרֵנַיָּם, and the Greek transcription of the name as Δανιήλ in Ezek 14:14, 20 and 28:3 show that the name was pronounced Daniel rather than Dan’el. The implication of this is that the Daniels in Ezek and Dan could be related in some way, and that together they could be related to the Dn’il of Ugarit.

Andersen and Forbes provide information about the use of mater lectionis in Hebrew. What they show does suggest that these two forms could be the same name. “Before the Exile the use of matres lectionis was restricted to the writing of vowels anciently long or long by derivation from diphthongs or by other changes.” They conclude that “by 600 BCE the practice, if not the rule, was to spell all primal long vowels and long vowels derived from diphthongs plene.” This can be shown by some

---


---

16 See below on the discussion of the Ezek passages.


20 Andersen, and Forbes, Spelling, 68.
examples. In Sam, "David" is always spelled דוד, but in Chr-Ezra-Neh it is always spelled דוד.\(^{21}\) As well, the parallel passages in Gen 10:8 and 1 Chr 1:10 shows that "in the first, Nimrod (נירוד) is a hero (伝え); in the second, נבורה (נבוּד) is a hero."\(^{22}\) The Exile was the transition period, and thus, in Ezek, "David" is spelled three times defectively (34:24; 37:24, 25) and once plene (34:23).\(^{23}\) Given this trend, it is not surprising that in a reference to an existing tradition in the time of Ezekiel the word could be written defective, but could be written plene in the reference to an exilic character, Daniel, in a book that has its origins in the Persian period at the earliest (i.e., Dan). There is no reason, therefore, why the two forms could not be the same name.

There is evidence that no differentiation was made between Daniels of yore and of the Exile by means of a different orthography. At Qumran in the Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch the name of the antediluvian angel and that of Daniel the seer are both spelled שדי.\(^{24}\)

Even though there is no reason to rule out an association of figures on the basis of names that are differently spelled, neither is there any reason why there has to be such an association. In fact, the use of this name beginning with at least the second millennium, in various societies, in lists as well as in literature, should caution us against a too hasty association of figures merely on the basis of the name. Just the symbolic value of the name must have led to its use in times of disaster ('El has judged


\(^{22}\) Andersen, and Forbes, *Spelling*, 33.

\(^{23}\) Andersen, and Forbes, *Spelling*, 5; cf. 26-27.

\(^{24}\) For the spelling in the Enoch fragments see Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 150, l 9; and possibly 188, l 26. For the spelling in 4Qpseudo-Dan\(^{a,b,c}\) see 4Q243 1,1; 2,1; 5,1; 6,3: 4Q244 4,2; 4Q245 113 (Brooke et al., *DJD* 22).
one's own people) or victory ('El has judged one's enemies). We must not assume, therefore, that the mere use of a name is evidence of a tradition; there must be some other evidence to corroborate such a claim.

The Ancient Daniel

The most common suggestion for the origins of the Daniel figure in Dan is the figure Dn’il who is a central figure in an epic recorded on cuneiform tablets that were discovered in the ruins of Ugarit. This Ugaritic figure is also thought to be the Daniel to whom two references are made in Ezek. This theory can safely be called the scholarly consensus with very few speaking against it. It is not, however, without its problems, as we will show.

25 Cf. n. 63.


The Daniel of Ugarit.

Among the tablets found at Ugarit there is a set that tells the story of Aqht.\(^{28}\) He is the only son of Dn’il, and the brother of Pgt. The goddess Anat kills Aqht, because he refuses to give her the bow that the divine craftsman had given him. Pgt sets out to avenge the death of her brother, but we do not know how the story ends, because the end is not extant. It would appear that the story concludes with the restoration of Aqht to Dn’il by the gods through Pgt’s agency, but this is only scholarly conjecture. We know from the colophon that the extant tablets were copied in the mid-fourteenth century by Ilimilku. The story itself may have originated in the fifteenth century among “… a West-Semitic people inhabiting northern (Galilean) Canaan and northern Transjordan (Bashan/Golan) …”.\(^{29}\) Thus, as many as 1000 years intervene between these texts, \textit{i.e.}, the only extant copy of the tale and the nearest possible Hebrew reference to the figure in \textit{Ezek}.\(^{30}\)


\(^{29}\) Margalit, \textit{Aqht: Text, Translation, Commentary}, 473-77; quote from 473.

\(^{30}\) A second set of tablets \textit{CTA} 20-22, the Rephaim texts, also refer to Dn’il. See W. T. Pitard, “A new edition of the ‘Rapi’uma’ texts: \textit{KTU} 1.20-22,” \textit{BASOR} 285 (1992): 33-77 for the most recent edition of the fragments, with bibliography. \textit{CTA} 20 is a broken fragment that may belong with \textit{CTA} 21-22 or may belong with \textit{Aqht}. The latter two are probably from the hand of the same scribe who copied \textit{Keret} and \textit{Aqht}. \textit{CTA} 20 is related to \textit{Aqht}, not only because of the mention of Dn’il, but also because of the use of the same phrase, \textit{mt hrmmy}, to describe Dn’il (\textit{CTA} 20 II, 7-8; \textit{cf.} \textit{Aqht} \textit{CTA} 17 I, 18-19, 36-38, \textit{passim}). See Pitard, “‘Rapi’uma’ texts”, 72-74, on the problems even of starting a translation of the texts.
The first scholar to make a connection between the Ugaritic Dn’il and the Ezek Daniel seems to have been René Dussaud. In the second to last paragraph of his article “Brèves remarques sur les tablettes de Ras Shamra” he remarks, quite simply:

D’autre part, le Dn-’El que M. Virolleaud signale dans les tablettes de 1930, pourrait, à notre avis, répondre au légendaire Daniel mentionné dans deux passages d’Ezéchiel. D’abord, en compagnie de Noé et de Job trois hommes qui s’étaient signalés par leur vertu — ce qui est précisément le cas du Dn-’El de Ras Shamra. Puis, dans une apostrophe ironique que le prophète lance au roi de Tyr, qui se prétend un Dieu, résidant dans une demeure divine au sein des mers: «Certes, tu es plus sage que Daniel!» Pour être compris du roi de Tyr, Ezéchiel devait parler d’un Daniel fort connu des Phéniciens et qui, il est inutile d’y insister, n’a rien de commun avec le Daniel de l’époque achéménide. La rapprochement parit d’autant plus en situation que, comme nous l’avons indiqué plus haut, il est probable que Sapouna fut une colonie tyrienne.31

Other than his insistence that it is futile to deny a connection among the three Daniels, no argument is put forward to back it, and so the only real value in his work is the suggestion that subsequently has been taken up by others.

Barton, relying upon Virolleaud’s edition of the texts,32 argues that the Ugaritic Dn’il was a Galilean hero who was semi-divine.33 Although most of Barton’s article concentrates upon the location of the tradition in Galilee,34 of interest to us are some of Barton’s concluding remarks. He argues that, at Ugarit Dn’il was a semi-god: ‘El was


32 Virolleaud, Légende Phénicienne de Danel.


his father (Tablet II, ii, 21 and 43), and a pillar was set up for him, as for a god (Tablet II, ii, 16; cf. I, 45), and he seems to have been derived ultimately from the god Aleyan. Barton links this figure both with the Daniel of Ezek and with the Daniel of Dan, without any supporting arguments, however. He also links the Ugaritic figure with the Daniel of 1 Enoch 6-9 who is a "son of the gods" who came down from the heavens like the "giants" in Gen 6:2-4. "The author of this apocalypse [1 Enoch] regarded Danel as a semi-divine being who had rebelled against God, and who taught men sinful arts. There seems to be here a recollection of the divine origin of Danel celebrated in the Ras Shamra poem." If he is correct about the origins of Dn’il as a semi-god, then he may be correct about the connection with the angel of 1 Enoch. Much, however, has changed in the understanding of the text since Virolleaud’s day, and thus Barton’s theory is brought into serious question. The citations to which Barton refers as evidence of Dn’il’s divine status are now seen in a different light. Despite this, there still is evidence that in some traditions Dn’il may have been considered semi-divine. In CTA 20 B 7-8 Dn’il makes a statement at a feast of the Rephaim. Whether he is host, guest or has some other relation to the Rephaim, cannot be ascertained from the present texts, but it is certain that in the other texts (CTA 21-22) he is not named and so probably has a minor role. If he is host to the Rephaim or one of their numbers, he could be a semi-divine figure. But, this is not known. Thus, Barton’s theory about Dn’il’s semi-divine status is very weak.

Spiegel discusses the Dn’il of Ugarit in some detail, but most of the discussion is a retelling of the story as it was understood in the 1940s. However, he does offer his conjecture of how the broken story ended, i.e., with the resurrection of Aqht

because of the prayers of righteous Dn’il. He concluded that *Ezek* 14:14ff. confirmed
this ending, because it assumes that Dn’il, as well as Job and Noah, save their son(s)
and daughter(s) through their righteousness. To conclude this, however, he has to
argue that the Job story ended with Job’s original children being restored to him, not
just being replaced, although he does also include the regaining of the same number of
children as a near equivalent. Also, as we will show below, there is sufficient
uncertainty about the *Ezek* passages to cast doubt on any putative connections between
them and the *Aqht* tradition.

In his new edition of *Aqht*, Margalit does not deal specifically with the
connection between Dn’il and the Israelite Daniels. However, he does make two
passing references that are relevant. He argues that Dn’il is the symbol and
embodiment of Raphaite society, one of the ‘nobility’ (*adrm*): he was a landowner,
noble and pious, a humble servant of the high gods, a devoted caretaker of the ancestral
cult, honest and hospitable, a just adjudicator, a good family man. Although Margalit
argues that the author of *Aqht* does not think that this is the case, and so exposes all the
weaknesses of Dn’il and thus of his society, nonetheless, it is this “… picture fostered
by the sacred tradition preserved by Raphaite society of LB Ugarit … which reached
the Hebrew poet Ezekiel several centuries later.”

---

38 Spiegel, “Noah, Danel, and Job”, 316-17.
41 Margalit, *Aqht: Text, Translation, Commentary*, 477-78 (= B. Margalit, “The
90.
The scholarly consensus has not been without its critics. There was some early scepticism about the relationship of Dn’il and Daniel. Joüon seems to have been the first scholar to discuss in detail the relationship among the Ugaritic, **Ezek** and **Dan** figures. Based on Virolleaud he makes several observations about the Ugaritic Dn’il. First, he notes that Virolleaud’s transliteration of the name as dnel should properly be Dn’il, there being an aleph with an “e” Class vowel in the name; ‘Danel’, he notes, would be dnl in Ugaritic. Supposing there to be an “a” vowel in the first syllable, the name would be יקיא and therefore identical to the Hebrew יקיא in **Ezek**. In a note he also makes the observation that if the name was to be Daniyye[ 1,’ the name could have been written with a yod in Ugaritic. For purely orthographic reasons, this might put into doubt the connection between either Dn’il or Daniel of **Ezek** and the Daniel of **Dan**, but even that is not likely considering our previous discussion of the orthography of the names. In the light of his conclusions about the **Ezek** passages in 14 and 28, however, Joüon concludes that no link can be made between Aqht and **Dan**. Joüon notes that Aqht does not portray Dn’il as a sage or as a righteous man. Joüon also notes that, although Dn’il may be a king, and in that capacity he judged widows and orphans, the poem does not comment on the quality of those judgements, i.e., whether they are just or not. These points are not valid, as we will argue (pages 46-48). Joüon’s problems with the connection are therefore no longer problems.

---

45 Joüon, “Trois noms”, 284 himself, however, transliterates the Hebrew יקיא as **Danel** not **Dânel**!
May argues that *Ezek* was not referring to the Ugaritic tradition, but is a late reference from the early Persian period to the Daniel of *Dan*.47 Such passages as *Dan* 2:19-23; 4:7, 8; 5:13, 14, *etc.*, show that it was the Jewish Daniel who was noted for wisdom and who had access to all secrets. This, of course, assumes that the “Daniel tradition” existed in some form at this early period. Although we do not find this to be unreasonable,48 it is, nonetheless, unproven.

Dressler argues in detail against the belief in a connection among the Ugarit, *Ezek* and *Dan* traditions.49 First, he argues that the Dn’il of *Aqht* was not a king by claiming that the word *mlk* does not occur at *CTA* 19:152. Margalit argues that Dressler is wrong about this,50 but Dressler counters him on the basis of a personal examination of the actual tablet, claiming that the word is not *mlk.*51 In his recent edition of *Aqht* Margalit still assumes that *mlk* occurs in the text, but that it is “[... a suffixed noun *ML*, cognate with Ar. *v*īm(y)l ‘incline, lean, slope’, referring to the downgrade outlet of the lake to the Jordan [...].”52 He translates the line: “May Baal


48 After all, the alternative is to assume that the tradition represented by one extant text that predates *Ezek* by a millennium is that to which the writer refers, yet the putative tradition of some Daniel of the exile would be only one or two centuries removed!


51 Dressler, “Reading and interpreting”, 81.

stop-up *thy well-spring(s) now and forever*...” (emphasis added). 53 So, whether Dressler or Margalit is correct about the occurrence of *mlk* at *CTA* 19:152, it seems that it does not mean ‘king’, which supports Dressler’s argument. Unfortunately, Dressler never states why he is so concerned with the social status of Dn’il. 54 It may be that he is arguing against scholars such as Joüon or Spiegel who refer to the Ugaritic Dn’il as a “righteous *king*”, but the social position of Dn’il may not really be relevant to the matter at hand. The only possible relevance the position of “king” could have to the arguments about the relations of the various characters is the connection it might create between the Daniel of *Ezek* 28:3 and the one in *Aqht*, because the former is referred to in connection with the *king* of Tyre.

Next, Dressler argues against the notion that Dn’il was a “wise man” in any professional sense. He notes that the term *hkm* is never used in the extant *Aqht* text. Nor does Dn’il ever function in any way as a wise man, not even as a mantic. 55 In his reply to this point Margalit agrees with Dressler, 56 and this would put into question much of what Müller argues about Daniel being a magico-mantic wise man. 57

Dressler next addresses the notion that Dn’il could be considered righteous. Again, the term associated with this quality, *sdq*, never occurs in the extant *Aqht* text and, Dressler claims, “nowhere is Dnil praised for his righteousness or his special


54 Day, “Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel”, 176 n. 5, too, is puzzled by the purpose of this argument despite its probable correctness.


relationship with the gods”. He makes his point by showing that the text that scholars have assumed demonstrates his righteousness, *i.e.*, “he judged the case of the widows, he tried the lawsuit of the orphan” (*CTA* 17.V.4-8; 19.I.19-25), can also be translated “they judged … they tried” in which case Dn’il might have been among the elders in the gate, or might only have observed the proceedings. He also argues that even if it is Dn’il who judges, to do so does not make him “righteous”. Day is surely correct, however, to argue that “this … ignores the fact that the expression ‘to judge the widow/orphan’ clearly does not mean to judge them in a neutral sense, but rather has the positive meaning ‘to judge the widow/orphan justly’, *i.e.*, to dispense justice to the widow and orphan.” Day refers to two of several Biblical passages where this is clearly the case, *Isa* 1:17, 23 and *Ps* 82:3. Dressler has no counter argument for this point in his reply. Indeed, earlier, Fensham’s work had shown that caring for the widow and orphan and others who were weak in society was the duty of leaders in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Israel. The faithful performance of this duty by leaders was assumed, as in this text.

---


59 Dressler, “Identification of the Ugaritic Dnil”, 154; Dressler, “Reading and interpreting”, 81-82.


61 Dressler, “Reading and interpreting”. 81-82.


63 A. Curtis, “God as ‘judge’ in Ugaritic and Hebrew thought,” in Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity by Members of the Ehrhardt Seminars of Manchester University (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1988), 3-5. In addition, it should be noted that this ascription may be a play on Dn’il’s name: *ydn dn ‘lmnt* “he judged the case of the widows”, just as in *Gen* 49:16 there is a play on the name Dan: דנך דנ נשים שמות. However, in *Keret* (*CTA* 16 vi 45-50) the phrase *lidn dn ‘almnt* “you cannot judge the cause of the widow” occurs where it is clearly not a wordplay on the name Dn’il.
Margalit also responded to this element of Dressler’s argument. He points out that, although not said to be righteous, in *Aqht* Dn’il acts in a righteous way. He deprives himself, and offers food and drink to the gods in order to bring to their attention his plight of being without a male heir. His reasons for wanting a son are religious: care for the cult of the ancestral dead, and their place of residence and participation in the temple rituals of Ba’al and ’El. Margalit notes that the one exception is the need of someone to carry him home when he was drunk. However, that would seem to be a criticism prejudiced by modern attitudes toward drunkenness. Like Job, when he loses his son, Dn’il does not curse the gods, rather he curses things and places. Finally, in the Rephaim text (*CTA* 20), Dn’il is a prominent figure, and there he acts as host to, guest of, or member of nether-world figures, any of which indicates his piety.

We must conclude from these points that Dn’il was righteous, even though he is never explicitly referred to as such.

A fourth point that Dressler contests is that Dn’il saves his son Aqht and his daughter Pgt. However, his arguments against this, and the arguments of others in favour of it are arguments from silence—the text is incomplete! Also, as we will show below, the reliance upon the *Ezek* texts to reconstruct a scenario of the end of

---


Aqht is precarious in that those texts are not clear about who the “children” are. So, given the lack of texts to support Spiegel, Day, Margalit, et al., the weight of the evidence must fall in favour of Dressler’s position.

Based upon our investigation we would draw the following conclusions. First, there is a gap of a millennium between Aqht and the Ezek references, which is detrimental to any case for a connection between the texts. Second, Dn’il was not likely a semi-divine figure, which weakens the possible connection with the later angelic figures in 1 Enoch and in the Aramaic incantation bowls. Third, Dn’il was not a king, or a professional wise man of any kind, nor is there anything in the text that requires that Dn’il’s child(ren) be resurrected. All of these weaken the possible connection with Ezek. The one connection that we can maintain with Ezek is that Dn’il was righteous.

The Daniel of Ezek

In Ezek there are three references to Daniels: 14:14, 20, and 28:3. Before the discovery of the Ugaritic materials it was the consensus that the Daniel referred to was the Daniel of Dan, a contemporary of the prophet Ezekiel. This was not a unanimous position, however. Spiegel refers to Kimhi and Krochmal who had noted the difference in the orthography of the names in Ezek and Dan and suggested that they might be different individuals, a matter we have dealt with above. Spiegel also refers to Hävernick and Zunz who had suggested that the three were non-Israelites, which would

---


69 Spiegel, “Noah, Danel, and Job”, 310 n. 9.
exclude the character in *Dan*. Charles flatly denies that this Daniel could be the Daniel of *Dan*; he had to be a patriarch. The discovery of the *Aqht* text gave scholars a new possibility for the origins of this (these) figure(s). In what follows we will examine this relationship to determine whether it is plausible.

**The relationship between chapters 14 and 28.**

Before we can begin to examine the texts in detail, we must consider the relationship of *Ezek* 14 and 28. In much of the early discussion it was assumed that these chapters were integral to *Ezek*, or at least were added to *Ezek* at the same time and come from the same source. This assumption gave some strength to the argument that there was a relationship between this ‘Daniel’ and Dn’îl, because from the three verses and their contexts in *Ezek* we can conclude that the referent was an ancient, wise, righteous king. The scholarly understanding of the relationship of these two chapters in *Ezek* has changed, however, and the implications of this change must be considered, because it has serious ramifications for our study.

May thinks that the Daniel of *Ezek* was based upon the Daniel of *Dan*. He argued that the passage in chapter 14, and possibly the one in chapter 28, was an interpolation from a post-Exilic redactor in the early Persian period that knew of the later Daniel tradition. Zimmerli, on the other hand, argues that 14:14-23 is original and he dates it to *ca*. 598/7 BCE. He does argue that 28:3-5 is an interpolation, as do

---

70 Spiegel, "Noah, Danel, and Job", 310 n. 10.


most other scholars. Verses 3-5, which comment on the pride of the King of Tyre that is mentioned in v. 2, break the \( \text{לֶחֶם} \ldots \text{שֶׁם} \) structure of the sentence, and require that the theme of v. 2 be taken up again in v. 5b. Nonetheless, in his discussion of chapter 14, Zimmerli does bring together the characteristics of the figure from chapters 14 and 28 in order to form a composite of the ‘Ezekielian’ Daniel. He does this without explaining how the original and interpolated passages could be related, however: “The mention of Daniel in Ezek 28:3, where the prince of Tyre is praised as being ‘as wise as Daniel,’ makes it likely that we should see in Daniel a figure who stood close to Phoenician tradition”. But if 28:3-5 was interpolated and chapter 14 was not, one cannot assume that the material has the same source. The most one may say in favour of an integrated source is that 28:3-5 is from the same source as 14:14 and 20, but was added later, but there is no way to know this. Alternatively, one could argue that the material in 28 was developed on the basis of chapter 14, and they are related in that way. This, however, makes chapter 28 irrelevant to the discussion of the

---

Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), xiii does note that Jörg Garsha (Studien zum Ezekbuch: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von Ezek 1-39, Europäische Hochschulschriften 23. Lang: Bern) separates out 14:1-23 as a “sacral-law stratum” composed around 300 BCE. His judgement on Garsha’s and others’ similar work is that they exhibit an “exaggerated one-sidedness” that should be more accepting of the dates in the text of Ezek (Zimmerli, Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48, xiii-xiv); and when comparing Liwak’s dissertation (Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Probleme des Ezechielbuches: Eine Studie zu postezehielischen Interpretationen und Komposition, Bochum University, 1976) to Garsha’s he claims the former’s is “disproportionately more careful” (Zimmerli, Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48, xv). He seems not to have changed his mind in the time between the first and second editions (Zimmerli, Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24) of the German work, from which the Preface to the English 1983 volume is taken.

74 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48, 75, 79. See R. R. Wilson, “The death of the king of Tyre: the editorial history of Ezekiel 28,” in Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope, eds. Marks, John H and Good, Robert M. (Guilford, Conn.: Four Quarters, 1987), 211-18 for a complete discussion of the chapter. He observes that, when these verses are taken out of the context, they are a tribute that links wisdom, trade and wealth (pp. 216-17). He also notes that the character to which these are traditionally attributed is Solomon, which may mean that this chapter was intended as a slur against Solomon by later authors.

75 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24, 315.
origins of the Daniel in chapter 14. A variation on the previous suggestion would be that a later editor of *Ezek* linked the references in chapter 14 to the Daniel of *Dan*, and integrated that into chapter 28. Against the latter proposal, however, is the fact that in both chapters 14 and 28 the orthography of the name is the same, and it is different from what is preserved in both the Masoretic Text and the Qumran texts of *Dan*. Only a reference to an older form of *Dan* 1-6 or to an older tradition that predated the collection of 1-6 could ameliorate this problem. Although that connection is speculative, it is what we will hesitantly conclude below.

Based upon this examination of the relationship of the Daniel material in *Ezek* 14 and 28, we conclude that the material from the chapters does not come from the same source. 28:3-5 was added at a time later than that of the pericope in which it is found. Secondly, we conclude that the orthography of the name makes it probable that its occurrence in 28:3 is based upon the form already found in the book at 14:14 and 20; it is not a reference to *Dan*, unless it is to some very early version or tradition, to which we have no access. The result of these conclusions is that we should not assume that we could group together the characteristics of the Daniels in the two passages to form a composite picture of a character that we can compare with Dn’il. We must, therefore, examine each passage separately.

*Chapter 14:14, 20.*

We will consider the occurrences of the name Daniel in *Ezek* 14:14 and 20 by looking at several matters raised by the discussions of the passage: the listing of the names; the period of time in which each worthy was supposed to have lived; the righteousness of the characters; and, finally, the question of whether the characters had children.
The three illustrative men.

The listing of the three names in the order “Noah, Daniel and Job” raises an issue that complicates our understanding of who the Daniel might have been. Noah and Job are generally considered to be the Noah and Job of the Biblical traditions, although they might not come from the traditions as presented in the Hebrew Scriptures. It seems natural to suppose that the placement of Daniel between Noah and Job would indicate that he comes from the same time as them and not from the time of Ezekiel and, thus, that it is three very ancient worthies who were chosen as representatives of righteousness.

Noth thinks the most likely referent is the Dn’il of Ugarit tradition; he could not be a contemporary of Ezekiel. Instead, we must look to the Dn’il of Ugarit who has qualities corresponding to the Daniels of Ezek: in *Aqht*, Dn’il is a leader (*cf.*, *Ezek* 28:3) and appears as a righteous judge who defends widows and orphans (*cf.*, *Ezek* 14:14, 20). Such correspondences can hardly be justification for arguing that there is a link, however, because this could be said of any leader (whether judge or king or both) who is held up in public as an exemplar. Also, this assumes a unity of authorship between 14:14, 20 and 28:3, which, as we have shown, should not be assumed.

Noth also argues that the collocation of the three in *Ezek* 14:12-20 is an indication that they are from the same time, and that it was an early time, which is made clear from the Noah and Job traditions. This, therefore, means that the three figures are non-Israelites, whether pre-Israelites or extra-Israelites. It seems to Noth that Ezekiel deliberately avoided naming Israelites even though he had model examples of righteousness at his disposal from within that tradition. This was done purposely by

---

the author of the material in order to make his point: the justice of God does not change through time or from place to place—in the way that God acted in the circumstances of these three men, so He would act in the circumstances of the Israelites, *i.e.*, the presence of some just people in Israel would not spare the nation.

Noth does not pursue the question of whether Ezekiel knew of narrative traditions in which these three characters were rescued because of their righteousness.


In the framework of a great liturgy for a day of penitence in time of drought (*Jer* 14:1-15:4), we have Yahweh’s rejection of the solemn prayer of penitence by the community (*Jer* 14:19-22). Not even Moses and Samuel, Israel’s two great intercessors, could move Yahweh to be gracious.... The connection between the reference to the four powers of judgement [sword, famine, birds, and wild animals] and Yahweh’s refusal to listen to prayer, even the prayers of great men of piety, sets *Ezek* 14:12ff in such a striking relationship to *Jer* 15:1-3 that we cannot regard it simply as accidental.

The *Jer* passage is related to a specific occasion, but there is no specific occasion of penitential worship implied in the *Ezek* passage, so “the reference is formulated generally and didactically”.

Because of this general nature of the passage, the two “great intercessory figures of Israel” were not used, rather three men characterised by righteousness were chosen. Zimmerli links the choice of righteousness over prophetic intercession to Ezekiel’s proclivity to priestly ideas.

When he compared *Ezek* with *Jer*, it was clear to Zimmerli that the choice of Noah, Daniel and Job moves *Ezek*’s example into the international sphere. He “was here speaking in a universal way of the divine righteousness, which inevitably

---
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concerned every man, whether Israelite or not, in his own actions”, although in vv. 21-23 the writer does return to Jerusalem. Zimmerli understands the ‘Noah’ of this passage to be from the same tradition as that represented by the Gen sources P (6:9) and J (7:1), and by Isa 54:9, i.e., a pious man delivered from the Flood along with his family. The ‘Job’ he considers to be the same as the one in Job. The ‘Daniel,’ however, is to be understood in conjunction with the reference in Ezek 28:3, which makes it likely that he is from the Phoenician tradition and is represented by the righteous judge in Aqht. Zimmerli wonders if Ezek might have known a tradition about the miraculous deliverance of this Dn’il similar to Noah. As we have already shown, however, Zimmerli has not explained how the two passages can to be linked, if 28:3-5 is an interpolation.

Margalit also argues that this Daniel is not an Israelite figure. Like Noth, he argues that the Daniel of Ezek was, with Noah and Job, a paradigm of non-Israelite righteousness, which fits the Dn’il of Ugarit, but not the Daniel in Dan. He concentrates upon the question of Dn’il’s righteousness, which is discussed above (page 46). As we have argued in that discussion, Margalit is correct that Dn’il was righteous, which makes it possible that the original reference in Ezek 14:14, 20 was to that tradition.

There are those who think that the Daniel referred to in Ezek is really the Daniel of Dan. May notes that the Ugaritic Dn’il does not appear in any known text after the

---
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fifteenth century, and that such passages as Dan 2:19-23; 4:7, 8; 5:13, 14, etc., show that it was the Jew Daniel, not the Ugaritic figure who was noted for wisdom and who had access to all secrets. He does not think that the Ezek 14 and 28 passages are references to a contemporary of Ezekiel, but rather that a post-Exilic redactor interpolated the former and possibly the latter in the early Persian period. As we have already noted, Zimmerli thinks that the chapter 14 material is a unity except for 14:22b-23a, which is a later addition.\footnote{Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24}, 312, 316.} He does think that 28:3-5 is an interpolation, however.\footnote{Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48}, 75, 79.} May suggests that a Daniel tradition circulated before the composition of \textit{Dan}, and cites the prayer of Nabonidus as evidence of this. A serious problem with that proposal, however, is that no name is attached to that fragment other than that of Nabonidus. It seems unlikely that the יְנִיה was named Daniel, because the fragment \textit{does} preserve the beginning of the story but reference is made only to the "Jewish extispex".\footnote{See "Chapter 3" for the rendering of יְנִיה as "extispex".} If the fragment is evidence of an earlier tradition behind the \textit{Dan} 2 story, then the name Daniel may have been attached at the time of the composition of the present stories and not before then.

According to Dressler, the lists of names in Ezek 14 are representative of a pre-Israelite (Noah), an Israelite (exilic Daniel) and a non-Israelite (Job).\footnote{Dressler, "Identification of the Ugaritic Dnil", 156-57.} He argues that it is not necessary to suppose that Daniel's position between two non-Israelites makes him a non-Israelite from antiquity. Older commentators (\textit{e.g.}, Keil or Schröder) did not assume this, but suggested other options to explain the order, such as an order that is
based upon climax or elevation. However, before the discovery of Aqht, very few scholars conceived of the Daniel being anyone other than the Dan character, and so they had to explain the nonchronological order in some way.

Dressler also points to other lists in Ezek and concludes that it is not possible to determine what the reason for the order of the names might be (e.g., climax or elevation). Regardless of the point he is trying to make, it is significant that an examination of lists that are repeated in Ezek reveals that order is not important. Apart from the two occurrences of the three names in chapter 14, there are other lists in Ezek that contain three or more elements. The group “sword–famine–pestilence” is found four times in that order (6:11; 7:15; 12:16; 14:21), and four times in other orders (5:12; 17; 7:15; 14:12-19). The group “silver–bronze–tin–iron–lead” is found once in that order (22:18), once with “tin” moved to the end (22:20), and once without “bronze” and ending with “iron–tin–lead” (27:12). The group “mountains–hills–ravines–valleys” is found in that order three times (6:3; 36:4, 6), and once with the final two elements inverted (35:8). Several of the elements are found in other lists as well (6:13; 31:12; 32:6; 34:6). The elements “lamb–sheep–ram–goat” are grouped in several ways: all three share “goat–ram” (27:21; 34:17; 39:18); two share “lamb”.

---

89 Cf. C. F. Keil, The Book of the Prophet Daniel (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872), 185-86: “The fact that Daniel is named before Job does not warrant the conjecture that some other older Daniel is meant .... Consequently, as Hävernick and Kleioth have shown, we have a climax here: Noah saved his family along with himself; Daniel was able to save his friends (Dan. ii. 17, 18); but Job, with his righteousness, was not even able to save his children.”

90 Dressler, “Identification of the Ugaritic Dnil”, 156.

91 In 14:21 another item “evil beasts” separates the last two members of the list.

92 There also are lists that have two of their elements in common, which again are not consistently ordered: e.g., “gold–silver” (7:19; 16:13, 17; 28:4; 38:13); “Tubal–Meshech” (27:13; 38:2, 3; 39:1); “Persia–Put” (27:10; 38:5); “Lud–Put” (27:10; 30:5); “buckler–shield” (23:24; 38:4; 39:9); “fine flour–oil” (16:13, 19); “honey–oil” 16:13; 27:17); and various of the elements “chariot–wheel–assembly–horse–rider” are used in lists (23:24; 26:7; 26:10; 38:4; 39:20).
What these lists show is that the order of the elements in lists in *Ezek* is not important. Thus, the order of the characters in 14:14, 20 is probably not important; they are simply listed. Thus it is possible that this Daniel could come from a later time than those of Noah and Job.

Most recently Wahl has argued that the Daniel of *Ezek* is the Daniel of *Dan*. He makes a number of important points. To begin with, the three names occur in Biblical texts (*Gen, Job, and Dan*), but occur together nowhere else in the Biblical, apocryphal or pseudepigraphical literature other than in *Ezek* 14. Although he also states that not even two of the three occur together elsewhere, he has missed *Jub* 4 where a Dan’el is mentioned in v. 20 and then Noah is mentioned in v. 30 (also 5:21, 22, *etc.*). The *Jub* references are not part of a list, however, so Wahl’s point is still valid, that this collocation of names is unique. Nonetheless, the *Jub* reference is significant: the writer of that book knew of an antediluvian Daniel, and linked him with Noah in time. We will address this matter in detail below where we will argue that the writer of *Jub* more likely got the idea for his Daniel figure from *Ezek* 14 and 28 than from a tradition originating in Ugarit. More serious is the problem of ‘canon’ that Wahl imports into the discussion. He assumes that *Gen, Job, and Dan* were already part of an authoritative corpus in the post-exilic period.

Although the names of Job and Noah are found in ancient texts, those texts are lists not literature and, besides the figures in the Biblical texts, we know nothing about them. The only non-biblical literary text extant that has any possible relevance to one of the three names is *Aqht*. Wahl concludes that it is reasonable to link the Noah and

---

95 Wahl, “Noah, Daniel und Hiob”, 545-46.
Job of *Ezek* to the Biblical traditions. He fully rejects any possible connection of the Dan’el of *Aqht* and the Daniel of *Ezek*, however.⁹⁶

The problem of the era is not a problem for Wahl. The three righteous men of *Ezek* are not from the same era: Noah is primeval; Job is nomadic; Daniel is exilic.⁹⁷ They were chosen because each was confronted with a unique crisis in the history of Israel, each of which is relevant to *Ezek* 14: the rescue of the people of Israel in a crisis (Noah); the accountability of the individual (Job); and faithfulness to Yahweh (Daniel).

Another point that unites them within the traditions of Israel is that, although Noah and Job are non-Israelites, they still worship the God of Israel (*Gen 7:1*; *Job 1:6-13*, etc.), the God of Daniel. This is to be contrasted with Dn’il in *Aqht* who served ’El or Ba’al.⁹⁸ The last point fails to take into account Noth and others who argue that, if there is a link between the *Aqht* tradition and the *Ezek* tradition, then the intervening millennium would surely have made modifications to the figure such that a worshipper of ’El or Ba’al in the 14th century BCE would have become a worshipper of Yahweh by the time of the Exile or later.

The question remains, then, how could *Ezek* refer to the Daniel of *Dan*? Wahl argues that the materials containing the Biblical traditions about Noah (P), Job (1:1-2:13; 42:7-17), and Daniel (1-6) are all exilic or post-exilic, which is the same period in which *Ezek* came into its final form.⁹⁹ Thus, the Daniel of *Ezek* could easily have been

---


⁹⁹ Wahl, “Noah, Daniel und Hiob”, 550-51. Curiously, he states that *Dan* reached canonical status at the turn of the fourth to third centuries BCE and cites Garsha 1974 (see n. 73 for bibliography and 100 for a summary). Although this is hardly a point that can be proven and does go against the consensus, there is a distinct possibility that a “Daniel tradition” exited in the Persian period, but most likely only in the late Persian period.
the Daniel of \textbf{Dan}. He seems here, however, to be relying upon the work of Jörg Garsha\textsuperscript{100} whom he has cited and who, according to Zimmerli, concluded that \textbf{Ezek} was not completed until \textit{ca.} 200 BCE. Such a late date would allow \textbf{Ezek} to refer to the materials now found in \textbf{Dan} 1-6. With Zimmerli, however, we think that this is too late for \textbf{Ezek}, which brings Wahl’s point into doubt. The best that can be concluded is that \textbf{Ezek} may refer to an early form of the later Daniel tradition.

Finally, Wahl claims that the priestly circle in Jerusalem created the various materials. Thus he asks:

\begin{quote}
Was läge also näher als anzunehmen, daß die drei Heroen nicht Gestalten einer dunklen Vergangenheit sind, sondern Personen aus den kursierenden biblischen Erzählungen, die für die restaurative Theologie in nachexilischen Israel eine vorbildhafte Funktion besaßen?\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}

Although we do not accept some of the specifics of Wahl’s argument, nonetheless, he raises two important points. The Biblical documents with the names of the three worthies in \textbf{Ezek} 14 have a common ancestry, and they share a relative proximity in time in their final forms, \textbf{Dan} excluded.

\textsuperscript{100} Zimmerli summarizes Garsha’s conclusions in his new preface (Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48}, xii-xiii). All Garsha finds going back to Ezekiel is “an antecedent form of a fable about a vine that forsakes its natural habitat, deduced indirectly from 17:1-10, and the rudiments of the parable of the two women in Ezekiel 23” (Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48}, xii). REzek, the first redactor of the book, was responsible for the basic structure of the book and lived \textit{ca.} 485. DEzek, the Deuteroezekielian redaction, was an extensive reworking and is dated between 400 and 350. SEzek, the sacral-law stratum, dates from \textit{ca.} 300. This is the level to which chapter 14 belongs. Over the next one hundred years the King of Tyre, the descent into hell and the wisdom materials were added. To these levels belong 28:2, 6a, 7-10, 11-19. The remainder of chapter 28 must belong to what Zimmerli summarizes as “a not insignificant number of remnants … which cannot definitely be attributed to any characteristic strata” (Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48}, xiii).

\textsuperscript{101} Wahl. “Noah, Daniel und Hiob”, 551.
The righteousness of the three

The reason that the three men are listed is that they were all very righteous. According to Zimmerli, Ezekiel sums up יִשְׁרֵامتָא in 18:9 and there it is predicated of the one who relies upon God. In that passage the prophet also addressed the matter of the impossibility of the deliverance of an individual by a parent or child because of the latter’s righteousness. “No unrighteous person could follow in behind the broad back of a righteous one, even though the latter may have been exemplary in his righteousness.”102 What Zimmerli fails to point out, however, is that the passage states specifically that the righteous man does not feast at the mountain shrines, does not worship the idols of Israel and obeys the law of Yahweh (18:6, 9). This is Dressler’s argument, for as he points out, righteousness is faithfulness to Yahweh.103 If the Daniel in this passage is the one of Aqht, then he could hardly be considered “righteous” by Ezekiel. However, if Noth is correct, there could well have been two traditions, one that continued in the Phoenician-Canaanite traditions, and another that was incorporated, and altered appropriately, in the Israelite tradition. If it were such an Israelite tradition, then that Daniel would be “righteous” because he would have undergone a transformation within the Israelite tradition.104

Day, as quoted below (see page 71), notes that Daniel’s righteousness (6:23 [22] cf. Noah, Gen 6:9 and Job, Job 11), which delivered him from the lions, may be paralleled with the implication from Ezek 14:14 and 20 that the Daniel of that passage was saved because of his righteousness.

---

102 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24, 314.


104 Cf. Day, “Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel”, 178. This scenario is paralleled somewhat by the differences between the Mesopotamian flood figures Ziusudra and Utnapishtim and the Israelite flood figure Noah. A major difference with the Daniel figures is the different names in the flood stories.
Children

Based upon the references to children in 14:16-20 it has been suggested that there must have been a tradition about a Daniel who had children that he saved from some disaster.\footnote{Cf. Alfred B. Bertholet, *Das Buch Hesekiel Erklärt* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1897), 75; A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908-1914), V, 49. Even Dressler, “Identification of the Ugaritic Dnil”, 155 assumes this to be the case and cites W. Eichrodt, G. A. Cooke, and C. H. Gordon.} One of the most significant problems with relating this passage to *Dan*, is that Daniel lacks any children in *Dan*.\footnote{Keil, *Daniel*, 186 and Cooke, *Ezekiel*, I, 153 replace the children with Daniel’s companions in 1:6-20.} There is nothing to even suggest that Daniel was married. Noah did save his children at the time of the flood, and Job may have had his children restored to him, if Spiegel is correct about there having been an alternate ending to the story.\footnote{Job’s original children are not restored after their deaths in *Job*. However, Spiegel, “Noah, Daniel, and Job”, 319, 323-30 (cf. Bruce Zuckerman, *Job the Silent: A Study in Historical Counterpoint*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991)) does consider the regaining of the same number of children as a near equivalent. He also has arguments for a different original ending of the book that may be hinted at in some of the difficult passages in *Job* 42. Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel I-XX* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1983), 258, however, says that scholars have not been convinced by Spiegel’s “tour de force”.} Thus, the Daniel of *Dan* seems out of place. The Dn’il of *Aqht*, however, did have children and, if scholars’ reconstructions are accurate, they may have been restored after death—’Aqht at least. As we have noted already, however, this latter reconstruction is speculative.\footnote{Cf. Day, “Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel”, 179; Dressler, “Identification of the Ugaritic Dnil”, 155.} Moreover, the linkage of these two accounts may be circular: *Aqht* is reconstructed using *Ezek* in such a way that Dn’il’s child(ren) is (are) restored to him; the reconstructed text of *Aqht* is used to support the link of Dn’il and Daniel. Whether in the now lost portion of the extant text, Aqht was restored or not may not matter, if it is only one version of the tradition; a later version may have related such a restoration.
What must be pointed out here is that the *Ezek* passage may not even say that the three worthies had children! Wahl reminds us that the passage in *Ezek* 14:16-20 is not about the physical children of the three righteous men, but about the individual retribution of God.\(^{109}\) The passage is dealing in generalities, or as Joyce writes, they “simply represent hypothetical righteous individuals within the present generation.”\(^{110}\) This is emphasised by the lack of any third person masculine plural pronominal suffixes in vv. 16, 18 and 20. These verses speak generally about sons and daughters, and even change from the plural in v. 14 to the singular in v. 18: should they have had children or even one child, their righteousness would have saved themselves alone; even the children of such righteous individuals would need to be saved on their own merits.\(^{111}\) This issue arose out of the exiles’ concern for their own children as it is expressed in 24:21. It may also be a reflection of a dependence upon a tradition like that in *Gen* 19, where Abraham pleads for Sodom and Gomorrah, and where he saves his undeserving nephew.\(^{112}\) There is nothing in these verses then to indicate that they did have children, only that if they were alive in Ezekiel’s day and had children, their children would have to be saved from the disaster by their own righteousness.

In this examination of *Ezek* 14 we have concluded the following. In *Ezek* the order of items in lists is not necessarily important; Daniel could have come last chronologically and could have been put in the middle for a reason other than chronology. If the *Ezek* Daniel is a reference to the figure in *Dan*, it must be to an early form of the *Dan* 1-6 material, but few would agree that there was such an early

---

\(^{109}\) Wahl. “Noah, Daniel und Hiob”, 549.


\(^{111}\) *Cf.* Joyce, *Divine Initiative*, 72-74.

Persian tradition. The collocation of the three names does seem to indicate that the figures come from a similar period (antediluvian and patriarchal periods), and are therefore all non/pre-Israelites. The reliance of this passage upon Jer 15, where Moses and Samuel are mentioned, and the non-use of those names as paradigms of righteousness are further evidence that the three share the common feature of being non/pre-Israelites. A further link is that, like the Dn’il of Aqht, this Daniel was righteous. Scholars who hold to a link realise that the righteous Dn’il would not be righteous in Israel because he was a pagan. These scholars maintain that, if the two figures are related tradition-historically, Dn’il would have been “converted” from a pagan to a faithful Jew in the transmission of the tradition. We did conclude that the passage in Ezek 14 does not say that the three had children, only that, if they had children, they could not save their children by their righteousness. Although this weakens the link between the two figures based upon their both having children whom they saved, it does not completely negate a link, because the passage does not say that Daniel did not have children. We conclude tentatively, therefore, that the Daniel of Ezek 14 could be based upon a Jewish version of the Ugaritic Dn’il, and is not likely based upon the Daniel of Dan 1-6. It also is possible that the referent is to some other Daniel tradition lost to us.

Chapter 28:3.

As with the previous verses, this one raises several questions that must be addressed. First, we must note that there is nothing in this passage that indicates this comes from the same source as the material in chapter 14. This is not to say that they are not connected, for, as we have already argued, the orthography of the name argues for some kind of connection between the Ezek passages and against a dependence upon Dan with its plene spelling, although this connection may be no more than pre-Exilic origins. However, we have already discussed the probability of 28:3-5 being an
interpolation. If that is granted, then this probably derives the name from the references in chapter 14.

In addition to the general observations just made, there are two other matters that must be addressed: the audience of the prophecy and the wisdom of the character.

The audience.

Who the perceived audience of chapter 28 might be makes a difference in how we understand who the referent might be behind the name Daniel. Joüon\textsuperscript{113} and Noth\textsuperscript{114} think that the Daniel of Ezek must have been well known to the inhabitants of Tyre and possibly the whole of Phoenicia, as well as to Ezekiel's Israelite contemporaries, because it is addressed to the king of Tyre. This is a weak point, however. There is no way to know whether this speech was ever intended to be heard by the King of Tyre. It is more likely that it was intended for the followers of Ezekiel, or Jews at large: it was for the reassurance of the faithful, not the conversion the King of Tyre. If this is the case, then the referent to which points does not have to be from the Phoenician-Canaanite tradition, but rather from an Israelite tradition, which may or may not be Phoenician-Canaanite in origin. In addition, if the oracle was delivered to the King of Tyre, it was probably done so without any mention of Daniel, as vv. 3-5 are probably an interpolation. The audience of vv. 3-5, then, would be later than the composition of Ezek and would have been Israelites, not Phoenicians.

\textsuperscript{113} Joüon, "Trois noms", 284.

\textsuperscript{114} Noth, "Noah, Daniel und Hiob", 253.
Wisdom.

The Daniel of this passage is compared to the King of Tyre who is characterised as thinking that he is very wise. As early as Behrmann, a connection was made between the Daniel here held up as an exceedingly wise man, and the Daniel of Dan. He connected Dan 4:6 “no mystery is too difficult for you,” and Ezek 28:3 “nothing is hidden from you.” It is clear that there is a similarity in the thought expressed and in the general construction of the sentences. However, there are no linguistic connections that would necessarily lead us to conclude that one verse is dependent upon the other. It must be granted, however, that there are two languages involved and that may account for the differences in lexemes.

Day is more cautious than Behrmann. He notes only the similarity of the two passages in their ascriptions of wisdom to the characters. The words “no secret is hidden from you” in Ezek 28:3, suggest that the mantic character of the wisdom of Ezekiel’s Daniel, are strongly in accord with the wisdom of the hero of the book of Daniel: not only in his interpretation of dreams and mysteries, but in his perception of events hundreds of years in the future (chapters vii-xii) he is clearly presented as having greater insight than is the case with any other figure in the Old Testament.

Day also points out that the root הֵס that is used in Ezek 28:3 also is used in Dan 8:26, 12:4, 9 of the Daniel of Dan. The problem here, however, is that the connection is between Ezek and the second century BCE portion of Dan. The most that could be concluded from this observation, therefore, is that the second century author may have made some connection between the Daniel of Ezek and the Daniel of

---

115 Behrmann, Daniel, 26.

116 This verb denotes “blocking from view”. Of its 13 occurrences, 8 are to the blocking up of physical holes, such as wells and breaches (Gen 26:15, 18; 2 Kgs 3:19, 25; Neh 4:1 [4:7]; 2 Chr 32:3, 4, 30). The remaining 5 occurrences are to things that are hidden: knowledge that is not accessible to all, Ezek 28:3; the heart, which is blocked from view, Ps 51:8 [51:6]; revelations about the future that must be kept from general knowledge until their fulfilment is near, Dan 8:26; 12:4, 9.
the stories that had come to him.\footnote{117}{See p. 71, for other possible connections between these two books.} If the Old Greek is from an older version of the story in \textit{Dan}, then 4:6 may be even later than the Maccabean era because 4:2b-6 is missing from it.\footnote{118}{See J. Lust, "The Septuagint version of Daniel 4-5," in \textit{The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings}, ed. A. S. van der Woude (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 39-53 who argues that the Old Greek represents an older version of this chapter, the MT being a heavily redacted version of it.}

Zimmerli is hesitant to make a direct connection between the Daniel in the interpolated material of chapter 28 and Dn’il, because \textit{Aqht} speaks only of the \textit{just} ruler Dn’il.\footnote{119}{Zimmerli, \textit{Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48}, 79-80.} Zimmerli does think there is the possibility of a connection, for "(as the figure of Solomon in 1 Kgs 3 shows) right judgment and wisdom belong closely together." However, he does not hesitate to reject any appeal to the wise Daniel of \textit{Dan} to explain who this figure is. Zimmerli here raises a point that we have taken up on page 46, \textit{i.e.}, whether Dn’il was "wise". There we concluded that that is not one of the features of the Dn’il of the extant tale. Therefore, we cannot link the two figures on the basis of the tale that we have. It may well be that in the broader tradition this Dn’il was praised as a wise man; however, we do not know that.

We have concluded, then, that 28:3-5 is a later interpolation into \textit{Ezek} and that the orthography of the name indicates a dependence upon chapter 14, not upon \textit{Dan}. This does not argue for or against authorial knowledge of a tradition about a Daniel from some by-gone day to which \textit{Ezek} 14 may refer, and so we cannot join 28:3-5 with the chapter 14 materials to form a composite. Because the material is an interpolation, the link with the King of Tyre is lost along with the pointer to a Canaanite-Phoenician connection that might have provided a link with the Ugaritic Dn’il tradition.
various parallels made by Day (see below, page 71) point to some inter-textual connection between Dan and this verse. Given that most of the links are in the later material in Dan (chapters 7-12), and that one link is to material that seems to be a later addition in Dan (4:2b-6), it is reasonable to conclude that the second century author(s) of Dan depended upon Ezek, and not vice versa. Our investigation of material utilised by the authors of Dan and 7-12 confirms this, given the clear use of older narrative and prophetic material, especially of Ezek in chapters 7-12.

The transmission of the tradition.

Behind the discussion of the possible relationship of the Ugaritic Dn’il and the Israelite Daniel, whether in Ezek or Dan or both, there is the tacit assumption that such a tradition could have traversed the millennium that intervenes the time of the extant text of Aqht, and the Exilic and post-Exilic periods. Not only that, but it is also assumed that the version that would have survived to that time would have been similar enough to the version in the Ugarit text that we can compare the two. This must be addressed.

No one openly advocates the reliance of Exilic/post-Exilic Jews upon the tale of Aqht as we have it. Joüon comes close to it with his suggestion that the Daniel of the trio in Ezek was so completely forgotten in the Jewish traditions that the vocalisation of his name was later changed in order to bring to mind the pronunciation of the later Daniel. Although he does not say that the Ezek Daniel was of the Ugaritic tradition, he does indicate that he was not the same as the later Daniel, thus we are left to assume that the link is with the older Dn’il. In a similar way, Day proposes that the writer of

120 See “Chapter 4,” below.
121 See “Chapter 5,” below.
Dan relied upon the Ezek passage at a later time when the Ugaritic setting of the tradition was not known.  

Noth does not advocate a direct link between the Dn of Aqht and the Daniel of Ezek. He suggests that one must envisage a Phoenician-Canaanite tradition of a righteous Daniel who, on the one hand, found a place in the Aqht text as the father of heroes and, on the other hand, became established in the narratives of the Israelite traditions that had incorporated some of the traditions of the Canaanites. Noth does not attempt to outline specifics of such a scenario, however, due to limited materials in which the tradition is found. He also was of the opinion that this same figure, perhaps independent of Ezek, came to be the focus of Dan. He is aware of the striking change in time period, but he gives no explanation of how this could come about. He does posit that two traditions could have existed side by side.

Milik suggests that because of the juxtaposition of Daniel and Noah in Ezek “…the former could be the protagonist in the Phoenician history of the flood, a role comparable with the Babylonian ‘Most-wise’, Atra-šis.” He also notes how in the Book of Giants various Mesopotamian characters appear as giants, thus proving that at a late date these characters were known in Jewish circles. That we have no version of the Phoenician history of the flood renders his first suggestion pure speculation, however. That the characters in the Book of Giants were Mesopotamian, not Ugaritic, also renders his second suggestion pure speculation.

This problem of the tradition surviving a millennium does not escape Margalit’s notice. He makes two points to defend the possibility of the tradition surviving over

124 Noth, “Noah, Daniel und Hiob”. 253-54.
125 Milik, Books of Enoch, 29.
this period. First he argues "... that the Canaanite literary tradition did not come to an end with the cataclysmic destruction of the city of Ugaritic [sic] in ca 1200 B.C.E., anymore than it began with its founding."\textsuperscript{126} Second, he argues that, of all the ANE literature, \textit{Aqht} has the closest affinity with the Old Testament.

This affinity, whose detailed expressions we have noted in the course of this study, is probably related to the nearly certain fact that it alone was known in one form or another to the Israelites of the Iron Age. Support if not proof of this contention is provided by the explicit allusions to the hero Dan’el in the \textit{Ezek} (ch. 14\textsuperscript{127}) and, later still, in the Apocryphal \textit{Jub}.\textsuperscript{128}

Although we may grant the first argument as being reasonable, we will disagree with the second. As we have shown, the \textit{Ezek} figure cannot with certainty be claimed to be the Dn’il of the \textit{Aqht} tradition. Even the Daniel of \textit{Jub} who may more likely be connected to Dn’il, is not certainly so connected. We still, therefore, have no clear evidence that a connection exists between Dn’il, and either the Daniel of \textit{Ezek} or of \textit{Dan}.

Although many scholars assume the connection between the traditions of Dn’il and the Daniel of \textit{Ezek}, few explain how such a tradition could have traversed a millennium from one society to another. Margalit’s argument is reasonable, that the Canaanite literary tradition would not have ended with the demise of the political and physical structures at Ugarit; it is not likely that the people of the whole area were annihilated. There does remain the problem, however, that, apart from the cryptic reference to a Daniel in \textit{Ezek} 14 who may or may not be of the Dn’il tradition, there is no available evidence of a literary tradition about Dn’il in Canaan or in Mesopotamia after the destruction of Ugarit in the thirteenth century BCE.

\textsuperscript{126} Margalit, \textit{Aqht: Text, Translation, Commentary}, 488.

\textsuperscript{127} He purposely leaves out chapter 28, see Margalit, \textit{Aqht: Text, Translation, Commentary}, 490 n. 26.

\textsuperscript{128} Margalit, \textit{Aqht: Text, Translation, Commentary}, 489-90.
Conclusion.

Having established that the Daniel material in chapters 14 and 28 are not from the same source, and that 28:3 relies upon 14:14, 20, we have greatly weakened the link between the Ezek tradition(s) and the Aqht tradition. However, we still are left with the fact that in chapter 14 reference is made to an unknown Daniel. It seems highly unlikely that Ezekiel would have referred to a contemporary in the same way as he referred to Noah and Job; it is more probable that the character to which he referred was of the same stature and period as them. Given the literary texts that we possess from the Ancient Near East, the only possible candidate for this figure is the one found in Aqht. We have noted at several places that there are serious difficulties with this position, but, given the evidence we have, it seems the only logical choice. It is possible that the character is some early figure of which we have no record except this one reference, but there is no way to know.

The figure in chapter 28, unlike the one in chapter 14, is not a reference to the ancient worthy. This interpolation took its cue from chapter 14, which the orthography of the name indicates. It may be that the Daniel of the Dan 1-6 tradition influenced the figure referred to in 28:3, but there is no way to know this. It is more likely that it was the second century BCE writer of Dan 7-12 who relied upon the material in Ezek and possibly remodelled the character(s) of the stories after the composite Daniel of Ezek 14 and 28. This is part of the argument that Day makes when he draws the reader’s attention to parallels between the Ezek passages and Dan. We shall quote Day in full on this:

… just as Ezekiel xxviii 3 implies that Daniel was a pre-eminently wise man, so the book of Daniel ascribes wisdom to its central character, both explicitly and implicitly, more frequently than is the case with any other character in the whole of the Old Testament, with the single exception of Solomon (cf. Dan. i 4, 17, 20,
etc.), and in chapters ii, iv and v he exceeds all the wise men of Babylon in his ability to interpret the king's dreams and to read the mysterious writing on the wall. It is further interesting that the words "no secret is hidden from you" in Ezek. xxviii 3, suggesting the mantic character of the wisdom of Ezekiel's Daniel, are strongly in accord with the wisdom of the hero of the book of Daniel: not only in his interpretation of dreams and mysteries, but in his perceptions of events hundreds of years in the future (chapters vii-xii) he is clearly presented as having greater insight than is the case with any other figure in the Old Testament. Indeed, the very root *stm* used in Ezek. xxviii 3 is applied to Daniel's visions in Dan. viii 26, xii 4, 9. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that Daniel is depicted as righteous (Dan. vi 22 (Eng. 22), *cf.* Noah (Genesis. vi 9) and Job (Job i 1))—and that it was because of his righteousness that he was delivered from the lion's den, *cf.* Dan. vi 23 (Eng. 22), "My God sent his angel and shut the lions' mouths and they have not hurt me, because I was found blameless before him". This too suggests a connection with Ezekiel's Daniel, who, it may be implied, had saved his life by his righteousness (*cf.* Ezek. xiv 14, 20).

These points are sufficient to make it probable that the hero of the book of Daniel has his prototype in the Daniel alluded to by Ezekiel. 130

Day also quotes a number of places where the writer(s) of Dan seems to show dependence upon Ezek. 131 and supposedly did so at a time when the Ugaritic setting of the tradition was not known. This tradition-amnesia, he suggests, could be why the setting of the Dan tales is in Babylon: it is the setting of Ezek "and in the absence of proper knowledge of the real time and setting of Daniel, this may have suggested that he belonged there too". 132 The parallels between Dan and Ezek, with the exception of one (Ezek 17:23; 31:6 and Dan 4:9, 18 [4:12, 21]), are to material outside the tales, however. Therefore, if these connections show anything, it is not that the Daniel of

---

129 This point is overstated. One can argue that Joseph (Gen 40-42) had just as much insight and that Daniel was most likely modelled after Joseph. This will not negate the validity of the major point, however.

130 Day, "Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel", 182.

131 He notes Ezek 17:23, 31:6 and Dan 4:9, 18 [4:12, 21]; Ezek 10:6 and Dan 7:9; Ezek 9:3, 10:2, 6 and Dan 10:5, 7:6, 7; Ezek 1:27, 8:2 and Dan 10:6; Ezek 8:3 and Dan 10:10; Ezek 1:1 and Dan 8:2, 16, 10:4, 12:5, 7; Ezek 2:1. 3:1, etc. and Dan 8:17; Ezek 1:26 and Dan 7:13, etc.

Ezek and Dan are merely from the same tradition, but that the second century author(s) of Dan relied upon Ezek for some of his (their) ideas for the character of the stories that he (they) utilised to give a face to the visionary in chapters 7-12 of Dan. This does not require knowledge of any putative non-Israelite tradition behind the figure in Ezek. Thus, although it is reasonable to conclude that the Daniel of Ezek 14 is some distant relation to the Dn’il of Aqht, this relationship cannot be shown to have moved beyond the Ezek 14 reference.

The Daniel of Jub

Some scholars believe that Jub confirms that a tradition about an ancient Daniel existed in the Maccabean era and before. In 4:20 reference is made to a Daniel, the father of Edna and father-in-law of Enoch. Milik suggests that Jub presents an “archaic” form of the myth of the celestial provenance of human crafts and sciences. First, the Watchers come down to the earth to instruct humans and bring about justice and equity on earth (4:15), and it is only later that they deviate from that task and thus incur divine punishment (5:1-10). This is in contrast to the scenario painted in 1 Enoch of corruption that began before the angels left heaven. In between these two mythic events related in Jub (4:20) it is related that Enoch married Edna, the daughter of a Daniel.

In support of Noth’s suggestion that there could have been two contiguous traditions that had developed differently, Day suggests that the Daniel of Jub 4:20, i.e., Enoch’s father-in-law (but less likely the angel Daniel of 1 Enoch 6:7 and 69:2), may be related to the Ugaritic Dn’il because “wisdom and apocalyptic visions were ascribed

---

133 Milik, Books of Enoch, 29.
to Enoch, just like the hero of the book of Daniel . . .” and the time period could be construed as being similar for the Daniel of Jub and the Dn’il of Aqht.\textsuperscript{134}

However, contrary to scholars who take a position like Noth’s and Day’s, we would argue that no connection needs to be posited between the Daniel of Jub and the Dn’il of Aqht. Jub seems to have been produced between 175-100 BCE\textsuperscript{135} as a response to the increased pressure of Hellenism at that time. By that date Ezek was an established text. In that established text there were at least two references (14:14, 28) to a Daniel, who was preceded and followed by ancient figures, one being an antediluvian figure, the other a patriarchal figure. Even if the original reference in Ezek was to an exilic tradition that is reflected in the tales of Dan 1-6, there is no indication that the author of Jub could have known of this. Just as modern scholars have assumed that the Daniel in Ezek could not be the later Daniel and must be related to an ancient figure, so too the second century BCE writer(s) of Jub could have made the same assumption, without any knowledge of the Ugaritic tradition. We would argue that the Jub scenario could have arisen directly out of knowledge of the text of Ezek, which is more likely than dependence upon a tradition whose continuation beyond the fall of Ugarit is uncertain. Given that Jub is an expansion on Biblical texts, such an inclusion of the cryptic Ezek figure is not out of keeping with the nature of that work.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{134} Day, “Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel”, 183.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Conclusion

In our examination of *Aqht, Ezek, and Jub* we have concluded that in *Ezek* 14 there may be a reference to some late form of the tradition recorded in *Aqht*. This does not extend to the reference in *Ezek* 28, for that belongs to a portion of interpolated material that, at most, depended upon the chapter 14 materials. We also concluded that both *Jub* and *Dan* depended upon the *Ezek* material for the names and some ideas about their characters. Any dependence by the writer of *Ezek* 28, *Jub*, and *Dan* on the putative source of the *Ezek* 14 tradition or other traditions cannot be known. Thus, we do not find any positive evidence that these three works are evidence of a continuing tradition of an antediluvian figure noted for his righteousness and wisdom, upon which the later Daniel figure in *Dan* 1-6 could have been modelled. We have noted evidence that the later Daniel figure was modelled upon the *Ezek* figure, but that was more likely a reshaping of existing traditions about various successful Jews by a second century author/editor.

*The Angel Daniel*

There are four texts in which there are references to angels named Daniel. Two of the texts are in *1 Enoch*, one in the “Book of Watchers” and the other in “The Book of the Similitudes”; there are also occurrences in two Aramaic incantation bowls. These have been linked to the “Daniel tradition” by various scholars and so will be examined for any light they might throw on the origins of the Daniel figure in *Dan*.

The Daniel of *1 Enoch*

In *1 Enoch* 6:7 and 69:2 there are references to an angel named Daniel. Barton linked the Ugaritic Dn’il with this angel who is a “son of the gods” who came down from the heavens like the “giants” in *Gen* 6:2-4. “The author of this apocalypse
[I Enoch] regarded Danel as a semi-divine being who had rebelled against God, and who taught men sinful arts. There seems to be here a recollection of the divine origin of Danel celebrated in the Ras Shamra poem\(^{136}\). We have shown already that Barton’s theory of the semi-divine status of Dn’il is not very strong, but it is significant for now that he did point out this possible connection between the two figures. Müller discussed this angel at the same time as he dealt with the Ezek and Jub figures, because in each he found a magic or mantic connection.\(^{137}\) Collins did not think that the mantic connection was relevant for the Aqht Dn’il (and so, it might be concluded, for the 1 Enoch Daniel too), because it is so different from the wisdom of the Daniel of Dan.\(^{138}\) Collins also noted that the difference in the nature of the Daniels in 1 Enoch and Dan—an angel versus a human—also rendered any connection unlikely. We will take up the latter point below. At this juncture we will consider the magic/mantic connections.

As Müller noted, the context of the reference to the angel Daniel does refer to magic/mantic activities. The chapters that concern us, 6-8, begin by setting up the scene: the world was well populated, and among that population were some beautiful young women. Those women caught the eye of 200 angels (6:6) who decided to take some of them as wives. Verse 3 introduces the leader of these angels as Shemihazah.\(^{139}\) He has the band of 200 swear an oath to carry out the task to which they agreed, and they descend to earth at Hermon (6:6).\(^{140}\) It is at this point in the text

\(^{136}\) Barton, “Danel”, 223.

\(^{137}\) Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”, 85-89.

\(^{138}\) Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 2-3, 23 n. 7.

\(^{139}\) We are following the spelling based upon the Aramaic fragments published by Milik, Books of Enoch.

\(^{140}\) There is a word play here in the Aramaic: הַר מָרְאָם... “Hermon ... imprecations”, which is repeated in an Aramaic incantation bowl “the ban [ם]...
that the leaders of the angels are listed, beginning with Shemihazah (6:7), and it is this list to which the angel Daniel belongs.\textsuperscript{141} Chapter 7 continues the myth by relating how the 200 angels not only chose wives, but also commenced to teach what is described in chapter 9 as “eternal secrets” and “every (kind of) sin” (9:6, 8), \textit{i.e.,} “magical medicine, incantations, the cutting of roots, and … (about) plants” (7:1). The women also gave birth to giants who first devoured all the humans’ produce, then devoured the animal life on earth and finally turned to cannibalism. Chapter 8 relates how certain angels taught the women blacksmithery (often connected with magic in the ANE), the manufacturing of cosmetics and jewellery,\textsuperscript{142} alchemy and various forms of magic and divination. The remaining 3 chapters (9-11) deal with the judgement of the angels for their rebellious acts of taking human wives and teaching things humans should not have known. In chapter 9, Micha’el, Sari’el, Rapha’el and Gabri’el\textsuperscript{143} intercede on behalf of the humans, noting first the sins of ‘Asa’el (9:6), and then those of Shemihazah (9:7-9). God gives these four angels the task of bringing judgement upon these rebels, first upon ‘Asa’el (10:4-8), and then upon Shemihazah (10:11-14) (and also upon a son of Lamech and the giants).


\textsuperscript{142} For purposes of seduction, so M. Black, “The twenty angel dekadarchs at 1 Enoch 6.7 and 69.2,” \textit{JJS} 33 (1982): 232.

\textsuperscript{143} We follow the list of four as in Knibb, \textit{Ethiopic Book of Enoch}, 84; cf. Milik, \textit{Books of Enoch}, 157-58.
It would seem that in chapters 6-11 there are two traditions about fallen angels/watchers in the Ethiopic version of *1 Enoch*, and at least one of the traditions would appear to have been interpolated. Shemihazah led one group (6:7), and `Azaz`el led another (8:1-4). These insertions would leave material within which `Azaz`el is the leader and in which Shemihazah is subordinate to `Azaz`el or is not mentioned at all. Recently, Nickelsburg, Hanson, Molenberg, Dimant, and Davidson have separated 7:1d, e; 8:1-3; 9.6, 8c; 10:4-8 and perhaps 10:9-10 from the Shemihazah tradition as interpolated `Azaz`el material. All of this latter material deals with how the angels taught magical arts to the women.

Scholars seem to base their list of interpolated texts entirely upon the evidence from the Ethiopic version. In the Aramaic, the Greek, and the Ethiopic versions, *Shemihazah* leads the list of angels in 6:7, and *'Asa'el* follows in tenth position. In the

---


145 Dillmann (so Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 61) first suggested that 6:3-8; 8:1-3; 9:7; 10:1, 11 and a number of other sections outside this section were fragments from a work on Noah. Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 24-25 and loc cit, agreed with Dillmann, but altered the last reference to 10:1-3. He contended that all of chapters 6-11 were interpolated into their present location (Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 65).


148 Molenberg, "Roles of Shemihaza and Asael", 136-46.


150 Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 41-42.

151 Milik, *Books of Enoch*.

152 Charles, *Book of Enoch*. 
Ethiopic version of the list in chapter 8, 'Azaz'el is at the head (8:1), and Amasras follows him (8:3). Among the seven angels, there is no mention made of either Shemihazah or 'Asa'el in chapter 8. Only Armaras, Tam'el and possibly Baraqiyal and Kokabel occur in both lists. This gives the clear impression that in chapter 8 there is a list of angels unrelated to the one in 6:7.

Although the Ethiopic version of chapters 6 and 8 seem to have unrelated lists, the Aramaic and the Greek versions of the story are significantly different. The Aramaic of 8:1 in 4QEnb tells what 'Asa'el does. In 8:3 the Aramaic and Greek also follow the name 'Asa'el in 8:1 with Shemihazah, the leader of the list in chapter 6, and not with Amasras as in the Ethiopic 8:3. In the list in the Aramaic and Greek versions of 8:1-3, therefore, Shemihazah would seem to be subordinate to 'Asa'el, which is the reverse of their relationship in 6:7. These differences mean that in the Aramaic and Greek versions the list in chapter 8 is a subset of the list in chapter 6.

Whereas the Aramaic version is older than the Ethiopic, it is reasonable to conclude

---

153 See Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 71, 72, 82.

154 *Gk Sync a* actually makes an explicit link from 8:1 back to the angel 'Asa'el in 6:7: Πρῶτος Ἄζαηλ. δὲ δέκατος τῶν ἀγγέλων (Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 65; and see Black, "Twenty angel dekadarchs", 231, 232 on the variations of Ἄζαηλ.). Possibly significant also is the separation of 8:1 from the surrounding text in 4QEnb. In that text the verse is preceded by (which may be the case in 4QEna as well, see Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 150, 342), and appears to be followed by, blank lines. These serve to separate it from the preceding and following material. This highlighting of the one angel out of the 20 could signify an awareness in the tradition that the focus changes in the next list.

155 Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 82 believes that the Ethiopic word is "an inner-Ethiopic corruption of Semyaza", the Greek form of the Aramaic name.

156 The other angels are also somewhat different and the number of them is greater. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 158-60; 170-72, shows that in the Aramaic versions there were probably ten names, each occurring in the list in chapter 6. The same happens, with one exception (Σερπη[λ] in *Gr Pan*), in the Greek versions as well, but there are only eight names there. Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 81 thinks that the Aramaic fragments "appear to agree with *Gr Sync a*", where there are eight rather than ten names.
that the list in chapter 8 was not originally an interpolation, but was corrupted in the
history of transmission from Aramaic through Greek to Ethiopic.\footnote{There may be a conflation of two different “traditions” here. There is an
early example of the ‘Azaz’el tradition that Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 248-52 discusses in
the form of two Hebrew Qumran fragments, *4Q180* and *4Q181* in which reference is
made twice to ֲםְּנָה (\textit{4Q180} 17, 8). The document is a pesher on an unknown book
that Milik entitles the “Book of Periods” and to which he believes \textit{1 Enoch} 10:12
refers. It specifically links the angel with the \textit{Gen} 6:4 material. If this is so early as to
be referred to in \textit{1 Enoch} 10, then it is an early tradition indeed. Milik, *Books of
Enoch*, 252 suggests that it may come from the Persian period.}

Milik\footnote{Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 29.} does not seem to separate out the ‘Asa’el tradition as an interpolation.
He suggests that the two angels were modelled after the Babylonian pairing of
antediluvian kings and sages, the king being Shemihazah and the sage being ‘Asa’el.\footnote{Cf. the work of Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, and James C. VanderKam,
Biblical Association of America, 1984), both of whom find such Mesopotamian links
for Enoch in \textit{1 Enoch}.}

There are two problems with Milik’s suggestion, however. First, in the Aramaic
version, upon which Milik was primarily basing his thoughts, both Shemihazah and
‘Asa’el not only appear in the list of the “kings” they also appear in the list of “sages”,
something that does not happen in the Babylonian lists. Second, a sharp division
between the nature of the “sins” of the angels is not always evident—Shemihazah too is
accused of having “revealed to them every (kind of) sin” (9:8b), but specifically he
“taught spell-binding and cutting of roots” (8:3)\footnote{Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 158, 171.}. Nonetheless, the suggestion that
there was an original division between the cohabiting and its results (\textit{i.e.}, the birth of
the giants), which was associated with Shemihazah as leader, and the teaching of
heavenly secrets and its results (\textit{i.e.}, warfare, mantic arts, cosmetics, medicine and
magic), which was associated with ‘Asa’el as leader, seems a better option than the alternative suggestion of interpolated materials.\textsuperscript{161}

The implications of these variants and our examination of them are significant. First, as already shown, although in the Ethiopic version there appear to be two distinct lists, in the Aramaic and Greek there are two interrelated lists. The first of the lists names all the leading angels that were responsible for polluting the earth by breaking the heaven-earth divide, and whom Shemihazah led. The second list names those who, besides the previous breach of angelic taboo, taught women heavenly secrets, and were headed by ‘Asa’el. The leader of the first group (Shemihazah) is the second named in the Aramaic and Greek versions of the list in 8, and the first in that list (‘Asa’el) is the tenth in the list in chapter 6—both took part in the wrong doings instigated by the other. It is for this reason that in subsequent material (9:6-7; 10:4-8 & 11-14) these two angels are singled out for punishment.

The second implication of the variants and our examination is that the angel Daniel was part of the watcher tradition at an early point. Even if the ‘Asa’el material had been interpolated, it was still at a very early stage in the Watchers tradition, because some of the Qumran fragments containing this ‘Asa’el material date from the first half (\textit{4QEn\textsuperscript{a}}) and the middle (\textit{4QEn\textsuperscript{b}}) of the second century BCE\textsuperscript{162} and, thus, were in existence at the same time that \textit{Dan} was finalised.\textsuperscript{163}

The third implication of the variants and our examination is that, if the ‘Asa’el material was not interpolated, then there is no need to excise 7:1 or any of the other passages listed above (p. 78-78). Thus, even though Daniel is not one of the 8 angels

\textsuperscript{161} Cf. Molenberg, “Roles of Shemihaza and Asael”, 136-46.

\textsuperscript{162} Milik, \textit{Books of Enoch}, 5.

\textsuperscript{163} Cf. Black, “Twenty angel dekadarchs”, 232.
who are singled out as those who revealed magic/mantic practices to the women, but rather is in the list headed by one of the fallen Watchers who followed Shemihazah, still, this angel and others taught the women “magical medicine, incantations, the cutting of roots, and … (about) plants” 7:1. Thus there is a magic aspect to the knowledge all the angels imparted and this included Daniel. Thus, Müller’s connection between this Daniel and others based on the mantic arts is not unfounded.

The angel Daniel is mentioned a second time at 69:2. This list, however, does seem to be an interpolation into “the Book of Noah” portion of this section of 1 Enoch; indeed the whole of chapters 37-71 appears to be from some time later than the other 1 Enoch material, as it does not exist among the extant fragments from Qumran. The context of chapter 69 is tied up in part with the judgement pronounced against the angels who revealed “the oath” and its power. Verses 2-3 merely name 20 angels in a numbered order, and a further six angels and their sins are listed in 69:4-15, but these have no relation to the list in 69:2-3. The first of the two lists (69:2-3) would appear to be an insertion that was intended to bring this passage in line with chapter 6. This particular reference to Daniel is not, however, irrelevant to our discussion just because it is part of a duplication of the list in 6:7. It should be noted that the context in chapter 69 is clearly one of magic and therefore this tradition about the angel more directly associates the Daniel of 6:7 with magic.

164 Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 69.

165 The names in 69:2 come from chapter 6, and according to Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 76, are the furthest removed from the Aramaic forms found in the lists in 1 Enoch. Knibb concludes that “the nature of the variants in 69.2 suggests that the list was copied from the Ethiopic version of 6.7, i.e., that the addition was made during the transmission of the Ethiopic text and not any earlier.” Black, “Twenty angel dekadarchs”. 235, on the other hand, concludes in opposition to Knibb that the list in 69 is merely from a different Greek version of the Aramaic names. Regardless of the origin of the list, this material is later and is based upon 6:7.
We can conclude from this that the angel named Daniel in 1 Enoch was associated with magic and divination. However, what relation this has to the “Daniel tradition”, if any, remains unclear.

The Daniel of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls

There are two Jewish incantation bowls that refer to an angel named Daniel. One bowl is at the Louvre, and the second was in the possession of a couple in Susiane, France when Schwab examined it. We cannot be sure of the relation

166 See P. S. Alexander, “Incantations and books of magic,” in The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135) by Emil Schürer, eds. G. Vermes et al., 2d, Vol. 3/1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), 352-57 and J. Naveh and S. Shaked, Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985) for a survey and bibliography of the incantation bowls and amulets. The major works on the bowls are Montgomery, Aramaic Incantation Texts, Naveh, and Shaked, Amulets and Magic Bowls and Joseph Naveh, and Shaul Shaked, Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993). Naveh, and Shaked, Amulets and Magic Bowls, 20 point out that the corrections to Montgomery in J. N. Epstein, “Gloses Babylo-Araméenes,” REJ 73 (1921): 27-58 and J. N. Epstein, “Gloses Babylo-Araméenes,” REJ 74 (1922): 40-72 were never utilized by the works that followed, including C. H. Gordon, “Aramaic Incantation Bowls,” Or NS 10 (1941): 116-41, 272-84, 339-60; and Charles D. Isbell, Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls (Scholars Press, 1975). The bowls are simple earthen bowls with incantations written on them. They were placed in advantageous places to ward off or trap evil spirits or to bring enemies harm. These forms of incantation were wide spread in the Near East in the 300-600 CE period. The bowls seem to have been limited to Mesopotamia and the amulets to Palestine. Jews, it seems, were the magicians of choice for such incantations!


168 On this bowl see M. Schwab, “Coupes a inscriptions magiques,” Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology 13 (1891): 590-91. Note the serious caveat in the previous note. He is, however, the only scholar to have worked with this bowl. The name occurs as מ"ם, which, like five others of the nine angels mentioned in the bowl, ends with מ" rather than מ. Along with the name מ"מ, מ" has the double yod. On the variety of spellings in the bowls see the comments on orthographic variations in the bowls by Montgomery, Aramaic Incantation Texts, 27-
between these two angels. Both, however, are good angels, or at least are invoked in a "spiritual battle" against demons. They both are accompanied by other angels known from elsewhere, and in both cases by Gabriel.169

Day mentions the first of these angels, but was unaware of the second.170 He asserts that the probability of a relation between this angel and the Dn’il of Ugarit (and of the Daniel of Dan) is greater than the probability of a relation between the Daniel of 1 Enoch and the Dn’il of Ugarit. He bases this, first, on the relation between the counter-magical power of the angel and the magical-mantic wisdom of the Ugaritic Dn’il (and the Dan Daniel), and second on the negative portrayal of the 1 Enoch Daniel and the positive portrayals of the Aqht and Dan figures.

The relevance of these angels, is questionable. The incantation bowls probably date from the Talmudic era.171 Whether material that is so far removed from Dan and 1 Enoch is relevant to the development of the “Daniel tradition”, is doubtful. It is possible, nonetheless, that the angelic use of the name is the remnant of some myth of civilisation in which the angel Daniel played a part, as Spiegel speculates.172

The Relationship of the Angels

The occurrence of these angels named Daniel, raises the question of their relationship to each other. As we have already stated, the relationship between the two

28, and also the list of names in Montgomery, Aramaic Incantation Texts, 269-73 where the final element can be found as אלי or ילי. 169 This also may be true of Barqiel: ברקיאל and בראקיאל.

170 Day, “Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel”, 183. This was related in a personal conversation at the 1994 summer SOTS meeting in Edinburgh.


incantation bowl angels is unknown. Given the recurrence of the same names among the bowls, and the comparative paucity of this name, it is more likely than not that the referent is to the same tradition. Given both the age of the *1 Enoch* tradition and its continuance for many centuries, the likelihood of the incantation bowl angels being based upon the same tradition as found in *1 Enoch* is also more likely than not.

Some scholars have suggested that there are relationships between the various angels and certain parts of the "Daniel tradition". We do not find this convincing. We do know from the Qumran evidence that the angel pre-exists the final form of Dan, so the tradition is old and, thus, there exists the possibility that one grew out of the other. One problem with the theory, however, is the jump in category from human to angel, to which we will turn below.

A second problem lies in the association of the angel with the "Daniel tradition" that is based on a putative connection between the antediluvian angel of *1 Enoch* and the Dn’il of *Aqht* through a connection between Dn’il and the later Daniel in Dan. We have shown that the latter connection is tenuous, because scholars have now determined that the Dn’il of *Aqht* was not a mantic. Also, the Daniel of Dan, although wise, does not act as a magician of the type associated with the bowls or with the angels in *1 Enoch*.\(^{173}\) Given these problems, the association of the angel with the "Daniel tradition" is even more tenuous than the association with Dn’il, especially given the jump in categories.

The major problem with the proposal that the angels named Daniel might be related to the "Daniel tradition" is that this involves a jump in categories: there is a move from humans to angels. Only a few have tried to explain this move; most simply refer to the angels and assume some connection because of the names and the magic/

\(^{173}\) It is true, however, that some scholars have understood his ability to "loosen knots" (*Dan* 5:12, 15) in this way.
divination connection. Collins alone has indicated that the change in category was a problem. There are, however, various possible examples of such moves that may give some support to such a change in category taking place within a tradition.

The clearest case of a change in category within the Jewish tradition is found in the Animal Apoc. (1 Enoch 85-90). In this second century BCE composition the

174 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, 23 n. 7.

In addition to the following, there are examples in other Jewish literature. In the Apoc. Abr., there is a midrash on Gen 15:9-17, at (OTP I, 695) in which the angel Joael (יהואל) intervenes on Abraham’s behalf, and addresses Azazel. It is stated clearly that Azazel, a fallen angel with the characteristics of Satan, had lost his place in heaven and that Abraham had been given a place there. Then, Joael tells Azazel that the “garment” he had in heaven is no longer his, but Abraham’s (cf. 1 Cor 15:50-54), and that Abraham’s “corruption” has gone over to Azazel (cf. Lev 16:21; so R. Helm, “Azazel in early Jewish tradition,” AUS 32 (1994): 223). Abraham, therefore, although not yet transformed into an angelic being, will be so transformed in the future. (D. J. Halperin, “Ascension or invasion: implications of the heavenly journey in ancient Judaism,” Religion: Journal of Religion and Religions 18 (1988): 53). In 3 Enoch 3-16 (OTP I, 258), there is a tradition about how Enoch was transformed into an angel, and finally was installed as “the lesser YHWH” (12:5). The section makes it plain in 4:2 that the angel into which he is transformed is Metatron (see Alexander OTP I, 243-44 and 244 n. 66 for bibliography), who claims that he is the Enoch of 1 Enoch. Alexander (OTP I, 244) does not believe that this absorption of Enoch by Metatron would have been possible without the elevated language used of Enoch in 1 and 2 Enoch. He refers to 2 Enoch 22:8-10 in which Enoch is made to “become like one of his glorious ones [the angels in the seventh heaven], and there was no observable difference” (2 Enoch 22:10; OTP I, 138, 139). The probable transformation of Enoch in the Animal Apoc., as discussed above, may be the origin of the explicit transformation tradition in 3 Enoch. Such language is not used of Daniel in Dan nor in the other Daniel material, however. It is possible that a Daniel such as the one in Jub was transformed into an angel, but even that is doubtful. The angels in the incantation bowls are not of the same nature as Metatron. Also, it is Metatron who incorporates Enoch into himself and not the human Enoch who is transformed into the angel Enoch. Cf. the theme of the transcendence of death that is part of some apocalypses’ view of the salvific elevation of the ‘saved’, which involves a transformation from human to heavenly, possibly angelic. See J. J. Collins, “Apocalyptic eschatology as the transcendence of death,” CBQ 36 (1974): 21-43; J. J. Collins, “The symbolism of transcendence in Jewish apocalyptic,” BR 19 (1974): 5-22. This may occur in such passages as Dan 12:3; 1 Enoch 39:4-5; 104:2-7; T. Mos. 10:8-10; and 2 Bar 51:5-12 where the writers claim that at death humans will take up habitation with angels. What these do not say, however, is that humans become angels. It is conceivable that existence with the angels later became existence as angels, but there is no evidence of this.

176 I am grateful to Margaret Barker who pointed me to this set of examples in private correspondence.
various characters are portrayed in the following ways: animals represent humans; stars represent fallen angels; and humans represent the seven archangels. The verses concerned are 89:1, 9, 36, and 52. In 87-88 it is related how the visionary sees four “humans” come down from heaven. They remove the visionary to one of the heavens and then seize the first fallen star (Satan?).

In the Ethiopic version, either Enoch or Noah is transformed from a bovine into a human: “Then one of those four went to those snow-white bovids and taught (one of them) a secret: he was born a bovine but became a person; and he built for himself a big boat and dwelt upon it....” OTP I:64. The passage goes on to relate how Noah built the ark, survived the flood with his offspring and then that he “departed from them” (89:9). The Ethiopic of 89:9 also says: “the snow-white cow which became a man came out from the boat....” The other figure transformed from an animal to a human is Moses, at 89:36.

---

177 The other biblical character that is translated to heaven, Elijah, is not transformed in the Animal Apoc. Of him the writer says, simply: “…the Lord of the sheep rescued him from the sheep and caused him to ascend to me and settle down” (89:52; OTP I, 67). Milik, Books of Enoch, 6, records no fragments containing this verse.

178 Our italicised “he” refers back to the “(one of them)” to whom the secret was revealed, as Isaac seems to indicate by his insertion and as the Aramaic indicates. Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 198-99 makes it explicit: “And one of those four went to a white bull and taught him a mystery, trembling as he was. He was born a bull, but became a man, and built for himself a large vessel and dwelt on it ....” (The italics are Knibb’s.)

179 In the Aramaic of 89:1 (4QEn') there is nothing out of the ordinary (Milik. Books of Enoch, 238).

180 As in 89:1 (4QEn'), Milik, Books of Enoch, 241-42, says that the Aramaic (4QEn') does not have the text about the transformation, but there is so little of the text that this cannot be said with any certainty at all. Milik, Books of Enoch, 241, transcribes only one lamedh for v. 9.

181 Here both the Aramaic (4QEn'; Milik, Books of Enoch, 205) and the Ethiopic are the same: “I continued to see in that vision till that sheep was transformed into a man...” (OTP I, 66).
The second example of a change in category comes from the Melchizedek tradition as we know it from 11QMelch, a first century BCE document. In this text Melchizedek is not the earthly priest of Gen, but rather has taken on the characteristics of Michael the archangel, acting as the protector of Israel (15). In l 9 of the text Isa 61:1-3 is cited, but where the Masoretic Text has יהוה, this text has לאלך צדך. In l 13 this substitution for God is again implied where it is said that “Melchizedek will carry out the vengeance of God’s judgments”. The editors of the text do not believe that this substitution means that Melchizedek is a hypostasis of God, but it does mean that he certainly is not a human. Again, in ll 9-10 Melchizedek figures as a character in the scenario laid out in Ps 82:1. The editors of the text take the first לאלך as being Melchizedek, and the second as referring to others. It is also possible, given the substitution in l 9, that Melchizedek is acting on behalf of יהוה in the verse: “Gods shall stand in the assembly of God [as represented by Melchizedek]; in the midst of the gods (והון) he [Melchizedek] shall judge.” This fits well with l 13 where Melchizedek carries out מ месте ושם Jah “the vengeance of God’s judgments”. Melchizedek, the king of Salem, then, had become an angelic being who judges on behalf of God, doubtless because his God was “the King of Righteousness.”

The third source of a change in category within a tradition is drawn to our attention by Milik when he suggests that because of the juxtaposition of Daniel and Noah in Ezek

---


183 García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, *DJD 23*, 2, 231.

184 García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, *DJD 23*, 2, 231.

185 The wave underline is intended to replace the indicator (°) for an uncertain letter in the critical edition, which I do not have as a zero space character in a font.
... the former could be the protagonist in the Phoenician history of the flood, a role comparable with the Babylonian ‘Most-wise’, Atra-šamsī. The dethronement of the Phoenician wise man [Dn’il] to the rank of the wicked angels [in 1 Enoch] was to be copied by the author of the Book of Giants, who included in his list of giants one ‘Ahīram, one Gilgameš, who visited Utnapištim, the hero of the flood, in his ultra-terrestrial retreat, and one Höbabīš, without doubt the giant Humbaba, guardian of the cedar-forest and adversary of Gilgameš.186

Regardless of the merits of the argument for the Ezek passages, this example of Mesopotamian mythical characters becoming giants (the offspring of the union between the angels and women) does give some strength to the contention of Barton and others that the Dn’il of Aqht may be the source of the angel in 1 Enoch and possibly in the incantation bowls. This is especially the case because of the existence of an antediluvian human Daniel in Jub, which is also contemporary with the Dan and 1 Enoch materials. There are two differences, however. First, the Mesopotamian characters were viewed in a negative light among Jews, as their metamorphosis into “giants” shows. Daniel, even in Jub was not so viewed. Second, Dn’il was not Mesopotamian, but Ugaritic and there is no conclusive positive evidence that this tradition continued into the Israelite culture.

There are, therefore, four examples of a move in category from human/mythical figure to angel and they are in the Animal Apoc., in 11QMelch, and in the Book of Giants. Thus, it is possible that the angel Daniel and the figure in Dan were related. If they were, however, it was at a very early date, even before Dan was collected together. Whereas there is no evidence for the existence of Aqht in Mesopotamia, however, even the two clear examples do not help with this case and so the possible relationship is, nonetheless, improbable.

There is another possibility for the origin of the angel Daniel other than the metamorphosis of a human figure. A consideration of the various names of angels

186 Milik, Books of Enoch, 29.
shows that names with theophoric elements were preferred. A consideration of the lists of angels such as those in 1 Enoch 6, 8 and 69, in 3 Enoch, and in the incantation bowls\textsuperscript{187} show this clearly. In each list the predominant second element in names is \textsuperscript{88}. In Dan 9:21 and 10:13, the angels’ names \textsuperscript{69} and \textsuperscript{87} also have this element. Knibb\textsuperscript{188} notes that 15 of the 18 names in the 1 Enoch lists whose form he could determined with a high degree of certainty have the theophoric element or one of its later variations (see note 168). He also notes that 12 of those 15 are linked to astronomical, meteorological and geographical phenomena in the first element,\textsuperscript{189} and that he believed that the two elements are in a construct relationship, e.g., = ‘star of God’. “The three other \textsuperscript{7} names appear to have as their first element a verb in the perfect, viz. no. 7 \textsuperscript{190} [‘God has judged’], no. 10 \textsuperscript{191} [‘God has made’] and no. 14 \textsuperscript{192} [‘God has hidden’, \textit{i.e.}, has protected].” Likewise, in 3 Enoch 14:4 there is a list of 18 names of angels (but none is named Daniel). Every one of the angels has the theophoric element,\textsuperscript{193} and each is responsible for a particular aspect of nature.\textsuperscript{194} It is, therefore, possible that the name \textsuperscript{8} in the incantation bowls

\textsuperscript{187} Montgomery, Aramaic Incantation Texts, 96: “As a rule the names [found on incantation bowls] are formed in -’el, although other formations appear and quite unJewish potencies are brought in as angels.”

\textsuperscript{188} Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 70.

\textsuperscript{189} In Ps 104:4 and Heb 1:7, which quotes the psalm, this very point is made, \textit{i.e.}, that the natural elements are the angels of God.

\textsuperscript{190} Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 72.

\textsuperscript{191} Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 73.

\textsuperscript{192} Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 74.

\textsuperscript{193} H. Odeberg, 3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch, Edited and Translated for the First Time with Introduction Commentary and Critical Notes; Prolegomenon by Jonas C. Greenfield (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1973), II, 37-38, \textsuperscript{8}.

\textsuperscript{194} Cf. Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 69-70 on 1 Enoch 8.
was used simply because this is a name with a theophoric element. There are two problems with this suggestion, however. First, the first element in the name Daniel has nothing to do with the natural elements. The second problem with the suggestion is the limited scope of the names borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures. Although there are many names with theophoric elements in the Hebrew Scriptures, why were so few borrowed, and why was the name Daniel borrowed when others might have been more suitable?

Conclusion

Based upon our examination, it is possible to conclude that the angels named Daniel in 1 Enoch and in the Aramaic incantation bowls are related to the “Daniel tradition”. It also is possible to conclude that a human Daniel figure underwent a transformation into an angel in the history of the tradition. If that happened, however, it seems most likely that it was a worthy like the one in Jub who, like Melchizedek and the characters in the Animal Apoc. and those of Mesopotamian origins in the Book of Giants passage, was an ancient worthy or an antediluvian who later became an angel.

Based upon our examination we would conclude that the 1 Enoch and incantation bowl evidence are largely irrelevant to any considerations of the origins of the Daniel figure in Dan. If there is some connection, it would seem to be so distant as to be meaningless to the settings of the Dan stories, having only a slight connection through magic. Other than having the same name, therefore, there is little or nothing in common between the angels in 1 Enoch and the incantation bowls, and the “Daniel tradition”. The one noteworthy fact for our purposes is that at the time Dan was being brought together in the Maccabean period, and for at least a century before, there was a Jewish tradition about an angel named Daniel.
In addition to the stories in Dan 1-6, there are other stories or versions of stories and details about the same Daniel that may shed light on the origins of the “Daniel tradition”. These are found in the Septuagint, at Qumran, and in Josephus.

The Daniel of the Septuagint

Although the different form of the Greek Dan material may give us an insight into how the stories of Dan 1-6 came together, there is little that gives us insight into the origins of the “Daniel tradition”. The various stories are certainly of differing kinds and not all are examples of court conflicts: 2-6 and Bel are court conflicts of varying kinds, but Sus and the Old Greek version of chapter four are not, but that about exhausts what may be learned. The one exception is the introduction to Bel to which we will now turn.

The Old Greek translation of Bel as found in Rahlf’s MS 88 and the Syro-Hexapla has a superscription that is lacking in Theodotion. This superscription preserves a unique tradition that adds to our understanding of the origins of Daniel. It begins:

Ἐκ προφητείας Αμβακουμ ύιοὶ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευι.

From the prophecy of Habakkuk, son of Joshua, of the tribe of Levi. There

\[195\] Lust, “Septuagint of Daniel 4-5”, 41.

\[196\] Beginning with p. 177 of 967 increasingly larger portions of the bottoms of pages have been torn off. The place where these verses (1-2) would have been is, unfortunately, missing from the bottom of p. 185 where they followed immediately after 12:13. At the top of p. 186 the text resumes at v. 4 (αὐτοῦ δανιήλ δι προσευχῆ). See Angelo Geissen, Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel: Kap. 5-12, Zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco sowie Esther Kap. 1,1a-2,15 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt. 1968), 264-65, 268-69.
was a man, a priest by the name of Daniel, son of Abal, a companion of the king of Babylon.

Several matters must be addressed here. If the introduction is original to these stories, it would seem that they circulated independently of Dan before being included in this compilation. As early as Epiphanius it was noted that the introduction assumed that Daniel needed to be introduced fully,\textsuperscript{197} which indicates that the writer was not assuming the first 6 chapters of Dan. In distinction from Dan 1-12, the king in this OG story remains nameless. This story is also said to be part of material about the prophet Habakkuk, not about Daniel. Theodotion seems to be the redactor who integrated the material in Dan, the superfluous Old Greek introduction was smoothed out by modifying it so as not to include any reference to Habakkuk, although the other Habakkuk material in vv. 33-39 remained. Wills also argues that Theodotian gives the king the name Cyrus (Dan 1:21 6:28; 10:1) to smooth out the transition.\textsuperscript{198}

The Habakkuk material in the Old Greek introduction has led some to conclude that the introduction is an interpolation. Habakkuk figures at the end of this tale in both the Old Greek and Theodotion versions (vv. 33-39) where he is transported in an Ezekielian manner from Palestine to Babylon in order to feed Daniel in the lion’s den. This material is thought to be an interpolation because it does not fit well in the story.\textsuperscript{199} If that is the case, then, the superscription, which refers to Habakkuk, could be


\textsuperscript{198} This does make the assumption that Theodotion is simply a recension of the Old Greek. This assumption has been seriously challenged by R. T. McLay, “Translation technique and textual studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion versions of Daniel” (PhD dissertation. University of Durham, 1994), especially pp. 174-310.

an interpolation as well.\textsuperscript{200} In the \textit{Chronicle of Jerahmeel}, the Habakkuk material is missing as well. If Gaster\textsuperscript{201} and Koch\textsuperscript{202} are correct that this \textit{Jerahmeel} material is a version of the original Semitic story, then this would be further evidence that the Habakkuk material is a later interpolation.\textsuperscript{203} Reeves and Waggoner also note that the recounting of the \textit{Dan} materials in \textit{Sefer Josippon} has the Habakkuk story joined to \textit{Dan} 6 and the remaining incidents from \textit{Bel} (less the second incident in the lion’s pit) as a separate event.\textsuperscript{204} This may also support the theory that the Habakkuk story circulated independently.\textsuperscript{205} If the attachment to chapter 6 is evidence of such an independent circulation, then the original story must have had Daniel specifically named, because the story nonetheless is attached to \textit{Dan}. Reeves and Waggoner themselves point out, however, that \textit{Josippon} was aware of two distinct lion pit scenes, because this is specifically mentioned in a speech to the king when he mentions that his enemies made him enter the lion pit “two times”.\textsuperscript{206} They also suggest that the reteller

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{200}] Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 409.
  \item[\textsuperscript{202}] Klaus Koch, \textit{Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch: Entstehung und Textgeschichte} (Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker/Neukirchener Berlag, 1987).
  \item[\textsuperscript{205}] Reeves, and Waggoner, “Illustration from the Apocrypha”, 261 n. 29.
  \item[\textsuperscript{206}] Reeves, and Waggoner, “Illustration from the Apocrypha”, 262 n. 31.
\end{itemize}
had difficulties with this seeming doublet and may have attempted to resolve his problem by uniting the two incidents. If that was so, and it seems likely to be the case, then the Habakkuk incident would have had to have been joined with the pit incident of chapter 6 rather than with Bel, because of the former's setting in the lions' pit. Finally, the Lives of the Prophets (12:4-7b) also knew of the Bel tradition of Habakkuk and Daniel. This account, however, actually brings into some doubt whether the text from which the writer of Lives worked had the same superscription as what we have now in the Old Greek, for at 12:1 Habakkuk is said to come from the tribe of Simeon, not from the tribe of Levi as the superscription cited above says.

Although unique, the Habakkuk connection in the introduction to Bel does not seem out of place. It might equally be argued, therefore, that the superscription was original, or at least that it is an interpolation that preceded the interpolated material in vv. 33-39, and that the latter verses grew out of the association with Habakkuk in Old Greek v. 1.

Whether the material is an interpolation or not, it is early. The Old Greek version of Dan is usually dated to the late second or early first century BCE at the latest, before the translation of 1 Macc.207 Collins suggests tentatively that the original Semitic story was composed in Jerusalem in the first quarter of the second century.208 If he is correct, then vv. 1 and 33-39 were added to that original story in the time


208 Collins, Daniel, 418.
between composition and translation, if they were interpolated. This would mean that the 2nd-1st century BCE Old Greek translator included with the other Daniel material a story that already had the Habakkuk material, because he would have had no reason himself to interpolate it, especially the superscription, which is out of place in Dan. The superscription, therefore, is evidence of a tradition that probably existed in the Maccabean era. This would place the tradition of a Daniel as a priest in the same time period as that of the composition of the final form of Dan.

The reference to Daniel as a priest has led some, beginning from Epiphanius, to deny that this Daniel is the same as the one in Dan. Collins, for example, has problems with the reference to Daniel as a priest, which he claims is inconsistent with, and in contradiction to, Dan 1-6. This is not the case if our argument below has any validity. Regardless of the original intention, the Old Greek translator and Theodotian (although he does clean up the problems) clearly thought that this character was the same as the one in Dan.

Another point to note about this introduction is that the author of the superscription would seem to have been a priest, because he chose as his guise a priestly Habakkuk, or at least credits his priestly tradition with the “ownership” of Habakkuk, son of Joshua, from the tribe of Levi. Whether this is the prophet whose

\[\text{209} \quad \text{August Bludau, Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und Ihr Verhältniss zum massorethischen Text (Frieburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1897), 192.}\]

\[\text{210} \quad \text{Collins, Daniel, 409, 411, 418.}\]

\[\text{211} \quad \text{Cf. Moore, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions, 133.}\]

\[\text{212} \quad \text{It should be noted that Old Greek v. 1 does not say Habakkuk was a Levite (Λευιτης), but, rather, was from the tribe of Levi, as was Aaron. Delcor, Daniel, 280 suggests that the priestly status of Habakkuk was deduced from Hab 3:19b. He notes that Lives of the Prophets 12:1 derives him from the tribe of Simeon. A similar Septuagint text may shed some light on the reason for making the seemingly redundant connection between a priest and his connection to the tribe of Levi. In a unique colophon among Biblical texts, the Septuagint Esth 10:31 refers to one Dositheus δαμασκηνός.}\]
name is given to Hab is not really relevant. What is relevant for our discussion is that this superscription is clearly priestly. This puts this Daniel story within a priestly tradition. In fact, the OG story as a whole seems to be a priestly conflict story rather than a courtier conflict story. Daniel the priest is pitted against the priests of Babylon (OG 9, 15-17, 19, 21; Th 8, 9, 11, 15, 21) in a story that is more in line with Dan 3 and 6 than with the other tales.

Prince refers to this passage, but disregards it as a confusion with the “Levite mentioned [sic] Ezra viii. 2; Neh. x.6.” The Daniel in those passages was not a Levite, however, as will be shown below. Nor should the Ezra and Neh passages be so easily dismissed. If he is correct, however, then it is significant that so early after Dan

---

213 See Moore, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions, 132.

214 J. Schüpphaus, “Das Verhältnis von LXX- und Theodotion-Text in den apokryphen Zusätzen zum Danielbuch,” ZAW 83 (1971): 55-56 also notes that in addition to the difference in the texts in the introduction, the Theodotion text is different from the Old Greek at v. 22. There, after Daniel has exposed the appetite of the statue of Bel as that of the priests of Bel and their families, the King presents Daniel with the food that the priests had taken to their homes, ... καὶ τὴν δακτύλιν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐδώκε τῷ Δανηλα... Schüpphaus suggests that Daniel was here acting in his capacity as a priest who received the holy food. This seems unlikely, however. The priests of Bel had been exposed as charlatans and Bel thereby had been shown to be no god. The “offerings” were therefore stripped of all religious connotation and became simply food and Daniel became the recipient of the gracious, grateful act of the king.

was finalised a connection was made with the priest(s) in those passages. This would support the possibility that Daniel was intended to be thought of as a priest in the stories as we have them.

Based on our discussion, we would conclude that the superscription to Bel is early evidence of a tradition about a Daniel who was a priest. It also is evidence that this set of stories circulated among priests. There is evidence that the Habakkuk material was not part of the original story, but the fact that this material is in the Old Greek shows that it was part of the tradition by the second century BCE.

The Daniel of Qumran

Although several documents from Qumran seem related to the “Daniel tradition”, only one, the Prayer of Nabonidus, may offer any insight into the early development of one of the Daniel stories, i.e., 3:31-4:34. The Prayer of Nabonidus is an Aramaic document dating from the third to first century BCE, depending on whether or not one thinks it is a forerunner of the story in Dan. Milik thought the two stories were linked and he argues that the tradition predates Dan because it is more

216 See J. J. Collins, “4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar,” in Qumran Cave 4: XVII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 3, G. J. Brooke et al., in consultation with J. C. VanderKam (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) for the critical edition with full bibliography. The pseudo-Daniel material 4QPsDan (see J. J. Collins and P. Flint, “Pseudo-Daniel,” in Qumran Cave 4: XVII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 3, G. J. Brooke et al., in consultation with J. C. VanderKam (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)) seems to be based upon the Daniel of Dan 7-11 more than the stories in 1-6, although the court setting of 1-6 is utilized. Daniel stands before a king and relates the history of the world beginning at least with Noah and ending in the future, much like the Animal Apoc. does, although from a different narrative vantage point and without the allegory.

likely that the obscure Nabonidus was replaced by the well-known Nebuchadnezzar than *vice versa*.²¹⁸

The extant fragments of the story lack several of the features of the *Dan* story.²¹⁹ Vermes argues that we cannot tell whether this is a forerunner because of these differences. What we find interesting is that, in the beginning of the story, which has survived (it has a heading), the אֱל who heals Nabonidus is unnamed,²²⁰ and simply referred to as מֶל. If it is an earlier version of the story, then the name Daniel was attached to the story at some later time, possibly when the name of the king was changed.²²¹

The Daniel of Josephus

The treatment of *Dan* by Josephus is selective,²²² although he deals with *Dan* more than any other “prophet”.²²³ We learn nothing about the possible origins of


²¹⁹ E.g., the epistolary framework, on which cf. Lust, “Septuagint of Daniel 4-5”, 41-42.

²²⁰ Contra Milik who restored יְנִי to frg. 4.4 (Collins, “4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar”, 92, 93).

²²¹ Given the fragmentary nature of this material, it is possible that the יְנִי was later named and we simply lack that portion of the story.

²²² *Antiquities* 10.186-281; 11.337 covers *Dan* 1-6 and 8 in 10.186-274. He leaves 7 and 9-10 unaccounted for and uses only a few details from 11-12 in 10.271 (the number of days) and 10.275f. He does not deal with any of the “additions” (compared to the MT of *Dan*).

Daniel, however. Josephus says simply that Daniel, Azariah, Mishael and Hananiah were relatives from the royal line, being descendants of Zedekiah (*Antiquities* 10,186.188). This detail is not likely an independent tradition. Begg shows how Josephus focuses on details in Daniel’s life that parallel his because of “…the perception of a far-reaching kinship between himself and the ancient seer, (as well as the desire to underscore the affinities between them in the minds of the readers)…”  

Begg compared various parallels and relationships between the two and notes the relationship of lineage: Daniel and his friends were ἐυγενεστατοῦ (well born) and of the γένος of Zedekiah (*Antiquities* 10, 186.188); and Josephus was γένος…όυκ ἀσιμου (Life 1; War 5,419), and of the royal γένος (Life 2). This parallel could well have been extrapolated from Dan 1: 3 and 6.  

Josephus characteristically makes this sort of amplification.

He may have been aware of the tradition found in the OG of Bel about Daniel being a priest. Steussy suggests on the basis of *Antiquities* 10, 265 that Josephus believed Daniel was a priest. The material in question does not say that Daniel was a priest, only that “the one to whom this fortress has been entrusted is a Jewish priest and...

---


225 Hare (OTP II, 389 n. 4a) suggests that by combining Dan 1:3, 6 with Isa 39:7 Josephus determined that Daniel was a member of the royal family as did other Jewish traditions (so also Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, Eng. ed. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1936-1947), VI, 414. 448).

226 Bruce, “Josephus and Daniel”, 148.

227 He does seem to have used the Old Greek, Bruce. “Josephus and Daniel”, 160-61 n. 3.

this continues right up to today” (καὶ ὁ ταυτήν πεπιστευμένος Ἰούδαῖος ἐστιν ἱερεὺς καὶ τούτο γίνεται μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας). This may imply that Daniel was a priest, because it jumps from Daniel being the owner (10.264) to the continuing tradition of the occupier being a Jewish priest, but that is not a clear implication. This could be part of Josephus’ expanding on such a parallel with his own life, for he himself claims to have been a priest, and of royalty (War 3.352; Life 2). Some scholars point out that in Antiquities 10.267, 269 and 277 Josephus refers to Daniel leaving behind βιβλία, γράψας and συγγράψας in which “he made plain that his ability to prophesy was accurate and precise” (τὸ τῆς προφητείας αὐτοῦ ἀκριβὲς καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον ἐποίησε δήλον). The plurals βιβλία, γράψας, and συγγράψας could refer to the additions found in the Greek versions. However, Begg links them to Josephus’ having written various works and by attributing to Daniel many writings he had hoped to further the parallels with himself. There is a third possibility, however. At Qumran there was discovered a Danielic prophecy (4QpsDan, on which see note 216) in which the name of the seer is Daniel. Whereas Josephus focuses on how Daniel “made plain that his ability to prophesy was accurate and precise”, the deuterocanonical additions do not fit, because none contains prophecies. The Qumran material does fit, however, for it imitates the vaticinia ex eventu material in Dan 8 and 11. Such material could have been known to Josephus, but without more primary source data than we have, this must remain mere conjecture.

---


Conclusion

Based upon our investigations we have concluded that there was a tradition from a priestly circle in the third to second century BCE of a priest named Daniel. This tradition was linked to Dan through the stories related in Bel, and may be reflected in Josephus. Secondly, we concluded that there is evidence for a pre-Dan version of chapter 4, in which an unnamed Jewish healer figures prominently. The proximity in time to the final version of Dan indicates that the name Daniel was added late to stories that may have been nameless or had other names. Finally, we noted that Josephus claimed that Daniel was of royal descent, although that tradition seems to be a deduction from Isa 39:7 and Dan 1:3, 6.

Other Daniels

In addition to the Daniels discussed to this point, there are other Daniels that have been, or may be, linked to Dan: a son of David (1 Chr 3:1); one or two priests among those who returned with Nehemiah (Ezra 8:2; Neh 10:7); and a translator of the Septuagint (Ep. Arist. 49). We will now consider each of these in turn to determine whether they may hold some key to understanding the origins of the Daniel figure in Dan.

David’s Son

In the Masoretic text of 1 Chr 3:1 there is a son of David ִתַּלְאָה. The occurrence of the name here is supported by Josephus (Antiquities 7.21) who has the name דָּנֵי, and by Codex Vaticanus, which has דָּנֵי. In Codex Alexandrinus, however, we find דָּנְי. In 2 Sam 3:3, the source of the 1 Chr material, the Masoretic Text has the name דָּנֵי, a hapax legomenon. The Targum, Vulgate (Chelaab), and Syriac (בַּלְכָּב) seem to support the Masoretic Text. Aquila, Symmachus
and Theodotion all read Ἀβτα (Athia). As with Codex Alexandrinus at 1 Chr 3:1, however, Codex Vaticanus reads Δαλουα (Δαλουα), which is seemingly supported by 4QSam, where, unfortunately, the text is broken: [...] The strongest case can be made for Δαλουα as the original form, given its occurrence as a Greek transliteration in witnesses to the Greek of both passages and in the Qumran document. How the other forms arose, however, is difficult to explain. This occurrence of Ἐλον, therefore, is not to be considered with much seriousness. Even if it was the original reading, little could be gained from the passage that could enlighten us on the origins of the “Daniel tradition”.

231 So 1 Sam 8:2 et passim. At 2 Kgs 12:2 Ἀβτα is rendered with Ἀβτα where Ἄ may have been mistaken for an Ἄ. It is more likely that an Ἄ has been mistaken for a Ἄ, given that the other versions are consistent with the Greek. If Klostermann (see n. 234) is correct and the original form was ΔΑΔΟΥΙΑ = Ἐλον, or more likely Ἐλον (2 Chr 20:37), the form Ἀβτα = Ἐλον could be a deliberate change from what could be ‘mistaken’ as an offensive name, i.e., a change from Ἐλον as family relation = ‘uncle’ to Ἐλον family member = ‘father’ to avoid Ἐλον = ‘lover, betrothed’. This was suggested to me by my colleague, Timothy R. Ashley.

232 Cf. 1 Sam 26:6 et passim, Σαρουα = Δαλοὐα; 1 Chr 3:24; 27:9, Οδουα and 5:24; 9:7, Ωδουα = Δαλοὐα; 1 Chr 4:36, Ιασουα = Δαλοὐα. On the ending ὑνι-., cf., e.g., 1 Chr 3:24; 27:9, Οδουα = ὑνι- (K)/ ὑνι (Q); 1 Chr 25:4, 13, Βουκίας = ὑνι.

233 So BHS.

234 Klostermann’s (1887, so Samuel Rolles Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions and Facsimilis of Inscriptions and Maps (Winona Lake: Alpha Publishers, 1984), 246) explanation that ΔΑΔΟΥΙΑ is a corruption of ΔΑΔΟΥΙΑ cannot be sustained in the light of the Qumran evidence. The opposite could be the case, which could explain the occurrence of Ἀβτα, but there is no evidence of the form Δαλουα. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text, 246 explains as having arisen out of ditography from the first three letters of the next word, δοι. This is probably correct. It necessitates the dropping of the form Ἐλον (not Δαλοὐα) through haplography because of the preceding word Ἐλον. How could have arisen is even more uncertain, although metathesis and confusion with the beginning of the next word may explain it.
The Translator (Aristeas 49)

The Ep. Arist. was most likely written in Greek by a Jew sometime between 250 BCE and 100 CE. This "letter" refers to a Daniel (§49) who was one of the 72 translators who went to Alexandria to translate the Law during the reign of Ptolemy II (285-247 BCE). He is said to be from the "ninth tribe" of Israel, which is not named and therefore cannot be determined.

Wahl asserts that this Daniel (together with those of Jub 4:20 and 1 Enoch 6:7; 69:2) is part of the post-Dan tradition of Daniel. This, however, is pushing the concept of the history of a tradition too far! As we have shown, there were more Daniels than those of the traditions with which we are concerned. Also, there is nothing in the list of names to which this name belongs that shows any connection to the tradition of an Exilic or ancient Daniel.

The Priest

In Ezra 8:2 and Neh 10:7 one or two priests named Daniel are listed among the exiles that came back to Palestine with Nehemiah. Davies thinks that these references are too late to be considered as viable candidates for the names in Dan—and they are late. According to the text these individuals would have returned in the time of Artaxerxes I (465-424 BCE). Even the longest reasonable life span for the exilic

---


236 See, e.g., the lists in Gen 35:22-26; 1 Chr 2:1-2; Ezek 48:1-29.

237 Although he cites this as "ix 2" he must mean "lxix 2".

238 Wahl, "Noah, Daniel und Hiob", 544 n. 10.

239 Davies. Daniel, 40.
Daniel could not fit within that time period (Nebuchadnezzar reigned 605-562 BCE)! However, there did seem to be a Jewish tradition in which Daniel returned home.\footnote{Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, Vol. 4, 350; Vol 6, 437, notes some traditions that have Daniel die in Mesopotamia, and some that give the impression that he died in Palestine.} Such a tradition could have been based upon 2 Chr 36:20, which could be understood to refer to the deportees returning once Cyrus had taken over; but, of course, this does not help with the problem of the date. A hermeneutic such as that found in the genealogy of Jesus in Matt, where Rahab was the mother of Boaz (1:5), would allow many of the individuals surveyed with these names to be candidates for the young men in Dan. In fact, in 4 Ezra, the Latin apocalypse, at 12:10-11, Daniel is referred to by the Most High as Ezra’s “brother”, which could be understood literally, and would make them contemporaries\footnote{Lacocque, Daniel, 3 links the Ezek and Dan figures through Daniel the priest.} It should also be remembered that this priest is about one millennium nearer to the time of the character of Dan than is the Dn’il of Aqht! It seems more reasonable, then, to make a connection between the exilic and post-exilic figures than between the exilic and antediluvian figures.\footnote{See The Daniel of the Septuagint, 92ff. Both J. G. Gammie, “On the intention and sources of Daniel I-VI.” VT 31 (1981): 285; and Ernst Haag, Die Errettung Daniels aus der Löwengrube: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der biblischen Danieltradition (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983), 127-32 attribute parts of the redaction of Dan to a priestly tradition.} Also, as we have already demonstrated, there was a tradition about Daniel as a priest.\footnote{See The Daniel of the Septuagint, 92ff. Both J. G. Gammie, “On the intention and sources of Daniel I-VI.” VT 31 (1981): 285; and Ernst Haag, Die Errettung Daniels aus der Löwengrube: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der biblischen Danieltradition (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983), 127-32 attribute parts of the redaction of Dan to a priestly tradition.}

**Excursus: Dan and Chr-Ezra-Neh**

There is also another compelling reason for considering this priest seriously: the Jewish names of Daniel’s friends are also found in Chr-Ezra-Neh. This by itself is significant, all the names appearing in the same work. It is even more significant given
the relationship between *Chr-Ezra-Neh* and *Dan*. Before we consider the occurrences of the names in those works, I will set out the connections.

In order to substantiate several claims in this dissertation about the relationship between *Dan* and *Chr-Ezra-Neh*, it is necessary to show where the dependencies lie. Dependence on *Chr-Ezra-Neh* is evident in the latest stages of the book, in the historical introduction to the book, and in the latest additions to the book in chapters 10-12 and in chapter 9.

*Dan* 1:1-2 & *2 Chr* 36:6-10, 18

The first connection between *Chr-Ezra-Neh* and *Dan* is found in the first two verses of *Dan*. Koch\(^{243}\) notes about this introduction to *Dan* that it was clearly written for a Jewish audience with knowledge of Jewish history, given the use of the regnal year of a Jewish rather than a Babylonian king as the reference point for the historical setting (*cf. Jdt* 1:1, and *1 Macc* 1:1). Its editorial nature is also clear by the lack of reference to Jehoiakim in the rest of the book. As such, it seems safe to conclude that it is a late addition to the chapter or, more likely, the book; at a minimum, it serves with the concluding time reference in 1:21 as an introduction to chapters 1-6/10-12, given the introduction of the theme of the temple vessels, which figure prominently in chapter 5, and the reference to the time span of Daniel’s life into the reign of Cyrus (1:21; 6:28; 10:1).

In the wording and concepts of the verses there is evidence of a common tradition with *Chr-Ezra-Neh*, especially *2 Chr* 36:6-7, and 19. Scholars have made connections between these portions generally, and dependence posited.\(^{244}\) Only the

---


\(^{244}\) As far back as Keil, *Daniel*, 58ff. and as recently as I. Kalimi, and J. D. Purvis. “King Jehoiachin and the vessels of the Lord’s house in biblical literature,” *CBQ* 56 (1994): 449-57; and I. Kalimi, “History of interpretation: the book of
first part of 2 Chr 36:6 has a parallel in 2 Kgs and Jer; 2 Chr 36:6b-7 and Dan 1:1-2, however, have information that is found nowhere else, i.e., that Jehoiakim and vessels from the temple were taken to Babylon. 2 Kgs 23:36-24:5 mentions the subjugation, but not the capture and deportation of Jehoiakim, and makes no mention of a looting of the temple in his day. Only the deportation of his successor, Jehoiachin, and the removal of, and destruction of temple vessels at that time is mentioned (24:10-15) with parallel in 2 Chr 36:9-10.

A review of phrases in Dan 1:1-2 highlights the following relationships. The introductory date formula is limited mostly to Dan, Ezra, and Chr, occurring in these books nine of 11 times (but not in 2 Chr 36). 245 occurs one third of the times in Dan, Ezra, and Chr (55/91x), twice in chapter 36:20, 22. The form נבואותאצלם (with the plene וַוָּה) that is found in this verse is unique in Dan. The non-aleph forms נבואויותאצלם and נבואותאצלם are used the other times. 246 The aleph form matches that of the Chr passage, but not that of the Kgs passage, which uses נבואותאצלם. The phrase יִנְהַגֵּי אֱלֹהִים (with the plene וַוָּה) is used 7/22 times in Dan and Chr-Ezra-Neh (1x in 2 Chr 36). 247 The phrase יִנְהַגֵּי אֱלֹהִים is used 10/13 times in Dan and Chr-Ezra-

Chronicles in Jewish tradition from Daniel to Spinoza,” RB 105 (1998): 9, who states: “Thus, there is no doubt that the author of the introductory account in the book of Daniel was absolutely dependent upon the earlier narrative in Chronicles.”

245 Jer 52:31; Esth 2:16; Dan 1:1; 2:1; 8:1; Ezra 4:24; 6:15; 1 Chr 26:31; 2 Chr 3:2; 16:1, 12. Collins, Daniel. 133 suggests that the redundant phrase נבואותאצלם can be explained as a combination of two traditional formulas represented by 2 Kgs 1:17 and 2 Chr 16:1.

246 2:28, 46; 3:1; 3:2; 3, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, 24, 26, 28, 31 [4:1]; 4:1 [4], 15 [18], 25 [28], 28 [31]; 30 [33], 31 [34]; 5:2; and 11:18; 2:1, 1; 3:3; 4:34 [37]: 5:11, 18.

Neh (2x in 2 Chr 36). The phrase נֵבְעַד נֶבֶר is used 3/8 times in Dan and Chr-Ezra-Neh (but not in 2 Chr 36).

Why might Dan 1 use 2 Chr 36? The vessels are not mentioned in 2 Kgs 24:1 where Jehoiakim’s subjugation to Nebuchadnezzar is recorded. Also, in the accounts in 2 Kgs and Jer, many of the vessels are said to have been destroyed for their precious metal; in 2 Kgs 24:13, after Jehoiachin’s capture, specifically the gold ones, and seemingly also in 25:13-16 // Jer 52:17-23. However, Dan 5:2, 3, 23 needs the gold vessels that Nebuchadnezzar took to be in Babylon for Belshazzar to use at his banquet. “Obviously, this author of Daniel preferred to accept the Chronicler’s viewpoint about the moving of the Temple’s vessels intact to Babylon, their return to Zion with Sheshbazzar and the continuity of their usage in the Second Temple (2 Chr 36:6-7; Jeremiah 27:19-22; 28:3, 6; Ezra 1:7-11; 5:13-15; 6:5)”.

Different from the Chronicler, however, in the narrative of Dan the vessels that are taken to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar and then used by Belshazzar are not said to have been returned to Jerusalem. It may have been thought sufficient to imply this in the larger narrative context. In Ezra 1:7-11 it is Cyrus who issued the decree to return

---

248 Jer 27:16; 28:3, 6; Dan 1:2; Ezra 1:7; 8:33; Neh 13:9; 1 Chr 10:10; 24:14; 28:24, 24; 36:7, 18.

249 1 Kgs 1 4:26; 15:18; 2 Kgs 14:14; 18:15; Mal 3:10; Dan 1:2; Neh 10:39; 2 Chr 12:9.


251 Even Haag, Errettung Daniels, 56, accepts the reference in 5:2 as original in his complex redaction analysis.

252 Kalimi. Cf. Ackroyd, “Temple vessels”, 177-80, who notes how in 2 Chr 36:10 the choicest temple vessels were taken with Jehoiachin to Babylon and in 36:18 all final vessels were removed in the final devastation of Jerusalem. This is reversed in Ezra 1:7-11: 7:19; 8:26-28, 33-34; Neh 10:40 [39]; 13: 5, 9. The Chronicler provides the continuity needed in the post-exilic era through these vessels and through the priesthood and Levitical orders.
the vessels to their rightful place in Jerusalem, and in *Ezra* 6:1-12 it is a Darius who enforces the decree of Cyrus. In *Dan* Cyrus is the closing thought of the stories (1:21; 6:28), and the last king mentioned in the book as an historical marker (10:1). Reference is also made in *Dan* 9:1 to a Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, a Mede (cf. 6:8). This is doubtless a confusion of the real order, which is found correctly in *Ezra* 4:5. It is also probably an attempt to link this Darius and the fictitious Darius of chapter 6. Obviously the continuity theme of the vessels was not sufficiently important to the final authors of *Dan* to be mentioned explicitly, but in a context where the Chronicler’s tradition would have been known, the mere mention of the names of these Persians may have been sufficient to imply the return of the vessels.

In addition to needing the vessels in Babylon for the Belshazzar story, another reason for using the theme of the vessels in *Dan* 1-6 may be the actual historical context out of which chapters 7-12 came, i.e., the Maccabean period. In these second century visions, the temple is assumed to have been in operation, doubtless using vessels returned after the decree of Cyrus. However, Antiochus defiled the temple by entering it and robbing it (*1 Macc* 1:21-23; *2 Macc* 5:16), as had happened in Daniel’s day (1:1-2; 9:17). Thus, in 8:9-14; 11:31; 12:11 a new restoration and cleansing of the temple is predicted. Just as defilement and restoration had happened in the time of Daniel and the early post-exilic period, so it could happen in the writers’ time.

---

Hymnic insertions and *Chr*

Kratz argued for a Persian date for *Dan* 1-6. He noted the similarity of the poetic passages in *Dan* 2:20-23; 3:31-33; 4:31-32; 6:27-28 and biblical hymns such as *Ps* 145, but in particular *1 Chr* 29:10-13; and *2 Chr* 20:6.254

**Dan 9 & Chr-Ezra-Neh**

At the turn of the last century, Bayer noted a number of connections between *Dan* 9 and *Chr-Ezra-Neh*.255 In all he argued that there are at least 34 dependencies upon material from *Chr-Ezra-Neh* in the 16 verses of the prayer of *Dan*. These borrowings are mostly from Solomon’s prayer at the dedication of the temple, found in *2 Chr* 6, the prayer of Ezra found in *Ezra* 9, and the prayer of Nehemiah found in *Neh* 1.

The prayers are each a “prose prayer of *penitence*”, which is also found in *Ps* 106, *Ezra* 9:6-15, *Neh* 9:5-37, the “words of the Luminaries” from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and *1 Bar* 1:15-3:8.256 The prayer in *Ezra* is for the sin of intermarriage, and *Neh* 9 follows the reading of the law. Both prayers have their narrative setting in Palestine. *Neh* 1, *Dan* 9, and *1 Bar* have their narrative setting in Babylon, and arise out of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and the exile of its inhabitants in Babylon. *1 Bar* seems dependent upon *Dan*, in part at least, because it repeats the mistake of thinking that Belshazzar was the son of Nebuchadnezzar. *Neh* 1 and *Dan* 9 both arise out of concern for the state of the city of Jerusalem, and seek the end of the desolation. *1 Bar* arises out of concern for the sin that led to the exile. *Dan* 9 and *Neh* 1, therefore, have the following in common: the narrative setting is during the exile in Babylon; they are prepared for by


fasting and other rites of mourning (Dan 9:3 and Neh 1:4); the focus of concern is the continuing desolate state of Jerusalem; and they contain prose prayers of penitence.

It is a matter of debate whether the prayer in Dan is original to the chapter. However, the work of Jones, Gilbert, and Fishbane is sufficient to show that the prayer, if not original to the author, was at the least included purposely by the author and worked into the context. In Chapter 5, we will also show that the authors of 7-12 used scriptures in a way very similar to that found in the prayer.

Possibly the clearest example of dependence upon the Chr-Ezra-Neh material is the extended opening to the prayer in Dan 9:4, which comes from Neh 1:5. Both prayers begin with ascriptions of praise that cannot be merely coincidental.

Although this may have elements that are found elsewhere, these two occurrences of this exact combination are the only ones in the Hebrew Scriptures, although the end of the prayer at Neh 9:32, has similarities. In addition, the prayer at Neh 1 closes with a petition that begins with (1:11), just as the prayer begins in Dan 9:4. These two occurrences of are the only ones in the Masoretic Text.

---

257 Collins, Daniel, 347-48 reviews the literature and arguments.


The year in which Daniel prays is the “first year of Darius”\(^{262}\). 2Chr 36:21-22 makes the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy the first year of Cyrus’ reign, when he allowed the exiles to return. Ezra 4:23-24 notes that the work begun under Cyrus was stopped and did not resume until the second year of the reign of a Darius, the same time that Haggai (Hag 1:1; 2:10) and Zechariah (Zech 1:1), (both mentioned at Ezra 5:1) are supposed to have begun their work.

It hardly seems accidental that in Dan 9 Daniel prays in the first year of the reign of a Darius, and that in Ezra, Hag, and Zech, the fulfilment begins to happen in the second year of the reign of a Darius. Dan, then, could be implying that the Chronicler’s interpretation of Jeremiah’s prophecy is incorrect. By placing Daniel one year before the beginning of the work of Haggai and Zechariah, well after the decree of Cyrus, he seems to intimate that the activity of these prophets and the activities of the Ezra account are, in part, the result of Daniel’s successful intercession.\(^{263}\) This scenario fits well with Fishbane’s proposal that the occasion of the prayer matches the theology that arose out of the union of Jer 25:9-12 (explicitly referred to in Dan 9:2) and Lev 26:32-35 in 2Chr 36:18-21.\(^{264}\) The Lev material, he argues, is taken up also in Dan 9:17-20. He suggests that by so joining these texts, the writer “wished thereby to suggest that the old promise of doom for covenantal disobedience was being fulfilled. It may now be added that the key purpose of Daniel’s prayer was not solely to suggest that old curses had been fulfilled. It was also to emphasize that more hopeful side of

---

\(^{262}\) See below on some of the problems associated with the names of Persian kings.

\(^{263}\) This, of course, would mean that the writer of chapter 9 did not believe that the Darius the Mede of chapter 6 was the same as his “Darius son of Ahasuerus, by birth a Mede.”

Lev. 26, which announced that repentance could terminate the severe decree." In this way the prayer of Dan 9 becomes the “fulfilment and antidote” to the recasting of Lev 26:27-45 as a prophecy of doom.

The parallels noted above and the choice of the opening words from Neh 1 seem intended purposely to connect the two, such that the reader realizes that the prayer of Daniel begins in the time of Nehemiah, what would not be completed for 490 years (7 cycles of jubilees).

Dan 9:24-27 & 2 Chr 36:21

In addition to influence from 2 Chr 36:6-10, v. 21 of that chapter seems also to have been utilized in Dan 9:24-27. The prayer was occasioned (9:2) by Daniel’s pondering the meaning of Jeremiah’s reference to a 70 year exile (Jer 25:11; 29:10). As Fishbane shows, however, the Jeremian prophecy is combined with Lev 26:34-35 to be understood as referring to seventy sabbatical cycles, or ten jubilees (Lev 25:1-55). Thus, the angel tells Daniel that the duration of the exile was really only the first jubilee cycle of 49 years. The ‘real’ fulfilment of the prophecy is then put off into the distant future, the time of the writers of Dan 7-12.

Dan 11:2 & Ezra-Neh

The scheme of kings assumed by Dan 11:2 is probably based upon those mentioned in Ezra-Neh. It is well known that the knowledge of the Babylonian and Persian history is at best sketchy on the part of the writers of Dan, especially when compared to the detailed knowledge of the Hellenistic era. In Dan, for example, Belshazzar, not Nabonidus, is Nebuchadnezzar’s son and successor; Darius the Mede is

---

266 Fishbane. Biblical Interpretation, 482-84.
a fictitious character;\(^\text{267}\) and the Darius of chapter 9 is either Darius the Mede or one of
the Persians (although of Median descent!). Given such details as these, it is little
wonder that the Persian era is thought to have had as few as 4 kings, when in fact there
were 13: Cyrus (560/59-530), Cambyses (530-522), Smerdis (522), Darius I (522-486),
Xerxes I (486-465), Artaxerxes I (465-424), Xerxes II (424), Sogdianos (424-423),
Darius II (423-405/4), Artaxerxes II (405/4-359/58), Artaxerxes III (359/58-338/37),
Artaxerxes IV (338/37-336), Darius III (336-330). If one relies upon the
names referred to in the Hebrew Bible, the names of Cambyses, Smerdis and
Sogdianos have to be dropped from the list. One is then left with Cyrus, Darius (x3),
Xerxes (x2), and Artaxerxes (x4). For writers whose knowledge of the period was
sketchy at best, these well-used names would clearly be confusing! To complicate
matters even more, chapters 7-12 could well come from a variety of visionaries and
redactors. Thus, the reference to Persia being represented by a four winged leopard in
Dan 7:6\(^\text{268}\) is not necessarily indicative of how the writer of 11:2 viewed matters, and
should not necessarily be used to resolve the matter.

\(^{267}\) See L. L. Grabbe, “Another look at the Gestalt of “Darius the Mede”,” CBQ
50 (1988): 198-211 for a critique of three attempts to find this figure. Darius the Mede
may have come into being as a figure to fulfil Jer 51:11, 28 and Isa 13:17, which make
the ‘Medes’ the conquerors of the Babylonians (Harold Henry Rowley, Darius the
Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel, (Cardiff: University of
Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman, eds. Meyers, Carol L. and
O’Connor, Michael Patrick (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 290) and as the
logical deduction from what could be learned of the return from exile through a study
of the prophets Zech and Hag who “return” and begin restoring the temple under a
Darius (so H. F. D. Sparks, “On the origin of ‘Darius the Mede’ at Daniel V.31,” JTS

\(^{268}\) E.g., James A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the
Book of Daniel (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), 423; Charles, Daniel, 273; Bernhard
Haßberger, Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis: Eine Formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8
Scholars resolve whether 11:2 assumes 5 or 4 kings differently. Whereas the vision is dated to the reign of Cyrus,\(^{269}\) we take the reference to “another (דֵּלֶד) king” as being subsequent to him, and thus, with דֵּלֶד “the fourth”, there are five in all: Cyrus, three more, and then the fourth.\(^{270}\) Whether these are specific kings or not is also open to question,\(^{271}\) but there is a solution that relies upon Ezra-Neh, which is a more reasonable approach than looking for complicated solutions.

Four names are used for Persian kings in the Bible: Cyrus, Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, all of which are used in Ezra 4:5-7 (King Cyrus of Persia, King Darius of Persia, Ahasuerus (Xerxes), and King Artaxerxes).\(^{272}\) In addition to Ezra 4:5-7, however, reference is made to a Darius, a Persian in Neh 12:22, who could be understood as following Artaxerxes, given the narrative sequence. It also seems to have been known that the last king of Persia was named Darius, as is related in 1 Macc 1:1, and this would fit with the last Darius from Neh. Based upon Ezra-Neh, then, we

\(^{269}\) The reference to Darius in 11:1 may complicate this somewhat. MT, Peshitta and Vulgate all read Darius, however, both Theodotion and Old Greek read Cyrus. The latter should be regarded as a later scribal change based upon the association of Cyrus with the return of the Jews. In Dan Darius is king under whom Jews came into favour 6:25-28 (Charles, Daniel, 272-73) and it was the Medes who overthrew the Babylonians (5:31; 6:1).

\(^{270}\) Dan 11:1 clearly refers to Darius the Mede, and then goes on to refer to kings in Persia who would follow. This reference to Darius the Mede seems to be a reference back to a time previous to when Michael came to help this interpreting angel. It would seem that the angels were perceived to be fighting with the angel of the ruling power of the day. This would then give the sequence of Media (when this angel helped Michael), Persia (with which this angel was fighting, with Michael’s help), and Greece, which would follow. The three additional kings, therefore refer to three after Cyrus, and then the fourth to follow them.

\(^{271}\) Goldingay, Daniel, 294-95.

have a series of Persian kings as follows: Cyrus, Darius the Persian (the one of Median
descent in chapter 9?), Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes, and the Darius whom Alexander the
Great defeated (cf. 11:2\textsuperscript{273}).

Conclusion

Our analysis and review of literature has shown that there is a reasonable case
to be made for dependence upon the \textit{Chr-Ezra-Neh} material in chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9,
and 11. Granted even some of these, it is reasonable to suppose that the names for
Daniel, Mishael, Azariah, and Hananiah came from the lists of returnees in \textit{Ezra} and
\textit{Neh}.

\textbf{The names of the four in Chr-Ezra-Neh}

Throughout the Masoretic Text there are various individuals by these same
three names. There is, however, a predominance of them in \textit{Chr-Ezra-Neh}. In the
following examination we will concentrate only on names that the texts say were exilic
or post-exilic, such candidates as a writer in the fourth to second century BCE might
have thought good for use in stories about the exile (\textit{i.e.}, \textit{Dan} 1-6), or who exemplify
the attributes found in the \textit{Dan} stories.

The first name is $\text{דaniel}$. In \textit{Ezra} 8:2 a Daniel is listed prominently, after
Gershom, at the beginning of a list of “heads of families” who returned with Ezra from
Babylon to Jerusalem. This individual named Daniel may be the Daniel who appears
in a list of priests in \textit{Neh} 10:1-8. That Daniel was a priest from the line of Ithamar, the
fourth and youngest son of Aaron. This line of priests remained prominent after the
exile, if the \textit{1 Chr} 24:1-18 list, compiled in post-exilic times, is any indication. It

\textsuperscript{273} On the complications of the text and its understanding see Collins, \textit{Daniel}. 363.
seems both from *Ezra* 8:1 and 24 that this Daniel was the head of a family, even though he and the other two individuals that head the list have no men listed with them. Williamson suggests that they lack accompanying lists in order to distinguish the first three names from the twelve that follow.\footnote{Hugh G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Waco, TX: Words Books, 1985), 110.}

The name נַעֲנָן and its related forms, נַעֲנָא and נַעֲנָה, is popular in the *Chr-Ezra-Neh* writings,\footnote{Outside the *Chr-Ezra-Neh* writings and *Dan* the name נַעֲנָן occurs only in *Jer* 28:1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15 bis, 17, 37:13. נַעֲנָא occurs in *Jer* 36:12; *1 Chr* 25:23; *2 Chr* 26:11. נַעֲנָה occurs in *1 Kgs* 16:1, 7; *1 Chr* 25:4, 25; *2 Chr* 16:7, 19:2; 20:34; *Ezra* 10:20; *Neh* 1:2; 7:2; 12:36.} and seems generally to have been a popular name in the post-exilic period as its prominence in some of the Elephantine papyri\footnote{Arnold Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 30-31; C. G. Tuland, “Hanani--Hananiah,” *JBL* 77 (1958): 157-61.} and in *4Q477*\footnote{Cf. Florentino García Martínez, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Leiden/Grand Rapids: Brill/William B. Eerdmans, 1997-1998). 958-59.} would suggest. In *1 Chr* 3:19, 21, a post-exilic Hananiah was the son of Zerubbabel and great-grandson of Jehoiachin, and thus of royal descent. In *Ezra* 10:28 another Hananiah was a returned exile said to have been among those who intermarried with foreign wives. He was from the exiles (10:7, 16), but was possibly not from among the group that returned with Ezra. Williamson thinks that the returned exiles, of whom this Hananiah was a member, could have been the district governors referred to in *Neh* 3:9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 18.\footnote{Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 130.} In the *Ezra* 10 list of names, this Hananiah is clearly not a priest or Levite, because the priests and Levites were listed in vv. 18-24. However, this individual is one of the group who signed their names to keep the covenant, a theme relevant to *Dan*. In the lists of those who helped build the Jerusalem wall in *Neh* there
are another two Hananiah's. The first in 3:8 was a perfume maker, the other in v. 30, the son of a man named Shelemiah. It is possible, although not probable, that yet another Hananiah in Neh 7:2 is the brother of Nehemiah to whom reference is made just before as הלל (see also 1:2). This use of two names for one person requires that the tranständigm be considered an explicative. Williamson, however, argues against them being the same and argues for the existence of two leaders. In the light of 1 Chr 25:4, where both names are juxtaposed as the names of brothers, such a thing is possible, however. In Neh 10:24 [23] there is a Hananiah who is a leader of the people who signs his name to a covenant that binds him and others to follow the Law of God. In 12:12 a Hananiah is listed as a priest during the time of Joiakim (12:10, 12, 26), i.e., in the next generation after the return. So, with the exception of the latter, the various Hananiah's were not priests or Levites, but were prominent leaders of the people.

In Neh 8:4, הלל is not likely a priest, because usually when reference is made to priests they are noted as being such. Also, an examination of the names of the individuals associated with him in this passage shows that they were more likely elders than priests. Regardless his relation to the tribe of Levi, he is one of the men to stand up with Ezra at the reading of the law—and with him (v. 7) is an Azariah who was probably a priest, as we shall argue.

279 Tuland, “Hanani--Hananiah”, 160. See “Chapter 4” at discussion of 1:3 for more on the explicative vav.

280 Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, 266.

281 Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, 358.

282 Williamson, Ezra, Nehemiah, 288-89.

283 In Exod 6:22 and Lev 10:4, a son of Uzziel, a Kohathite of the tribe of Levi, has the name Mishael, although according to Num 3-4 he may have been a Levite.
The word like Hananiah, like Hananiah, has related names and together they seem to have been popular. In 1 Chr and in Ezra there are two parallel genealogies of Zadokite priests. Each has two related pre-exilic Azariahs, and in the 1 Chr list there may have been three originally. One genealogy, Ezra 7:1-5, is for Ezra in which one Azariah was his grandfather. The genealogy in 1 Chr 5:30-41 [6:1-14], however, is for Jehozadak who, according to Hag 1:1 and Zech 6:11, was the father of Joshua, the high priest in Jerusalem after the exile and whose grandfather was an Azariah. According to Ezra 3:2, 8, and 5:2, Joshua, together with Zerubbabel, addressed the problem of the destroyed altar and temple upon their return from exile. Joshua’s descendants were known as the house of Jediah, the family that heads the list of post-exilic priestly families mentioned in Ezra 2:36-39 and 10:18-22. In 1 Chr 24:7-18, this family comes second in the list of courses of priests, the first of whom was Jehoiarib, the descendant of the Hasmoneans (1 Macc 2:1).

---

284 Like the forms of Hananiah (see n. 275), מִנְיָן and מְנִיָן were not thought to be the same, at least when 2 Chr 21:2 was written. In 2 Kgs 15:1, 6, 7, 8, however, the two forms are interchanged. Outside the Chr-Ezra-Neh writings, מְנִיָן occurs in 2 Kgs 14:21; 15:1, 7, 17, 23, 27; Jer 43:2. מְנִיָן occurs in 1 Kgs 4:2, 5; 2 Kgs 15:6, 8; 2 Chr 15:1; 21:2; 22:6; 23:14; 26:17, 20; 28:12; 29:12; 31:10, 13. At least four bullae from Israel contain the name מְנִיָן (Y. Shiloh, and D. Tarler, “Bullae from the City of David: a hoard of seal impressions from the Israelite period,” BA 49 (1986): 202-04; T. Schneider, “Six biblical signatures: seals and impressions of six biblical personages recovered,” BAR 17 (1991): 33 n. 33).


286 There are two forms for this name: מְנִיָה and the shorter form, מְנִי (Ezra 3:2; 10:18).


288 It should be noted that Dequeker, “1 Chronicles XXIV”, 94-106 argues that 1 Chr was the creation of the Hasmoneans in an attempt to justify their claims to the
Other Azariahs were the leader(s) in Neh 3:23-24; 7:7; and 12:33. There was an Azariah in Neh 8:7 who stood with Ezra when he read the law, and this Azariah taught (ג antioxidי) the people the law. The passage does not say what his societal status was, but a comparison of this list of names with the groupings of the names of Levites and priests in 9:4-5; 10:9, 10, 11, 13; 11:16, 22; 12:1, 8, 24, 25, 41, and 42 shows that he could well have been a Levite or a priest, or could easily have been construed as such by later readers.

The Chr-Ezra-Neh material that has been discussed may well be the source for the names of the young men in Dan. In our opinion, it is the most probable source of the names. There is demonstrable dependence in Dan on Chr-Ezra-Neh. In two lists not far removed from one another in Neh all four names occur: in 8:4, 7; 10:7, and 24. In the books of Ezra and Neh the names occur at various places for priests, Levites, and leaders among the returned exiles. This is not a claim that these individuals are those found in the stories of Dan, for the gap in time is too great. It is a claim that they are the probable source of the names. If so, then, again there are cultic associations with many of the individuals with these names. Definitely, the name Daniel is used exclusively of a priest in the Chr-Ezra-Neh material. As shown above, there were other early Jewish traditions about Dan as a priest, which may be why the name Dan was chosen over other names, Ezra-Neh, for the leading figure in Dan. We contend with Behrmann, Delcor, and Steussy, therefore, that it is probable that the Daniel of Dan was named after the priest(s) in Ezra 8:2 and Neh 10:7.

Zadokite priesthood and thus legitimise their claims to the High Priesthood. He is not the first to argue this as he notes in the article.

289 Behrmann. Daniel, xvi.

290 Delcor. Daniel, 64.

Conclusion

In Exilic and post-Exilic times the use of the name Daniel was not overtly restricted to any “Daniel tradition”. One of the sons of David underwent a name change from Cileab to Daniel before making it into 1 Chr 3:1 from 2 Sam 3:3. One or two priests among the returnees with Nehemiah were named Daniel. Finally, a Daniel is listed among the translators of the Torah in the Ep. Arist. If we learn nothing else from these occurrences of the name, we do learn that, given the exilic to post-Exilic date of all this material and of Dan, merely linking characters from different traditions because they have the same name is tenuous, at best. This was clear in the case of the association that Wahl made between the Daniels of Dan and Ep. Arist.; but equally it should be applied to the linking of the Dn’il of Aqht with the Daniel of Dan. The name was used for more than just one person, whether fictitious or real.

We have argued also that, at least one other feature of our examination of the Daniel who was a priest commends itself to our attention. In Dan, the four loyal young Jews are named Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, and in Neh 8:4, 7; 10:7, 24 alone, in all extant literature that may be linked in any way with the development of Dan the four names appear together in close proximity. The question that remains is whether or not there is a connection between these passages. Two can be suggested.

The first possible connection is that the four boys were real individuals, and the later figures are possible namesakes. Given the present scholarly consensus about the historicity of the Daniel stories, it would take some startling new textual evidence to support this contention. Otherwise it can neither be proven nor disproven.

The second possible connection is that the Neh lists formed the pool of names from which one of the compilers/editors of the Dan stories in (1)2-6 drew names for the four Jewish boys. He could have had before him stories with various names; stories with the name Daniel and one with three unnamed boys; or a story with the names of
Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah and several with an unnamed hero or with heroes of various names; or stories with boys that had foreign names, such as Belteshazzar שֶׁרֶשׁ, Meshach מְשַׁךְ, and Abed-nego אֱֽבֶדְנָגָו, for which he wished to select appropriate Jewish names.

The question that must be asked, however, is: why these four names out of all the other possibilities? We cannot with any confidence suggest why the names Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah were chosen, although the meanings of the names may have been significant for the author/editor. We can suggest at least three reasons for choosing Daniel for the leading character in the stories and in the book. First, as we have argued elsewhere, the Daniel(s) of Ezra and Neh was (were) a priest(s) as the Daniel of Dan might be. Secondly, as noted in the discussion of the Daniel in Ezek, there are numerous parallels between the Daniel figures in Ezek and in Dan. Also, there are various links between Ezek and the later material in Dan. And, thirdly, it is possible that a connection lies in one of the themes of Dan 7, i.e., judgement, as expressed by the repetition of the noun יַד (7:10, 22, 26; cf. 4:34). Scholars agree that Dan 7 is the first addition to the (1) 2-6 compilation of stories, and it could be that the names were assigned when chapter 7 was added in the 3rd/2nd century BCE. Daniel’s name, then, would have been chosen both for its symbolic significance (“El has judged”), the characteristics of wisdom and righteousness exhibited in the references to a Daniel in Ezek 14 and 28, and because of the priestly position of the Ezra-Neh Daniel among returning exiles.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have considered the various characters with a name based upon the consonantsdn[y]l. Before considering the various characters, we considered the name itself. We concluded that its meaning is “El has judged.” and that the forms
with and without the internal yod were the same, the yod being a late (from the Exile on) *plene* spelling. The name occurs in documents from various times and places in the Ancient Near East. This being the case, we concluded that it was unwarranted simply to assume a connection between figures on the basis of the same name. Such an association should not be immediately ruled out, however, instead we argued that each case must be dealt with in detail and argued for or against on the basis of more evidence than just the name.

We considered the figures in *Aqht, Ezek*, and *Jub*, which are usually referred to as being the basis of the figure in *Dan*. We concluded that the Ugarit figure might be part of the same tradition as the Daniel figure in *Ezek* 14, but the figure referred to in *Ezek* 28 is part of an interpolation and was based upon the one in chapter 14. Whether there was any knowledge of the putative tradition behind the figure in chapter 14 is unknown, but it is not necessary. Likewise, the figure in *Jub* is probably based upon the reference in *Ezek* to what the writer of *Jub* thought to be an antediluvian figure. Again, no knowledge of the putative tradition behind the *Ezek* 14 reference was necessary for the author of *Jub* to draw this conclusion.

Next we considered the figures that appear as courtiers, all of which seem to be related to the figure in *Dan*. The figure in the Old Greek of *Bel* was originally, or was later portrayed as a priest. This tradition comes from, at the latest, the second century BCE. The possible source for the *Dan* 4 account of Nebuchadnezzar's illness and recovery, the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, if it is evidence of anything, is evidence that the original story circulated without the name of the Jewish הַלּוּא being stated. This, along with the two-name tradition of the four young men in *Dan*, would suggest that some of the stories circulated originally with no names and others without Jewish names. The traditions about Daniel in Josephus' writings and in the writings of the Rabbis are little different from the material in *Dan*. 
Then we considered the texts that have angels named Daniel. We concluded that the Aramaic incantation bowls probably make use of the *1 Enoch* tradition. The *1 Enoch* tradition has an unknown origin. Two possibilities were suggested. First, a figure such as the one in *Ezek* or *Jub* may have undergone a metamorphosis in the way that other figures did. The second possible origin is suggested by the theophoric element in the name. Lists of angels are dominated by names with הָנָע. This proposal is not as likely as the first, however. Regardless of the origins of the angel figure, we concluded that these figures are irrelevant to the origins of the figure in *Dan*.

Two other figures that we concluded were irrelevant are the son of David whose name in the Masoretic Text is Daniel, and the translator mentioned in the *Ep. Arist*. The final figure is the priest(s) in *Ezra* and *Neh*. This figure would seem to have given the author/editor of *Dan* 1-6[7] the name he wanted for the figure he made central to the stories he selected; not only does it have a relevant symbolic significance, but its owner also reflected the social status of the author/editor. The choice of Daniel was probably also influenced by the occurrence of the *Ezek* figure, which accorded with the characteristics exhibited by the figures in the stories collected by the author/editor and who, from the second century BCE vantage point, could have referred to the exemplary figure in the stories. The reliance upon the *Chr-Ezra-Neh* material is corroborated by the occurrence there of the names used for Daniel’s three friends. In fact, all four names occur within two chapters of each other in *Neh* 8 and 10.
Chapter 3:
The Portrayal of the Religious Experts in Dan 1-6

Having established in the previous chapter that the character of Daniel in Dan is not linked in any direct way to mantics of the past, but rather is drawn from a mixture of Jewish sources, we will now turn our attention to Dan 1-6 to determine how he is portrayed, and his relationship to the religious experts in those chapters. We will limit our discussion to Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah in their capacity as religious experts and not administrators (chapters 3 and 6). We will begin with a discussion of the various terms, in order of appearance, used to denote the professionals in Dan 1, 2, 4 and 5. We will then consider the lists of these officials that are found in Dan. We will conclude this chapter with an examination of the portrayal of the Babylonians. In the next chapter we will look at the portrayal of Daniel.

The Nomenclature of the Religious Experts in Dan

In Dan 1-6 there are various words used to describe the professions of Daniel and other courtiers. These words are sometimes isolated, but mostly they occur in lists. They are listed in order of their occurrence in Masoretic Text in Table 2 below.
Table 2. Occurrences in MT of names for religious experts in Dan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MT References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>2:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>3:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>4:3 [6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>4:4 [7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>4:6 [9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>4:15 [18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>5:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>5:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כֶּסְדֵּי</td>
<td>5:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 See below p. 131 for a text critical discussion of the end of this list.
In all there are six lexemes used for the various religious experts. These are only a small percentage of those that occur in the Hebrew Scriptures.\(^3\) In order of their occurrence in the text they are: חכמים, מלכים, אָשֶׁר, חֲרָמָה, חֲשָׁדָה, מְשָׁרָה, and מַלְכָּת. There are eight lists consisting of two to four of the lexemes. There are 20 individual occurrences of three of the terms: חֲרָמָה, מְשָׁרָה, and מַלְכָּת.

The Nomenclature

**כְּשָׁדָה**

The first word used to designate a religious expert in *Dan* is כְּשָׁדָה in Hebrew and כְּשָׁדָה in Aramaic.\(^4\) Outside *Dan* כְּשָׁדָה and כְּשָׁדָה are found numerous times in the Masoretic Text.\(^5\) In the Greek *Dan* the 12 occurrences are rendered by Χαλδαιος and Χαλδαικος.\(^6\) In the Vulgate they are rendered with Chaldeus.\(^7\)

---


\(^4\) =:", 4:1; 2:2, 4, 5, 10\(^{2x}\), 3:8, 2:4 [7]; 5:7, 11, 30, 9:1.

\(^5\) They are found 76 times elsewhere: *Gen* 11:28, 31; 15:7; *2 Kgs* 24:2; 25:4, 5, 10, 13, 24, 25, 26; *Isa* 13:19; 23:13; 43:14; 47:1, 5; 48:14, 20; *Jer* 21:4, 9; 22:25; 24:5; 25:12; 32:4, 5, 24, 25, 28, 29, 43; 33:5; 35:11; 37:5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14; 38:2, 18, 19, 23; 39:5, 8; 40:9, 10; 41:3, 18; 43:3; 50:1, 8, 10, 25, 35, 45; 51:4, 24, 35, 54; 52:7, 8,
The Chaldeans were a people from southern Babylon who rose to power and formed the last dynasty of the Babylonian empire (629-539 BCE). They are the ethnic group to which Nebuchadnezzar belonged. It is in this way that the term כד is used outside Dan in the Hebrew scriptures. As well, the fifth century Greek historian Hellanikos, in Persika, may have used “Chaldean” to denote a people.

The Chaldeans rose in influence in Mesopotamia at the same time as careful historical, economic, and astronomical records began to be kept. However, the roots of astrological omen divination with which the Chaldeans would become associated go back at least to the Old Babylonian period. The omens are known mainly from the Neo-Assyrian period from two types of texts: omen collections such as Enûma Anu Enlil and Iqqur Ipuš, and reports in letters from professional astrologers to the Neo-Assyrian court. Such materials continued to be recorded into the reign of the

14, 17; Ezek 1:3; 11:24; 12:13; 16:29; 23:14, 15, 16, 23; Hab 1:6; Job 1:17; Ezra 5:12; Neh 9:7; 2 Chr 36:17.

6 In Dan they are rendered by Χαλδαιος in Old Greek at 2:2, 4, 5, 10\(^2\); 3:8; 5:7, 30; 9:1; and in Theodotion at 1:4; 2:2, 4, 5, 10\(^2\); 3:8; 4:4 [7]; 5:7, 11, 30; 9:1. One occurrence at Theodotion 7:1 renders הבה. Χαλδαιος is used at Old Greek 1:4. There are minuses at Old Greek 4:4 and 5:11, and in the plus in chapter 3 there are occurrences at Old Greek 3:25, 48 and Theodotion 3:48. They are found in Theodotion MS A at 2:7, where it forms the subject of a third plural verb, and in Theodotion MS Q and its equivalent in the Ethiopic at 5:15 between μαγοι and γαζαρηνοι (see the discussion below, p. 366). On the change from the sibilant ς to the labial  adress and thus Χαλδαιος and not Χασδαιος, see Richard C. Steiner, The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1977).

7 Chaldeus: Vulgate follows Theodotion, except at 3:25.

8 S.v. HALOT.


Babylonian Nabonidus,\textsuperscript{12} and beyond into the Greek era.\textsuperscript{13} Those who practised Mesopotamian "astrology", \textit{i.e.}, who were expert in the interpretation of celestial (and terrestrial) omens, were the scribes (\textit{tupšarru}),\textsuperscript{14} although these scribes could also specialize in mensuration, \textit{e.g.}, accounting.\textsuperscript{15}

After the fall of Babylon this confluence of the Chaldeans’ rise in influence and the recording of astronomical events were related to one another, thus connecting this

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} D. J. Wiseman, \textit{Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 88-89.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Wiseman, \textit{Nebuchadrezzar}, 177.
\item \textsuperscript{14} See Parpola, \textit{Letters from Assyrian Scholars}, Vol. 1, xiii. The difference between the Babylonian understanding of astral events and the Hellenistic astrologers' understanding of them is significant, as Rochberg-Halton explains:

Astrology can be historically differentiated from the branch of Babylonian divination that interpreted celestial signs as portents. As defined by Pingree astrology is 'the study of the impact of the celestial bodies—Moon, Sun, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, the fixed stars, and sometimes the lunar nodes—upon the sublunar world' [D. Pingree, "Astrology" in \textit{Dictionary of the History of Ideas}, vol. 1, 118]. So defined, astrology cannot antedate the Hellenistic period as it depends entirely upon the idea of a finite spherical and geocentric universe, viewed in accordance with Aristotelian physics and cosmology. (Rochberg-Halton, "New evidence", 116.)

The contrast between Babylonian and Greek methods and rationale for prognostication on the basis of celestial events can be expressed in terms of the difference between a form of divination on the one hand, in which the deity provides ominous signs in the heavens to be read and interpreted by a specialist, and on the other, a mechanistic theory of physical causality, in which the stars and planets themselves directly produce effects on earth. In addition, divination is, in principle, susceptible to the efficacy of magic, whereas astrology (in its most deterministic form) connotes inevitability. (Rochberg-Halton, "New evidence", 117.)

\textit{Cf.} Cryer, \textit{Divination in Ancient Israel}, 142-44 who uses the terms "astrology" and "genethliology" (horoscopic astrology) to differentiate the two uses of the stars.

\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
people with astrology. It was in this sense that the term Chaldean was used by the better known Greek historians. The association of the name “Chaldean” with the profession of astrologer seems to be a Hellenistic innovation. Thus, in the second century BCE Cato (De Agricultura 5.4) listed the Chaldeans among various types of religious experts. In the first century BCE, Strabo (Geography 16.1.16) used the name for both a profession and a people.

From this survey of the use of the terms Chaldea and Chaldean we can make some observations about their use in Dan. In 5:30 and 9:1 the term is used unequivocally as a reference to the people of Babylon at large, which is in keeping with the usage in the Hebrew Scriptures outside of Dan. The referent of the occurrence at 1:4 is unclear. It may mean the language and literature of the people of Babylon (as opposed to the Jews), which would be the way in which the word is used elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures. On the other hand, it also may refer specifically to the astrologers’ texts and the language training required to understand and use them. In the context of the chapter—in 1:20 it is religious experts to whom the four boys are compared—it is probably the latter, the Hellenistic use of the term, especially because literacy was not common and was the domain of religious experts and administrative officials. Used in this context, however, the term encompasses both referents.

---


17 Herodotus, Histories 1.181.5; Ctesias Persika 2; Diodorus 2.29-31.

18 Curiously, Jeffers, Magic and Divination, 57, believes that this use of the term is limited to Dan!

19 Cf. Josephus, Wars 2.112.

In the isolated occurrences at 2:4, 5, 10; and 3:8, the term could be used as a comprehensive one for all the religious experts, just like דניאל. It could also be that in these contexts the author wanted to make reference to only one of the professions. This use of כנף and כנין deserves a closer examination, especially given the frequency of use of כנין as the general designation for the religious experts in chapter 2.

At 2:2, Old Greek has the term defining the previous ones: τοὺς ἔξοιδους καὶ τοὺς μάγους καὶ τοὺς φαρμακούς τῶν Χαλδαίων, “the enchanter, Magi and sorcerors of the Chaldeans”. IQDan may support this. It has the form כנין rather than the Masoretic Text’s כנין. Unfortunately the fragment has none of the previous line and begins at this word so that whether or not the previous word is in the construct state cannot be determined with certainty. In light of the Old Greek, however, it is safe to conclude that the previous word was a construct. That makes this occurrence of the term an ethnic or political, not a professional one. This is clearly what happens at 3:8 where Chaldean and Jewish administrators are contrasted using the respective designations. Even in the list at 2:10 the occurrence of the word could be ethnic or political rather than professional, where the writer refers to “no hartom, enchanter,” and then in a more inclusive way “nor Chaldean ...”. It is just after this in 2:12 that the Jewish Daniel enters the narrative as a member of כנין, which is the first of many occurrences of the term כנין in the book. By so differentiating

21 Georg Behrmann, Das Buch Daniel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1894), 7; Montgomery, Daniel, 144; Goldingay, Daniel, 46; Jeffers, Magic and Divination, 58. On כנין as a general designation see below on page 147ff.


23 On this plural of a Gentilic see GKC §86 h and note the plurals of כנין at Exod 2:13, כנין, and at 3:18, כנין.

between the groups with and without Jews, the writer has provided a reason for Daniel's not appearing in chapter 2 when "all the hartoms and exorcists, i.e., the sorcerors of the Chaldeans" were summoned to interpret the King's dream: the four were not Chaldeans, they were Jews.\textsuperscript{25} This sense can be carried by each of the isolated occurrences of the term in \textit{Dan}.

The remaining occurrences are in \textit{Dan} 4 and 5 in lists and seem to be clearly the Hellenistic use of the term for astrologers.\textsuperscript{26} This could lead to the conclusion that these chapters reflect a later period of composition. However, one of the latest portions of the book, chapter 9, uses the term in the older political or ethnic sense. This reflects the chapter's dependence upon older biblical material. This, then, allows for chapters 1 and 2 (and 3), or at least at a significant point in their composition-history, to be later in their influences than chapters 4 and 5. It should also be remembered that Strabo (see above, p. 130) used the term in both ways in one passage, so the use of both in \textit{Dan} is not necessarily abnormal.

If our observations on its use are correct, then it would seem that it was under the influence of the Hellenistic understanding of the term in the lists of chapters 4 and 5 that a later copyist "corrected" or inadvertently harmonized the occurrence at 2:2, thus giving us the list in the Masoretic Text, and thereby obscuring the older usage in the rest of chapters 1 and 2. In those chapters it would appear to be used in a pregnant sense to include the specifically Babylonian diviners, as opposed to the Israelite ones.

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. Marti, \textit{Daniel}, 8, 11; and Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 139.

The second word used to designate a religious expert is הנה. In the eight lists of two or more cultic officials in Dan, this profession is absent from only two (5:7, 15), is listed first in five (1:20; 2:2; 2:10b; 4:4 [7]; 5:11), and is found in one other (2:27). It is one of the three terms used alone, but only once at 4:6 [9]. It is found 16 times in the Masoretic Text and at least once more in 4QDan. In the Greek it is translated with ἐπαθοδός 14 or 15 times: 5 times in Exod; 7 times in Theodotion Dan; and 2 or 3 times in Old Greek Dan. הנה is also translated 2 times each as ἔξηγητής and φαρμακός, and 1 time each as σφηστής and σφός. It is not rendered in Old Greek in three instances. It is translated into the Latin 5 times as maleficus, 6 times


28 ἐπαθοδός (“enchanter” LSJ) is found 23 times in the Septuagint. In addition to the occurrences cited in notes 29, 30 and 31, it translates רָעָל at Lev 19:31; 20:6, 27 and 2 Chr 33:6; and רְבֹּר at Isa 47:9 and Sir 12:13. It also occurs at Deut 18:11 in MSS A and B instead of the participle of ἐπαθείω (רָעָל), and it also occurs in Symmachus Eccl 10:11 (אֲרֵעַל) and Aquila Ps 57[58]:6 (אֶרֶעְל) instead of the participle of ἐπαθείω. It has no Hebrew equivalent at 1 Sam 6:2.

29 ἐπαθοδός: Exod 7:11, 22; 8:3 [7], 14 [18], 15 [19].

30 ἐπαθοδός: Theodotion Dan 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 4:7 [4], 9 [6]; 5:11.

31 ἐπαθοδός: Old Greek Dan 2:2, 27. The Vorlage equivalents in Old Greek Dan 5:7, 8 are unclear, however, we will argue below (pp. 364-365) that 5:7 had an original הנה, just as we find in 4QDan 5:7.

32 ἔξηγητής (“expounder,” “interpreter,” LSJ), Gen 41:8, 24. It is found one other time at Prov 29:18 (ἔννοια).

33 φαρμακός: Exod 9:11, 2x. See n. 81 for a full discussion of φαρμακός.

34 σφηστής and σφός: Old Greek Dan 1:20 and 2:10, respectively. See n. 94 on σφός. See n. 95 on σφηστής.

35 הנה: Dan 4:4 [7], 6 [9]: 5:11, each being part of a minus in Old Greek.

36 maleficus: Exod 7:22; 8:3, 14, 15 [7, 18, 19]; 9:11. See n. 82 on maleficus.
as *ariolus*, and once at *Dan* 5:11 it is rendered with *incantatus* the perfect passive participle of *incanto*, and once elsewhere with the noun *incantatio*. It is not rendered into Latin in 2 instances.

The מִלְשָׁנִים are a group of which Daniel is said to be the leader in 4:6, although his becoming head of this group is not related in the narrative. The closest that the narrative comes to this is at 2:48 where Nebuchadnezzar makes him head of all the מִלְשָׁנִים and at 5:11 where he is referred to as מִלְשָׁנִים. Outside *Dan*, מִלְשָׁנִים is found only in the Joseph story in *Gen* and in the story of the Exodus.

This word is a loan-word from the Egyptian *hry-tp*. It had a “non-etymological or phonetic spelling” *hr(y)-idb* that is found in various inscriptions and texts beginning in the early second millennium BCE and going into the Hellenistic age.

---


*incanto* ("a) to put a spell on, bewitch, enchant; to utter magic spells; b) to endow with supernatural properties by means of spells" *OLD*). This occurs only one other place as the perfect passive participle *incantatus*, -i at *Isa* 47:9 (םֹר). This translation as a passive seems to mean "one having been bewitched", which is not the same as the following forms with the active sense. The present active participle *incantans*, -tis occurs at *Ps* (LXX) 57:6 [58:6] (רְבָּע). The noun *incantator*, -oris ("an enchanter, wizard," *LD*) occurs at *Deut* 18:11 (רְבָּע); *2 Chr* 33:6 (רְבָּע); *Ps* (Heb) 57:6 (רְבָּע); *Isa* 47:12 (רְבָּע); *Sir* 12:13 (רְבָּע).

*incantatio*, -onis ("an enchanting, enchantment, spell," *LD*), *Exod* 7:11. It also occurs at *Exod* 7:22 and 8:18 (ו[ט]'); *Ps* (Heb) 57:6 [58:6] (רְבָּע); *Isa* 8:19 (רְבָּע ?); *Jer* 8:17 (רְבָּע).

*milshanim*: *Exod* 7:11; 9:11.

Jeffers, *Magic and Divination*, 45, is still unaware of Quaegebeur’s work, although she does refer to the *CAD*’s indication that it is an Egyptian loan word.
as shown by the word φερωμένος. Hry-tp means “chief,” and usually, but not always, occurs with the word hry-hb, which is the title for an expert in the Egyptians’ ancient texts, i.e., a lector-priest or a scholar. Given the phonetic spelling and the various ways in which sounds of one language have been represented in other languages, the move from hr(y)-tp > hr(y)-db > (Hebrew) hr-tb > hr-tm is not unreasonable. The term seems to have been applied to persons who were noted for their wisdom and who, for that reason, became counsellors of rulers—it is an honourific like the English “Excellency” or “Excellence” used of high officials such as governors and ambassadors. The phrase hry-hb hry-tp, therefore, indicates that a scholar attained the position of counsellor to the king. Thus, if the term hry-tp came to mean “magician”, it did so because of the prestige attained by someone with an

42 J. Quaegebeur, “On the Egyptian equivalent of Biblical ḫartummim,” in Pharaonic Egypt: the Bible and Christianity, ed. Israelit-Groll, Sarah (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985), 167-69. φερωμένος is derived from the definite form of the Demotic p3-hry-tb. In the move from Afro-Asiatic languages to Greek the h sound was dropped (J. Quaegebeur, “La Designation (p3-) hry-tp: phritob*,” in Form und Mass: Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des alten Ägypten: Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht zum 65. Geburtstag am 6. Februar 1987, eds. J. Osing and G. Dreyer (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987), 393 n. 150) just as in many names in the Hebrew Scriptures that have an initial ה, e.g., הַבָּא הַשָּׁבָש (Hab 1:1) and מָאָבָאָו (1 Chr 3:19).

43 Quaegebeur, “La Designation (p3-) hry-tp”, 384-88. Quaegebeur, “Egyptian equivalent”, 63-165 shows that Müller and others are incorrect in their understanding of how the two titles relate to one another. Müller understood hry-tp as an abbreviation of the hry-hb(ה) hry-tp, which he translated as “chief bearer of the ritual scrolls”, i.e., the “chief reciting priest” (TDOT, V). Quaegebeur, “Egyptian equivalent” and Quaegebeur, “La Designation (p3-) hry-tp”, however, corrects Müller on his understanding of the word (cf. T. C. Mitchell, “Shared vocabulary in the Pentateuch and the Book of Daniel.” in He Swore an Oath: Biblical Themes from Genesis 12-50, eds. Hess, R. S. Satterthwaite, P. E, and Wenham, G. J. (Cambridge: Tyndale House, 1993), 131-41). Quaegebeur shows that Müller’s source (W. Spiegelberg, 1925), does not claim the two words mean “chief bearer of the ritual scrolls” but rather that hry-tp meant “magician” and that hry-hb(ה) was a quite separate word meaning “lector priest”.

understanding of the ancient writings and gifted with extra-ordinary powers of understanding, it does not mean ‘magician’ in and of itself. 45

The word har-ti-bi, which is found in a few Akkadian texts, is also associated with the Egyptian and Hebrew–Aramaic words. 46 In the cuneiform prism of Esarhaddon this word is the only Egyptian title used in what seems a list of professionals taken as captives from Egypt by Esarhaddon. In ADD 851, an administrative document listing scholars attached to the court of Ashurbanipal, ca. 650 BCE, har-ti-bi follows a list of Egyptian proper names, 47 and precedes a list of three Egyptian scribes. Parpola transcribes and translates the material as follows: 48

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Rev III} & 12 \text{'gi?-si-i} \\
& 13 \text{'ra-a-esi-i} \\
\text{IV} & 1 \text{'si- hu-u} \\
& 2 \text{PAP 3 har-ti-bi} \\
& 3 \text{'hu-u-ru} \\
& 4 \text{'ni-mur-a-u} \\
& 5 \text{'su-u-a-su} \\
& 6 \text{[PAP] 3 A'-BA^MES} \\
& 7 \text{mu-šur-a-a} \\
\end{array}
\]

- \text{Gišī}
- \text{Raʾsī}
- \text{Sīhû}
- total 3 dream interpreters
- \text{Huru}
- \text{Nimmuraʾu}
- \text{Šuʾašu}
- total 3 Egyptian scribes

45 Quaegebeur, “La Designation (p3-) hry-tp”, 387-91.


The other groups preceding these two are Assyrian scribes (A.BA), exorcists (MAŠ.MAŚMES), haruspices (HALMES), physicians (A.Z[U]MES), chanters (UŠ.KUMES), and augurs (da-gil-MUŠEN).\(^{49}\)

Parpola uses “dream interpreter” to translate har-ṭi-bi. In this he is following Oppenheim and others who associated this term with dream interpretation because of the occurrence of םיריה in narratives in Dan where Daniel, the dream interpreter, is said to be the head of the םיריה (4:6 [9]; 5:11), and where they are included with the other magic and divination experts. It also fits well the general context of chapters 1, 2, and 4 where dreams play a prominent role. In the occurrences in Gen the emphasis is upon dream interpretation as well. Thus, Oppenheim suggests that the use of an Egyptian title rather than a Mesopotamian one may be due to dream interpretation having been considered the highest and typical achievement of Egyptian divination-techniques in the ancient Near East. The Mesopotamian dream interpreters, the ša’īlu, may not have been considered their equals and so, when referring to those from Egypt, the Egyptian title was used, not the Akkadian one.\(^{50}\) Whereas dream omen series were developed into the neo-Babylonian period,\(^{51}\) it may be that special dream interpreters were trained following the introduction of the har-ṭi-bi.

The problem with translating har-ṭi-bi and םיריה as “dream interpreter” is that the Egyptian term is not so associated. As we discussed above, Quaegebeur has shown that the term was associated with those from various professions who were deemed

\(^{49}\) Cf. the list at Vol. 1, 3, #2: “The scribes (ʼLU)A.BAMES, the haruspices (ʼLUHALMES), the exorcists (ʼLU)MAŠ.MAŚMES, the physicians (ʼLU)A.Z[U]MES) (and) the augurs (ʼLU)da-gil-MUŠENMES) ....”


wise enough to become counsellors to the king, not just one. Daniel also did more than interpret dreams and the קדמשה of *Exod* had nothing to do with dreams. It is unlikely, therefore, that the word came into *Dan* from either Egyptian–Demotic or from Akkadian where it is rare. Given that there are literary links between the Joseph story and the Daniel stories, and that the word occurs more in *Gen* and *Exod* than in Mesopotamian literature, the biblical stories are the probable source. It is true that the Joseph story has dreams as a significant element in them, but in *Exod* the קדמשה have nothing to do with dreams; in that story they are Egyptian courtiers who perform magic. It would seem that in *Gen* and *Exod* the term was taken over from Egyptian or Demotic and used of experts in the court of the Pharaoh. It was this association with a court that was taken up in the *Dan* stories where they are again court officials associated with the kings.

Likewise, the use of “magician” is not appropriate for this term. Following Spiegelberg, scholars such as Müller, Redford, and others (cf. *HALOT* s.v.) render קדמשה as “magician”. Spiegelberg surmised that in primitive tribes the chief of a tribe was endowed with special magical powers and this connotation stuck with the term. As we have already noted, however, Quaegebeur’s extensive investigation of the term reveals that in Egypt a *hry-tp* was an honoured advisor from any profession.

52 Spiegelberg, so Quaegebeur, “Egyptian equivalent”, 164.

53 H.-P. Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit und die Gestalt Daniels,” *UF* 1 (1969): 79-94; Müller, “Hartom”. See also the criticism in Quaegebeur, “Egyptian equivalent” and Quaegebeur, “La Designation (p3-) hry-tp” of Müller’s and others’ derivation of קדמשה from an *abbreviated* form of *hry-hb* *hry-tp*.


55 *hry-tp* means “one who is at the head of” (Quaegebeur, “Egyptian equivalent”, 164).

56 So Quaegebeur, “Egyptian equivalent”, 164.
with a special status before the Pharaoh, not a profession distinct from others such as scribes or priests. That the people so designated in the Hebrew Scriptures were not necessarily thought of as merely magicians is evidenced by their also interpreting dreams in *Dan* and *Gen*, and the enigmatic writing on the wall in *Dan* 5.

Given Quaegebeur’s correction to the understanding of this term, and given the various roles of those bearing this name in the Hebrew Scriptures, we must reconsider the meaning of it and its significance for this study. In *Dan* the הָעַרְבָּא are members of the court as other professions are. This function as a profession is not in keeping with the picture of them portrayed by Quaegebeur. In light of the probable dependence of *Dan* 2 upon *Gen* 40-41 and *Exod* 7-8, we may question whether the use in *Dan* is evidence of terminology based on usage in the Babylonian court. Mitchell notes the parallels in setting (court), story line and in terminology. For the latter he notes the expressions הָעַרְבָּא, *Dan* 2:1, 2:3; the cognate forms הָעַרְבָּא, *Gen* 40:5, 8; 41:8, 12 and הָעַרְבָּא, *Dan* (verb) 5:12, 16; (noun) 2:4 and 31 other times; and הָעַרְבָּא, *Exod* 7:11; *Dan* 2:2. From the parallels

---

57 See “Chapter 4”.

58 הָעַרְבָּא occurs five times in the Hebrew Scriptures: those already cited and *Judg* 13:25 where it is Yahweh’s spirit that is troubled and in *Ps* 77:5 without הָעַרְבָּא.

59 These occur only in these two stories in the Hebrew Scriptures, although in *Eccl* 8:1 הָעַרְבָּא occurs. They are all related to the Akkadian *paṣāru*. (Mitchell 1993 #798), 133, gives two analogous examples of the Ṣ > ḫ change with Akkadian and Aramaic: the name Assur in early Aramaic is ’swr and in the fifth century it is ’tuv; ‘table’ in Akkadian is *paṣṣuru*, but in fifth century Aramaic it is *ptwr*. Mitchell, “Shared vocabulary”, 133 n. 5 and 134) gives two possible explanations for the shift from Ṣ to ḫ: Klaus Beyer, *Die Aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984), 100 n. 1, suggests it happens before an r; Mitchell, citing von Soden–Röllig and Kaufman, suggests that in the Old Babylonian period there “may have been a dental spirant *ṭ* (th) in the spoken language which was represented in the script sometimes as ś and sometimes as t, the former in Genesis perhaps in some way reflecting this.”

60 *Dan* 2:5, 6x, 7, 9, 16, 24, 25, 26, 30, 36, 45; 4:3, 4, 6, 15x, 16x, 21; 5:7, 8x, 12, 15x, 16x, 17, 26; 7:16.
he concludes that the writer of *Dan* "might have consciously made use of the vocabulary stock in *Gen* and *Exod*. He knew this vocabulary would be familiar to his readers or hearers, and would represent technical titles in Babylon, coming near when possible to the Babylonian forms" such as המָטַח for *har-ti-bi*.\(^{62}\) Whereas we have already shown the problem with this last suggestion, it seems most likely that the term was chosen from *Gen* and *Exod* because of its foreign sound. This means that the original derivation of the word and its use in Babylon at one time are irrelevant to the *Dan* setting. For this reason we will render it with *hartom*.

We noted above that this word occurs alone once at 4:6 [9] when Nebuchadnezzar refers to Daniel as the head of the *hartoms* and at 5:11 of יִהְיָב חֶפָּר עָבֻּדָה, who in 5:8 are referred to as יִהְיָב חֶפָּר עָבֻּדָה. We also observed that this specific detail is not related in the narrative structure of the stories to that point. The other two lexemes that occur alone occur 7 ("Chaldeans") and 12 ("experts") times each, and so in *Dan* this lone occurrence of המָטַח is not typical.

It is said at 2:48 that Daniel was made head of המָטַח. There is a correspondence in form between המָטַח and המָטַח, so it is possible that the occurrence of המָטַח at 4:6 [9] was misread as the latter המָטַח. Such a possibility is encountered again at 1:20 and 2:10, and the reverse may occur at 5:15.

\(^{61}\) Mitchell, "Shared vocabulary", 134-35, 139 also notes the parallels between בֵּית הָרֶמֶשׁ (Gen 40:7, 2: Dan 1:3, 7, 8\(^2\), 9, 10, 11, 18 (but elsewhere 42 times)) and the Hebrew יִהְיָב and Aramaic יִהְיָב (Gen 41:8, 33, 39; Dan 2:12ff; 4:3, 15; 5:7, 8, 15; but many times elsewhere, too), but dismisses them as significant by themselves because of their frequent use elsewhere.

\(^{62}\) Mitchell, "Shared vocabulary", 139-40. He also notes the inclusion of the non-Pentateuchal terms חֵלֶב, חָטָא, and אָרַע, and he notes that the non-use of such Pentateuchal terms as בֵּית הָרֶמֶשׁ and יִהְיָב "supports the view that if the writer was selecting from the Pentateuch he only did so very judiciously" (pp, 140-41).
An interesting question arises about this term and its use in Dan. How could a good Jew like Daniel serve in such a capacity given the castigation of such religious experts in the Hebrew Scriptures? The answer may be found in the Exod narrative. At Exod 4:1-9 Moses is instructed by Yahweh to perform certain “signs”, ויהיה, which later at 4:21, 7:9, and 11:10 are referred to as “wonders” מופת. Whereas the instruction and ability to perform these come from the God of Israel, they are legitimate acts and fall outside the condemnations of passages such as Deut 18:10-11. At Exod 7:11, 22, 8:3, and 14, however, the Egyptian counterparts to Moses and Aaron, i.e., perform the very same acts, but this time the acts are labelled “secrets”, presumably because they were not sanctioned by, but were in opposition to, Yahweh. In these two passages, מופת and are subsumed under מופת. Moses and Aaron, therefore, could be considered and such a standing for these two could make allowance for a devotee of Yahweh such as Daniel to function under this label.

The third word used to designate a religious expert is . It is found 8 times in the Masoretic Text, all in Dan. It is rendered with μαγγας consistently in

---

63 At Exod 4:17, 28, 30; 8:19 [23]; 10:1-2 they are again called מופת.

64 This term has the form מופת at Exod 7:11, but מופת at Exod 7:22; 8:3 [7], 14 [18]; 1 Sam 18:22; 24:5; Ruth 3:7 and מופת at Judg 4:21.

65 However, Lawrence M. Wills, The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 34-37 argues that in court tales the focus was not on the way in which the protagonist is wise, but rather on the protagonist as being wiser than others regardless of the nature of the wisdom.

Theodotion.\textsuperscript{68} In Old Greek \textit{Dan θυρα} lacks translation 3 times,\textsuperscript{69} is rendered 2 times by \textit{μάγος},\textsuperscript{70} 2 times by \textit{φαρμακός},\textsuperscript{71} and once by \textit{φιλοσόφος}\textsuperscript{72} or \textit{φιλολόγος}\textsuperscript{73} (if Old Greek 1:20 represents the Hebrew of Masoretic Text, on which see the discussion below, page 356). In the Vulgate \textit{θυρα} seems to have been rendered consistently by \textit{magus}.\textsuperscript{74}

\textit{θυρα} is translated as “exorcist” (\textit{HALOT} “conjurer”) and is of Mesopotamian origin (\textit{HALOT}). The Akkadian equivalent is \textit{āṣipu}, “exorcist”.\textsuperscript{75} Such a person was a religious expert who practised \textit{āṣipātu}, “exorcism”, \textit{i.e.}, the expulsion of demons. He

\textsuperscript{67} \textit{θυρα}: \textit{Dan} 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 4:4 [7]; 5:7, 11, 15. It is also found at 1QapGen 20:19-20.

\textsuperscript{68} \textit{μάγος} (“one of the priests and wise men in Persia; enchanter, wizard” \textit{LSJ}). This is found 10 times in the Greek and only in \textit{Dan} (Old Greek 2:2, 10; Theodotion 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 4:7; 5:7, 11, 15) where it is a translation of \textit{θυρα}.

\textsuperscript{69} \textit{θυρα} 4:4 [7]; 5:11, 15.

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{μάγος}: 2:2, 10.

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{φαρμακός}: 2:27; 5:7. See the discussion of 2:27 on p. 361 where we argue that the translation for \textit{θυρα} was probably guessed at by Old Greek on the basis of the \textit{θυρα} cognates. See n. 81 for a full discussion of \textit{φαρμακός}.

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{φιλοσόφος} (“lover of wisdom,” \textit{LSJ}), 1:20 (88). This word is also found in 4 Macc 1:1; 5:35; 7:7, 21.

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{φιλολόγος} (“student, scholar,” \textit{LSJ}), 1:20 (967). This is not found elsewhere in the Septuagint.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{magus} (“1. In Persia, one of a class of priests or diviners; 2. a magician, sorcerer” \textit{OLD}). This occurs numerous times in the Vulgate Old Testament. \textit{Dan} 5:11 is a possible exception to the rendering of \textit{θυρα} by \textit{magus}, but see the discussion below (p. 366) on that verse.

also functioned as a purification-priest, healer and sometimes sorcerer. His patron god was Ashalluhi, who, with Ea and Marduk, was associated with magic and incantations. One of the functions of an exorcist (ašipu) was to treat the sick. He searched for omens in the body and surroundings of the sick person, and from this examination would predict whether the person would live or die and what demon, if any, was causing the problem. He offered incantations and other magic as well as any remedies indicated by the diagnosis. He also performed apotropaic and purification rituals for houses and temples, either when they were newly built, or when they were in need of an exorcism, or before someone important like the king arrived. The exorcist (ašipu) was also a scholar who did his work from a corpus of texts dedicated solely to his profession. The body of knowledge he was expected to master was summed up in a catalogue of the exorcist’s curriculum as “all the depths of wisdom (and) the secret lore of exorcism”. He might work in the palace, in the temple, in homes or on the street. It is not surprising, then, to find the exorcist among such lists of religious experts as those found in Dan 1-6.

The fourth word used to designate a religious expert is šalšalā, a Pi’el participle of the Hebrew verb ḫalshā. The verb means “to practise sorcery,” and is found 6 times in the Masoretic Text. The noun “sorcery” is found 6 times, and “sorcerer” 1

---

76 Moore, *Balaam Traditions*, 40 argues that it was thought that sorcerers disguised themselves as ašipu. We will suggest that ašipu probably never existed as a distinct “profession” (see below, p. 145).

77 As quoted by Sweet, “Sage in Akkadian literature”, 61 from *KAR* 44 r. 7.

78 ḫalshā: *Exod* 7:11; 22:17 [18]; *Deut* 18:10; *Mal* 3:5; *Dan* 2:2; *2 Chr* 33:6. The first 5 occurrences are participles.

time. In each case these are rendered in the versions by φαρμακός and maleficus. ¹ and maleficus. ² 

The כננה root seems to be related to the Akkadian kassāpu, “sorcerer”, one who practised kišpū “witchcraft” or “sorcery”. In Akkadian this word and its cognates are used of the practitioners of what we would label “black magic”, magic whose intent is the harm of others. The practitioners of this form of magic do not seem to have had a patron god, which indicates they were not associated with the temple. There also does not seem to be any reference to their working in the temple or palace. The very nature of this type of magic is that it is used by those marginal to society, not central to it, so their not being found in the temple or palace is not surprising. ³ There are no extant texts of their chants or courses, possibly because they were outlawed. In the Assyrian law code and Hammurapi’s lawcode, black magic and those who practised it were both outlawed ⁴

¹[Jer 27:9 [Septuagint 34:9].]

²[φαρμακός (“poisoner, sorcerer, magician,” LSJ), This is found 13 times in the Septuagint. In addition to its translation at the verses cited in n. 80, it occurs at: Exod 9:11; Ps 57:6 [58:6] (רל); Dan 2:27 (חנ); 5:7 (חנ), 8 (?). LSJ and Ziegler accent this word on the antepenult in the nominative singular, but Rahlff accents it on the ultima. On the basis of φαρμακός and Mic 5:12-13, Jeffers, Magic and Divination, 69-70, concludes that these were herbalists, who were viewed negatively because opponents chose to look at only the misuse of the potions, not their positive use. This is hard to demonstrate from the evidence that she adduces, however. This is especially so, because a variety of experts used plants and herbs in their treatments, see, for example, Parpola, Letters from Assyrian Scholars, Vol. I, 162-65, #219.]

³[CAD K: 284, 292, 454-56, 598.]

⁴[ANET, 184 and 166, respectively.]
It is doubtful that many would have owned such a designation in Mesopotamia.

Moore writes:

As “colleagues,” they even disguised themselves as legitimate āṣipu exorcists, making it difficult to tell one from the other. Some āṣipu deemed this enough of a problem, in fact, to expend considerable energy differentiating between the two. Each line of Maq IV:117-130 [an Assyrian exorcist’s text], for example, ends with the same phrase:

So-and-so is a kassaptu, but I am a pāsiru [unbinder/releaser].

Whether we should accept Moore’s interpretation of such material as evidence that a kassāpu would impersonate an āṣipu is debatable. It is more likely the case that competitors so labelled their opponents. Also, an āṣipu could project the origins of some evil upon an unknown and non-existent kassaptu whose work he could then undo. The āṣipu versus kassaptu scenario is probably similar to the prophet versus false-prophet one found in the Hebrew Scriptures such as in 1 Kgs 22:6-28, Jer 28 and Mic 3:5-11. In each case there does not seem to be anything in particular that distinguishes the one from the other except hindsight or point-of-view. The lists of

85 Moore, Balaam Traditions, 40.


87 See Grabbe, Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages, 113-15 and the bibliography there, to which we would add A. S. van der Woude, “Micah in dispute with the pseudo-prophets,” VT 19 (1969): 244-60. The difference between these two sets of conflicts is that in the Hebrew Scriptures there does not seem to be any term for “false prophet,” although לִיָּהַנְגָּה lying is used of what some prophets do in 1 Kgs 22:22, 23 (1/2 Chr 18:21, 22); Isa 9:14 [15]; Jer 5:31; 6:13; 8:10; 14:14; 23:25, 26. As a phrase. לִיָּהַנְגָּה “lying prophets” occurs first in extant literature in 4QList of False Prophets as the title of a list that begins with Balaam (M. Broshi and A. Yardeni, “4QList of false prophets,” in Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2. eds. M. Broshi et al., in consultation with J. C. VanderKam, Vol. 14 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 77-79). “False prophet” is found first in the Septuagint as ψευδοπροφήτης (Jer 6:13: 28:5; 33:7; 8. 11, 16; 34:9; 35:1; 36:1. 8; Zech 13:2 where they all translate פָּהֲנָה)
religious experts, as in *Mic* 3:11, may serve such a purpose as we have suggested *kassuptu* did in Akkadian.

Given the nature of this “expert”, it is surprising to find them mentioned positively among the religious experts in *Dan* 2:2. The use of Hebrew cognates might help us to understand why it is used, however. They are used of magic or divination experts who are grouped with other practitioners of more common magic and divination. So, if these Hebrew and Aramaic words did come from Akkadian, they may have lost the association with black magic. It may also be that all these forms come from a proto-Semitic root preserved in the three languages. The word may be used in *Dan* because it can be related to a known kind of Mesopotamian magical expert. However, like *מְלַשְׁפַּטְיָה* occurs in the Exodus story and that account is probably the immediate source for *Dan* (see page 141). Also, the association with Moses’ and Aaron’s equals might give the term the legitimacy it would need in order to be used of someone like Daniel.

Alternatively, in our discussion above, we took the term מֶלְשַׁפְּטְיָה as it occurs in the Old Greek and 1QDan*. In this version, מֶלְשַׁפְּטְיָה takes on a more pejorative sense. The first list, in 1:20 is מְלַשְׁפַּטְיָה מְלַשְׁפַּטְיָה. These two lexemes begin lists most often in *Dan*. It is these with whom the loyal Jewish boys are compared and found to be ten times better. The first list of chapter 2 begins by repeating these two terms: מְלַשְׁפַּטְיָה מְלַשְׁפַּטְיָה “the *hartoms* and exorcists, that is those of the Chaldeans who practice sorcery”. In these versions of the list the final two elements become a descriptive phrase of this second occurrence of the list from chapter


---

88 See the discussion beginning on p. 131 on the use of מְלַשְׁפַּטְיָה in “Chapter 2”.

89 See discussion of lists in “Appendix A”. 
1. Narratively we might expect such a clarification to occur in chapter 1, but given that chapter 1 was added late in the collection of the stories or as an introduction to the whole book, its list was taken from chapter 2, not *vice versa*.

The fifth term for a religious expert in *Dan* 1-6 is יְשַׁלָּם. This and its Hebrew cognate יְשַׁלָּמֶה are found numerous times in the Masoretic Text, and for that reason we must restrict our investigation to *Dan* where only the Aramaic adjective is found. The use of the two adjectives is similar in the two languages, and so it will be beneficial to review briefly how it is used in Hebrew. It is a common root in the Semitic family with the meaning of “wise” or “knowledgeable”. It is used to indicate skill in technical matters, *e.g.*, “skilful” artisans, *Exod* 36:1, 2, 4, 8; or sailors, *Ezek* 28:8. It also indicates ability or experience in various areas of life, *e.g.*, “wise” administrators, *Gen* 41:33, 39; judges, *Deut* 16:19; counselors *Isa* 19:11; kings *Prov* 20:26; and those who live lives obedient to God, *Ps* 107:43. As a substantive, it can be used to indicate “experts” or “wisemen/women”, *i.e.*, “advisors” in a variety of contexts, *e.g.*, kings’ courts *Gen* 41:8; and society *Deut* 1:13, *2 Sam* 14:2.  

---

90 A search for the Hebrew and Aramaic adjectives using the electronic text with *Bible Windows Ver. 5.5*, Silver Mountain Software, 1993, resulted in 152 hits.

91 *TDOT*, IV, 364-67.

92 *HALOT*, s.v.: Müller and Krause, “Chakham”, 373-84. Müller makes too much of the mantic and magical, as if יְשַׁלָּם were used in a special way for that notion. Thus, he devotes sections to both mantic and magical wisdom (pp. 376-78), and even in his section on artisans (pp. 378-79), he works in “the manipulation of the appropriate powers”. See also his article Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”. Obviously, in the right context, the adjective would denote expertise in these areas, but it is not a different use from skill in any other valued area of life; this adjective applies to any field of knowledge or skill. Thus, without further evidence, the “wise women” of *Jer* 9:16 [17] should be understood as being no more than “professional/skilled” mourners.
In Dan the Aramaic adjective ß'D1 occurs 14 times.\footnote{2:12, 13, 14, 18, 21, 242x, 27, 48; 4:3 [6], 15 [18]; 5:7, 8, 15. ßDí does not occur in Dan.} It is translated in Old Greek with σοφος twice,\footnote{σοφος ("learned one," "wise one"), 2:21, 27 (We accept the 967 reading σοφος at 2:12; cf. R. T. McLay, "Translation technique and textual studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion versions of Daniel" (PhD dissertation, University of Durham, 1994), 73). σοφος occurs 14 times in Theodotion and only for ßDí (see n. 93) and 10 times in Old Greek (11 if 2:12 is included: 1:4, 19, 202x; 2:10, 21, 25, 27; 5:112x). Where it does not render ßDí, it renders ἰδρευς (1:4) and possibly ἰδρευς (2:10) or is used only as an adjective or has no equivalent or relevant substantive (1:19, 202x; 2:25; 4:15 [18]; 5:7, 8 (a list of experts is found here), 112x). 4:3 [6] and 5:15 are missing due to minuses in Old Greek.} 6 times with σοφιστής,\footnote{σοφιστής ("master of one’s craft,” ‘adept,’ ‘expert’ of diviners,” LSJ), 2:12 (on which see n. 94), 14, 18, 242x; 48. σοφιστής is found 9 times in the Greek, all but one in the Old Greek Dan, i.e., Exod 7:11 where it renders ßDí. At Dan Old Greek 1:20 it possibly translates ßDí (see discussion of 1:20 on p. 356) and at Dan Old Greek 4:15 [18], 34c [37/3:31-33] there are no equivalent Aramaic forms. According to Hatch and Redpath it also occurs in a Theodotion reading at Gen 41:24 (ßDí).} and 6 occurrences are not rendered.\footnote{ßDí: 2:13; 4:3 [6], 15[18]; 5:7, 8 (a list of experts is found here), 15.} It is translated with σοφος every time in Theodotion. In the Vulgate ßDí is rendered by the participle sapiens, -tis every time and the participle occurs nowhere else in Vulgate Dan.

The occurrences in Dan are of the substantive use of the Aramaic adjective ßDí. Müller argues that, in addition to “sages”, the Hebrew equivalent of this, ßDí, can refer to people who were skilled in magic and divination, such as in Isa 3:2-3.\footnote{Müller, “Magisch-mantische Weisheit”; Müller and Krause, “Chakham”, cf. Jeffers. Magic and Divination. 40-44, esp. 42-43. But one should note that the full expression at Isa 3:2-3 is ßDí ßDí (skilled magician) where ßDí merely defines ßDí further. When Isaiah talked of “diviners” he used the technical word ßDí in the previous v. (2). There may of course be some anti-wisdom invective here.} It could be magic and divination that comes to the fore in Dan. Didactic wisdom would have been the domain of the administrators referred to in the lists of Dan 3 and 6, but ßDí does not occur there. In the chapters with which we are concerned, however, it can refer to Mesopotamian religious experts generally in the phrases “wise men of
Babylon/the kingdom/the king”. It also may refer to a specific religious profession when it appears without qualifiers in lists at 2:27 and 5:15. In *Dan* 1-6, then, it may have the magic or divination connotations noted by Müller, but to what specific Mesopotamian magic or divination expert is it meant to refer?

Sweet studied the use of words in Akkadian that might approximate 𒈺𒀀𒀀 in its Biblical use for a class of learned and shrewd men or a wise teacher or sage. He looked at seven substantives meaning “wise man”, ten adjectives meaning “wise”, 20 substantives meaning “wisdom,” and one verb meaning “to be wise”. The study was done with the awareness that what Mesopotamian society and what Hebrew society thought were the wise, could be quite different. Therefore Sweet studied the Mesopotamian literature in an attempt to determine what Mesopotamians thought. Generally he found that the king was the wise man *par excellence*, although this was not a scholarly type of wisdom, rather it was “largely a matter of recognizing the supremacy of the gods and performing deeds pleasing to them”. Besides the king, the wisdom terminology of the Mesopotamians was applied to certain classes of the king’s subjects. They were professionals who possessed some “special know-how, whether in the realm of material concerns or in affairs of the unseen world of the gods”. They could be skilled in anything from carpentry to warfare, but the skill could not be “widely shared skills of daily life”, so that the terms are not applied, e.g., to agricultural workers, shepherds or boatmen. Thus the term is more similar to the English word “professional” or “expert” than the phrase “wise man”.

---

100 Sweet, “Sage in Akkadian literature”, 47-50.
Relevant to our study is the following conclusion:

What is not found here is evidence that the Akkadian wisdom terms were used with special frequency for a “class of learned and shrewd men, including astrologers, magicians, and the like” or for persons who were “wise, ethically and religiously,” including the “wise teacher, sage” (to revert to definitions of ḫākām in BDB with which this essay began). Akkadian literature knows of such persons, but it does not single them out as especially deserving of the vocabulary of wisdom.

Those persons of whom this terminology is used and who are of special interest to this study were diviners (bārū), exorcists (āsipu and isibgallu), physicians, scribes and counsellors.103 So, the use of חכם as the title of a specific type of professional seems not to have a Mesopotamian origin or parallel.

There is another approach to this word, however. We have noted above that in Dan there are connections with the Joseph and Exodus stories. In Gen 41:8 חכם appear as colleagues to הדר, and in Exod 7:11 they appear as colleagues to חכם.104 It could be that these narratives have provided justification for this use with such religious experts as appear in Dan.105 Again, this would have little to do with any putative knowledge of the Mesopotamian court systems, and would be solely literary in nature.

Rather than understanding these to be a single profession such as “sages”, it is better to understand them as “experts” in the court, i.e., it is an inclusive term, an adjective that can be used of any person who is wise in some way.106 This general use is found at 5:7 where it summarizes a list:

---


104 See above, p. 141.

105 Cf. Isa 44:25.

106 This is the point that Müller, Jeffers and others have overlooked. As an adjective this word modifies many nouns in the Hebrew scriptures. That the adjective is used substantivally in some contexts need not indicate that there existed a specific
As such, it fits well as a general designation that could include the four Jews, which could not, given its ethnic and political uses.

The only places where this may not work are in the lists at 2:27 and 5:15. The first of these could easily move from the general to the specific, however: “no expert, whether exorcist, chaldean, or extispex, is able …”. The use in the list at 5:15 could also be a general designation followed by just one of the other terms used as a truncation of the list: “experts, the exorcists, etc.” The two elements of the list would come from 5:7 where we find the only list in Dan to begin with harperez, and where the list is summarized by camai, making this list the same as at 1:20, or it could be an author’s mistaken understanding of how camai is used elsewhere. The first explanation is a reasonable one, however, and does not require either emending the text or imputing mistakes in the understanding of so common a term as this.

Another nuance to the use of this term in Dan presents itself, as well. As we shall argue in the next chapter, Daniel does not act as one of the religious experts when he interprets the dreams and writing on the wall. He acts more as a prophet who receives revelations. The term הולא and its Hebrew cognate could have been chosen because of a conflict between proponents of a “secular” wisdom approach to life and a prophetic revelation approach, i.e., natural versus special revelation. The international flavour of Israelite wisdom is well known, and Ben Sira’s picture of the good wise man group of “wise men”. It may be more a matter of knowing what the assumed nouns are in such contexts. In a context such as Dan, they are wise (diviners).

107 Cf. Marti, Daniel. 6 on 1:20.
does nothing to detract from that, given the praise of serving princes and rulers and traveling in foreign countries (Sir 39:4-5). Such a picture fits well the setting of the Dan stories, which, we shall argue, assume the presence of other Jews among the experts in the court of the kings of Babylon, Media and Persia, and against whom Daniel and his three friends stand as Jews loyal to their heritage. This conflict could go a long way to explain why דְּעִי is used so frequently in chapters 1-6, and is the main (or only) term used to refer to all the experts (14x). We shall explore this more later, but it deserves to be mentioned at this point in the discussion.

The final word used to designate a religious expert is דְּעִי. This word is pointed as the Aramaic participle of the verb “to cut”. The participle is found only in Dan in the Hebrew Scriptures108 where it is used as a substantive whose referent is a religious expert. In Theodotion the transliteration γαζαρπνός is used for each of the occurrences in Masoretic Text Dan.109 In the Old Greek the phonetic rendering occurs

---

108 The participle used as a substantive is found in Dan 2:27; 4:4 [7]; 5:7, 11. The Verb דְּעִי is found elsewhere in 1 Sam 27:8 (? , see n. 110); 1 Kgs 3:25, 26; 2 Kgs 6:4; Isa 9:19 [20]; 53:8; Ezek 37:11; Jonah 2:5 (? , see n. 110); Hab 3:17; Pss 31:23 (? , see n. 110); 88:6 [5]; 136:13; Job 22:28; Lam 3:54; Esth 2:1; 2 Chr 26:21. The noun דְּעִי (“pieces” HALOT) is found in Gen 15:17; Ps 136:13 (The proper name Gezer (“closed off space” occurs in 15 places: Josh 10:33; 12:12; 16:3, 10; 21:21; Judg 1:29; 2 Sam 5:25; 1 Kgs 9:15, 16, 17; 1 Chr 6:52; 7:28; 14:16; 20:4). The noun דְּעִי (fm. of *דִּין, “infertile land”, i.e., land cut off from water, HALOT) is found in Lev 16:22. The Aramaic noun פְּלַי (“decree”) is found in Dan 4:14 [17], 21 [24]. And the noun דְּעִי (“forecourt” HALOT) is found in Ezek 41:12, 13, 14, 15; 42:1, 10, 13; Lam 4:7. The noun דְּעִי (axe) is found only once in 2 Sam 12:31. HALOT, s.v., also notes an alternative form of the Hebrew דְּעִי, i.e., דְּעִי, that occurs at Ps 31:23, דְּעִי, and for which there are several manuscripts that read דְּעִי, a form found at Lam 3:54, and two manuscripts that read דְּעִי as at Jonah 2:5. L. Delekat, “Zum hebraischen Wörterbuch,” VT 14 (1964): 11 proposed that דְּעִי is the root behind these variant forms. Also, note the K-Q of דְּעִי - דְּעִי at 1 Sam 27:8.

109 γαζαρπνός: this occurs only in Dan. In addition to its ‘translation’ of דְּעִי, it also occurs in Theodotion Dan 5:15 as an addition to the list there.
only 3 times, the other occurrence not being represented in that tradition. The Vulgate renders it each time with aruspex.

The translation of ἄριστος is uncertain, although its basic meaning of “cut” seems not far removed from its various uses. In Hebrew, the concept of cutting is evident in such cases as 1 Kgs 3:25, 26 and 2 Kgs 6:4, where the verb denotes the halving of a child and the felling of trees respectively; the word for axe (2 Sam 12:31); and the use of the noun to denote the cut pieces of an animal (Gen 15:17), and the parting of the Red Sea (Ps 136:13). In Aramaic it is evident in the use of the verb at Dan 2:34.

By the time Job 22:28, Hab 3:17, Esth 2:1, and Dan 4:14 were written the word could denote the making of a decision or the decision itself. This relationship of cutting and decision making is one found in the usage of other similar words. As

110 γαραξηνος; 2:27; 5:7, 8. Actually, in MS 967 the word is transliterated γαραδηνος at 2:27 and 5:7 and γοραξηνος at 5:8. It is difficult to determine whether this transliteration with the metathesis of the γ and the dental (τ/θ) is the original Old Greek rendering of the word or whether it is limited to this MS. Given the variant forms in the Hebrew text listed in n. 108, it is possible that 967 is based upon a manuscript that actually had that inversion. If it is original to Old Greek, the different form in MS 88 could be further evidence of harmonization of Old Greek toward Theodotion. However, the inversion of the liquid and dental make the word easier to say and 967 appears to have had difficulty with liquids, e.g., ελινφας for ελρινφας 6:22(23); άρθρος[εν for άρθρος 6:19(20); δεκακπις for δεκακπις 9:7 (August Bludau, Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und Ihr Verhältniss zum masoretischen Text (Frieburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1897), 92 notes how the non-differentation of the liquids influenced the use of θαλασσα for ὑπαντα at 10:6); and with dentals, e.g., καππανον for καππανον 3:46; κανηια for κανηια 7:1 (but see Joseph Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), 71-72 on both the replacement and omission of liquids and dentals generally in manuscripts). See McLay, “Translation technique and textual studies”, 51-100 for a listing of 967 variants. It seems more likely, therefore, that the metathasis arose out of the copyist’s euphonic mistake than out of an original translator’s mistake.

111 aruspex (“a diviner of a class originating in Etruria; according to Cicero they were interpreters of internal organs, prodigies and lightning” OLD), this is found 6 times in the Vulgate. In addition to the 4 occurrences in Dan, it is found at 2 Kgs 21:6 and 23:5 where it translates הִנְּשֶׁר and גּוֹמֶל respectively. The form haruspex does not occur in the Vulgate.

112 See n. 108 for full details on the cognates.
*HALOT* (s.v.) notes, the same overlap of semantic domains pertains to יָרָה, יָרָה, and כָּרַע.

The use of רָה in *Dan* has usually been understood in the light of Mesopotamian astronomy. It is thought that the night sky or a chart was "cut" into different segments so as to determine the fate of individuals based upon the activity of the stars.\(^{113}\) Montgomery delineates the standard explanation in his day, but he also notes that at *Dan* 2:27 Symmachus may relate רָה to the examination of entrails, because it translates it with θυτοι, "sacrificers,"\(^ {114}\) rather than with Old Greek’s transliteration γαζόρηνοι.\(^ {115}\) Also, in *Dan* wherever רָה is used for the court experts, the Vulgate translates it consistently as *aruspices*, a class of diviners who functioned just as the *bārū*.\(^ {116}\) Thus, Montgomery suggests, רָה may be the Hebrew term for the Mesopotamian *bārū*, "diviner".

This is a very reasonable suggestion in our opinion and deserves careful consideration. The *bārū* were expert in divination from entrails, especially the livers of sheep.\(^ {117}\) They had to be knowledgeable in the voluminous omen literature (*bārūtu*), which made theirs a learned profession. Their patron gods were Šamaš and Adad. They were associated mainly with the temple and palace, although they did seem to have a role in divining for commoners, but sheep were expensive and this form


\(^{114}\) Symmachus, the Syro-Hexaplar and Jerome all use θυτοι, but only at 2:27 (Ziegler, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, loc cit.).

\(^{115}\) Montgomery, *Daniel*, 163.

\(^{116}\) See above, n. 111.

\(^{117}\) Cryer, *Divination in Ancient Israel*, 168-80 has a helpful synopsis of what is known about Mesopotamian extispicy, and another on the question of whether the Israelites used this method (295-306), on which cf. Jeffers, *Magic and Divination*, 158-60.
of divination seems to have been for the wealthy.118 The bărû also made use of other means of divination, such as leconomancy, libanomancy, and possibly ornithomancy and oneiromancy. They also participated in a petition-response “liturgy” in which they made requests of the gods, and received answers through various means already noted.119

The form of divination for which the bărû were noted, however, was extispicy, which necessarily involved the cutting open of the animals to inspect the entrails, a practice that continued into the Hellenistic period.120 It is especially interesting that, as Moore points out, “in neo-Assyrian texts, the designation LûHAL (literally, ‘the man who decides’), … came to be the most popular designation for bărû.”121 Whether יִט (“one who cuts”) is meant to refer to the bărû cannot now be determined with certainty, but it seems more likely than a reference to one who makes decisions by divining by the stars.122 For that reason, we shall translate this term as “extispex”.

---

118 CAD B:121-25; Moore, Balaam Traditions, 42. Some scholars have suggested it means “determiners” of the future; “those who make decisions” regarding spirits; perhaps “cutting” the way off for evil spirits (Goldingay, Daniel, 46). Jeffers, Magic and Divination, 31, suggests it could include “‘cutting’ the dreams in the sense of analysing them part by part”, but this is off the mark. As Oppenheim, “Interpretation of dreams” shows, the terms used for this are from the psr cognates.

119 Moore, Balaam Traditions, 42-45.

120 Gilbert J. P. McEwan, Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1981), 15, although they are referred to very rarely in the Hellenistic era.

121 Moore, Balaam Traditions, 41. The emphasis is mine.

122 M. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 457 n. 43, argues that יְשֵׁב, Judges 7:15, יְשֵׁב in (Isa 47:13b) and יְשֵׁב (Eccl 3:18; 9:1) are all forms of the same root *br as that from which bărû comes. J. D. Levenson, “A technical meaning for N‘M in the Hebrew Bible,” VT 35 (1985): 67 proposes that the phrase יָשָׁב יֵאָנ (Num 24:3, 15; 2 Sam 23:1; Prov 30:1) refers to a mantic such as an oracle priest and that the Mesopotamian parallel would have been the bărû. S. Ackerman, “The queen mother and the cult in ancient Israel,” JBL 112 (1993): 385-401 argues that a cognate to that term, the נְרָבָע, a title used for Queen Mothers in Israel, was a title used to indicate them as cultic figures.
There is an occurrence of the word in the fourth line of 4QPrNab ar, “The Prayer of Nabonidus”. Almost without exception the fourth word of the line has been read as אֵלֶּה. As such it has been understood as meaning “exorcist” or “diviner”. Some have taken it to mean “one who practices healing”, for this unnamed Jewish person has a part in the healing of Nabonidus from an “evil disease” (ן יי וֶהָיָה). Such healing was the work of the exorcist, the āsipu. In Mesopotamia, however, it seems there were not always distinct boundaries between the domains of some professions, so that a diviner could be involved in healing as well. There seems no reason to vary from the discussion above in understanding how the word is used in this composition, “extispex” being a suitable rendering. In the end, therefore, the possible occurrence in 4QPrNab ar is of little help in determining how אֵלֶּה is used in Dan, but it does demonstrate its use for some sort of religious expert in a court setting in the second century BCE.

______________________________

123 A. Lange and M. Sieker, “Gattung und Quellenwert des Gebets des Nabonid,” in Qumranstudien: Vorträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25./26. Juli 1993, eds. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 9-10, 16-20 call into question the reading of the letters in the text as אֵלֶּה and read instead בְּּוֹ “protected citizen”. They argue that in this fragment the letters ב, ה, ב, and ו are almost indistinguishable. The plates in DJD XXII, however, seem clear enough: the letter is a clean line down with no head; ב and ד are very similar, but have small heads (see Plate VI; cf. J. J. Collins, “4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar,” in Qumran Cave 4: XVII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 3, G. J. Brooke et al., in consultation with J. C. VanderKam (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 85).


125 Besides the context of healing, the occurrence of בְּּוָיִר in frg. 4.1 is probably to be understood as from בְּּוָיִר “to restore to health”, which fits the context better than ‘to dream’ (Collins, “4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar”, 92-93).

126 Ritter. “Magical-expert (=ĀŠIPU) and physician (=ASŪ); CAD A1:432.
Administrative titles

Having considered the six words used to designate religious experts, one cannot help but take note of the contrast with the use of the titles for administrators in chapters 3, 4 and 6:

**Table 3. List of administrators in Dan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Title</th>
<th>Dan References</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;hšetra-pāvan&quot;</td>
<td>3:2, 3, 27; 6:2</td>
<td>[1], 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ahšadrapānu&quot;</td>
<td>[2], 4 [3], 5 [4], 7 [6], 8 [7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;šaknu&quot;</td>
<td>3:2, 3, 27; 6:8[7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;pihātu, pahātu&quot;</td>
<td>3:2, 3, 27; 6:8 [7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;handarza-kara&quot;</td>
<td>3:2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ganzabara&quot;</td>
<td>3:2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;dātabara&quot;</td>
<td>3:2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;tayu-pata&quot;</td>
<td>3:2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;sāraka&quot;</td>
<td>6:3 [2], 4 [3], 5 [4], 7 [6], 8 [7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these administrative titles derive from either Akkadian or Old Persian, with the exception of "šālān, "governor", which is a general designation for all the

---

127 On the derivation of the names see HALOT, and Collins, Daniel, 182-83, 265.

128 It also occurs at Esth 3:12; 8:9; 9:3; Ezra 8:36.

129 It also occurs as הָלָם at Isa 41:25; Jer 51:23, 28, 57; Ezek 23:6, 12, 23; Ezra 9:2; Neh 2:16; 4:8, 13; 5:7, 17; 7:5; 12:40; 13:11.

130 It also occurs at 1 Kgs 10:15; 20:24; 2 Kgs 18:24; Isa 36:9; Jer 51:23, 28, 57; Ezek 23:6; 23:12, 23; Hag 1:1, 14; 2:2, 21; Mal 1:8; Ezra 5:3, 6, 14; 6:6, 7, 13; 8:36; Neh 2:7, 9; 3:7; 5:14; 15, 18; 12:26; Esth 3:12; 8:9; 9:3; 2 Chr 9:14.

131 It occurs as עַבָּר at Ezra 1:8 (Hebrew) and 7:21 (Aramaic).
administrators. The contrast between the accuracy of these and the varied nature of the religious experts’ titles is striking. The offices held by these administrators did not take on Hebrew titles or descriptions, yet, they are the kind of positions in which Jews were more likely to be found. These titles, therefore, show an accurate knowledge of the administration of the Persian period, unlike the names of the religious experts, which betray an ignorance of something so basic as accurate titles.

Conclusion

In summary, we have come to the following conclusions about the terminology used of the officials in the lists in Dan.

and are translated into Greek and Latin consistently with phonetic equivalents, which we have also chosen to do. However, because it is used both as an ethnic or political designation and a title for a professional diviner, we will use two forms: “Chaldeans” for the ethnic or political usage and “chaldean” for the title. The word denotes an ethnic or political group in other Biblical texts, and in Dan we concluded that this was the case in 7 of the 12 occurrences. The remaining occurrences are used anachronistically (from a narrative point of view) in lists of professionals, betraying a Hellenistic usage.

is borrowed from Gen and Exod where it is the title of certain officials in the Egyptian court. It is best to render it as “hartom”, because it seems to have been chosen for its foreign sound, not its original meaning. In Egyptian it was an honorific used of counsellors of a Pharaoh. The word was usually rendered in Greek by ἐπαξιοδότης, and in Dan it was usually rendered into Latin by ariolus.

---

\(\text{הַלֶּאֱוָן}\) in both Hebrew and Aramaic is found exclusively in \textit{Dan}. It is usually rendered into Greek with \(\mu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\circ\varsigma\), and into Latin with \textit{magus}. The word may derive directly from the Akkadian \(\text{āṣipu}\) ‘exorcist’ and so we have chosen to translate it with ‘exorcist’.

\(\text{מָלֵךְ}\) occurs only once and, denotes a “sorcerer,” which is the same denotation of the words used to translated it into Greek (\(\phi\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\kappa\varsigma\circ\varsigma\)) and Latin (\textit{maleficus}). It is cognate with Akkadian terms that also denote sorcerers and sorcery. Such “experts” were not associated with the temple or palace and were outlawed in Mesopotamia, although it may have been only a term used to slander one’s opponents or to explain the source of some problem. Such an expert probably would not have been in any ruler’s court. We concluded that it was used as a general description of the \textit{hartoms} and exorcists.

\(\text{הֵפַסֵכְנָה}\) is the most common of the terms and was usually translated by \(\sigmaφιστής\) in Old Greek, by \(\sigmaφός\) in Theodotion, and by \textit{sapiens} in Vulgate. The adjective’s use as a substantive denoting a specific group of religious experts is without parallel in equivalent terms in Mesopotamian literature. Its generic use is more in keeping with the adjectival use of similar terms in Akkadian. The probable source for the term in \textit{Dan}, however, is not Mesopotamia, but the Joseph and Exodus stories and its general use in Hebrew for experts. We shall render it by “expert”.

\(\text{טוֹרָבָר}\) most likely refers to those religious professionals who practised extispicy as a major part of the decision making process of Mesopotamian kings. That was not their sole function, but it was their main one. Thus, the question of whether it should be translated “one who cuts” or “one who decides” is irrelevant, because the two concepts are related. The cutting was not of the heavens, however, but of sheep. In the Greek of \textit{Dan} the word is transliterated from the plural \(\text{תורבְּרָבָּנָה}\). The Latin renders it with \textit{aruspex}. We render it with “extispex”.
When this list of terms for religious experts is compared to the list of terms for administrators in *Dan*, there is a stark contrast. The names of administrators are almost all derived from Old Persian or Akkadian, the only exception being 'ח'ג'. If one was to use such terms to determine whence the writings came, it could be argued that they originated among administrators rather than among religious experts. The contrast between the two sets of terms in *Dan* is of such a nature that we can conclude with a measure of confidence that the list of religious experts did not derive from insiders’ knowledge of such professions.\(^\text{133}\)

*The Lists of Religious Experts in Dan*

Montgomery states that “In this passage [2:2] and elsewhere in the bk. [sic] the several classes of diviners are listed with no technical or exact sense, as the variability of the lists shows.”\(^\text{134}\) Now that we have discussed the general translation equivalents of the terms, we will consider the various lists in which they are found to determine whether there is more that can be learned from them than Montgomery thought. The lists of religious experts occur in 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 4:4 [7]; 5:7, 8, 11, and 15, and are discussed in detail in “Appendix A”.

Our examination of the lists of religious experts in *Dan* results in the following series:

\(^{133}\) Cf. Montgomery, *Daniel*, 137; Collins, *Daniel*, 139: “There is no evidence that the biblical author understood the specializations of the Babylonian castes or was familiar with their methods. The use of a Babylonian term, ח'ג', which does not occur elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, requires no intimate acquaintance with Babylonian learning. We find in Daniel an acquaintance with a wide range of material but little mastery of history or of the scientific learning of the day.”

\(^{134}\) Montgomery, *Daniel*, 143.
Table 4. *Summary of lists of experts in Dan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:27</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:7</td>
<td>4QDan²-OG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have left Old Greek 5:8 out of the group because we determined it to be a probable harmonization with 5:7. Also, for purposes of comparison, the lists at 2:2 and 2:10 include only the actual lists, and not כְּשֶׁרַיִם, which are separated from their lists. Likewise, the list from 5:7 ends with כְּשֶׁרַיִם, not כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם.

Although these lists vary, there is a general pattern. In 5 of the 8 lists the first word is הַרְפָּא. In 7 of the 8 lists the second word is חֲמָן. In 4 of the 5 lists with at least 3 terms, the third word is כְּשֶׁרַיִם. In the 4 remaining lists the fourth word is כְּשֶׁרַיִם. This results in כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, כְּשֶׁרַיִם. The lists in 4:4 [7] and 5:11 follow this order exactly, which makes it tempting to accept the Old Greek order in 5:7, a temptation we shall resist. Of these four words only one, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, may have its etymological origins in the name of a profession of a true Mesopotamian religious expert. Another is of Mesopotamian origins, כְּשֶׁרַיִם, but its use for a class of professionals is anachronistic. כְּשֶׁרַיִם may be of Egyptian origins, but it is most likely derived from 135 Exod 7. כְּשֶׁרַיִם, although it may refer to Mesopotamian

---

135 Charles, *Daniel*, 27, following Bevan, suggests that it stands first due to Gen 41:8.
extispices, is not derived from any Akkadian words, but is merely descriptive of the activity of such experts.

Conclusion

Given a list such as חכמה אֵשֶׁת בַּשְׂרִי נָהו and what we know of these words, we draw the following conclusion. When this list is contrasted with the relative accuracy of the lists of titles of Babylonian and Persian administrators, it leads us to the conclusion that if the titles of religious experts reveal anything about the possible origins of such stories as these, then they originated among Jewish administrators in the Persian period (cf. Nehemiah), not among Jewish religious experts in the Mesopotamian courts. The titles reveal an accurate knowledge of the terminology of the administrators, but not of the religious experts. Jewish administrators would have been familiar with such experts, but would not have had to develop an accurate or consistent vocabulary for them in contrast to their own positions.

What can be said positively about these various designations is that they are related to a broad range of magic or divination techniques (magic, dream interpretation, exorcism, astral omen interpretation, extispicy), and that all of them, with the exception of נַחֲלָם and נָהו are of foreign derivation, or are foreign sounding. They seem to have been chosen to enhance the Mesopotamian setting of the stories.136

The Portrayal of the Religious Experts in Dan

Having looked at the names and lists, we will now proceed to examine how these experts are portrayed in Dan. This matter is of some significance for determining the attitudes of the Jews in the circles for whom Dan was written toward such

professions. This, in turn will help to place the character of Daniel in relation to those professions.

In chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5, there are many times that the religious experts are expected to function as the professionals that they were trained to be. However, they do not do as well as Daniel and his three friends, or cannot perform their functions at all. The failures are essential to the stories, because they provide a negative contrast for the abilities of Daniel.

Were it only that the other professionals failed, that might not be significant. It might only mean that Daniel, the best in his profession, had to come to the rescue of the others. This would mean that Daniel could be understood to be a positive portrayal of the profession, *qua* a viable profession for aspiring Jews. In the stories, however, there is a biting critique of the very nature of the professions themselves. It is made clear that they cannot deliver what is expected, not because of ineptitude, but because the task is impossible for humans to accomplish. 137

These are not the only negative features in the stories however. Comedy or satire also seems to be used. This feature of the stories is directed against the kings and the religious experts. The humour is found in the combination of inappropriate responses to dire situations, plays on words, and the comedic portrayal of the courtiers.

Chapter 1

Chapter 1 sets the scene for chapters 1-6 in several ways. One of those ways is to establish Daniel and his three friends as superior to the religious experts in the king's court. Although it is not clear for what the captives are being trained in chapter 1 — there being only a cryptic reference to them being taught the language and letters of the

---

“Chaldeans”, when they are tested at the end of the chapter, it is made clear that not only are they at the head of the class of their peers they also are ten times better than any of the (experienced!) hartoms and exorcists in the kingdom (1:20). Here these Jews are clearly being portrayed as soundly beating the Babylonians at their own game; they not only had the prerequisite skills to become court experts, they excelled at these skills. This comparison sets the scene for ones that follow where the abilities of Daniel and his three friends set him apart from other experts in the court. The four are not yet assigned to any group, however. They are only said to be admitted to the court.

Chapter 2

When Nebuchadnezzar had his troubling dream, he summoned the “hartoms and exorcists, i.e., those of the Chaldeans who practice sorcery” to interpret it for him. That they are of the Chaldeans seems to exclude Daniel and his friends, who are Jews. This would be why the four seem to exclude Daniel and his friends, who are Jews. The king, withheld the dream from them, probably as a test, and expected them both to relate it to him and then remember a forgotten dream depends upon the meanings of לְדוּתּוּ (v. 2), מַלֹּלָם (v. 3) and מַלֶּלֶתּוּ (v. 5, 8). The first can be used to convey the idea “to expound” something not understood, like a riddle (BDB s.v. high. §2; HALOT, s.v. hif. §2.) as well as “to make known”. The second usually means “to learn about” what was not known before. It also can mean “to know well”, i.e., to know the meaning of the symbols in this case, as in Isa 29:11-12. The third item may be translated as if was the root הָלַשׁ = הָלַשׁ, “to go” (So LXX, Th., Vg, KJV), thus “the thing has gone from me”, i.e., “I have forgotten it” (Montgomery, Daniel, 147). Montgomery says that T. Nöldeke was the first to derive it from the Persian azdā and Montgomery follows Torrey in taking its Aramaic meaning to be “sure” (Montgomery, Daniel, 145, 147). Subsequent work supports him in deriving it from Persian, but it is from azdā meaning “well known; conception, notion” (E. Vogt, Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti Documentis Antiquis Illustratum (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1971), 3; cf. F. Rundgren, “Aramaica III: an Iranian loanword in Daniel,” Or Suecana 25-26 (1976-1977): 44-55; H. Happ, and W. P. Schmid, “Zu ἄσμανθης, ἄσκουθης, ἄστάνθης =,Bote’,” Glotta 40 (1962): 198-201, 321). Cowley suggests it means “statement” or “information” (A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. Edited, with Translation and Notes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 102). As such it means something like, “My decree has been made known”, i.e., the decree that they will die (2:5), or it means “a well known thing has been decreed by me”. i.e., it has been made known and is firm (Vogt. Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae, 3).
interpret it. The religious experts, however, needed to know the content of the dream so that they could interpret it, which would be consistent with their training in learned interpretation.\(^{139}\) They plead for him to tell them the dream so that they can interpret it for him. He then states:

"I know with certainty that you are buying time, because you see that the command I have issued is an edict, that if you will not make the dream known to me there is a law. You have agreed together to make a false and corrupt statement in my presence until the time changes. Therefore, tell me the dream and I will know that you can tell me its interpretation. (vv. 8-9)"

Interpretations of omens were like the utterances of the Delphic oracle, open to many meanings. The king here tells the religious experts that he suspects they play for time by giving vague or false interpretations,\(^{140}\) then when something takes place that fits into the interpretation, they take the glory of having predicted the future.

which is the way that *HALOT*, s.v. understands it ("definite," "irrefutable"). Given this understanding of the word, it is not necessary to maintain that Nebuchadnezzar forgot the dream. (Cf. Bentzen, *Daniel*, 225) There are two further narrative difficulties with maintaining that Nebuchadnezzar forgot the dream. If he forgot it, the courtiers could have made one up and the king would not have known the difference. Also, if he had forgotten it, how did he know that Daniel was correct when he revealed it. That the author/editor wanted to portray the king purposely withholding the dream fits better with the challenge that if they can relate it to him, he knows they can interpret it too.

\(^{139}\) Such interpretation was done through consulting texts or relying upon "the oral tradition of the masters". See Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars*, Vol. I, 11; II, 18, #13. There exists an Assyrian book of dream omens used in such circumstances. It is likely that books of natural omens were used, if anything within their purview appeared in dreams. Thus, if a birth anomaly was seen in a dream, the collection of birth anomaly omens would have been consulted. If they were told the dream, therefore, they could rely upon their collections to interpret it. Oppenheim, "Interpretation of dreams"; Oppenheim, "New fragments", 153-65; A. R. Millard, "Daniel and Belshazzar in history," *BAR* 11 (1985): 73-78.

Therefore, he wanted them to tell him the dream. If they could do that he had assurance that they truly had access to divine plans.

Biblical Judaism had no doubt that what the king suspected was in fact true. Yahweh, through *Deutero-Isa*, mocked the gods and religious experts of the Babylonians by challenging them to predict the future as He had, but, of course, they could not for only Yahweh could predict the future. In *Dan* 2, however, it is the king of the Babylonians who is questioning the veracity of the religious experts and their professions!

Such royal scepticism is not limited to the Hebrew Scriptures. In two accounts of the legendary Naram-Sin, this king doubted the diviners, although for this he was sternly reprimanded by the gods through defeat.\(^{141}\) Oppenheim translates part of an Assyrian letter from a religious expert to king Esarhaddon in which the religious expert related how the king "closed his ears" against an omen interpretation, but, he boasted, the omen had come true within the month. Oppenheim also makes reference to how Sennacherib’s suspicion of collusion led him to separate diviners into four groups in order to obtain a reliable report in an important question.\(^{142}\)

Parpola’s translation of the letters from diviners to Esharhaddon and Assurbanipal also reveal such distrust in at least two letters:

As reg[ards what the king, my lo]rd, wrote to me: "[Why] have you never told me [the truth]? [When] will you (actually) say to me [what] it is?"

...\(^{143}\)

... But perhaps the king, my lord, does not believe (me)! The rear side of

---


the Moon should be shown to one (of the) eunuch(s) ... the king, [my lord], [will] soon [believe me]. 144

Oppenheim also notes: “when one reads through their reports to the Assyrian kings, one can be amused at their efforts to interpret bad omens in a favourable sense by means of complicated reasoning”. 145 So Nebuchadnezzar’s mistrust is not merely the literary creation of a Jewish author. Mesopotamian kings had misgivings of which any faithful Jew would gladly have made much.

Because they were only practitioners of learned interpretation, and were unable to produce the dream for Nebuchadnezzar, the order was given to kill “all the wise men of Babylon” (v. 12). It is important again to note the move here from “Chaldeans” to “experts”. The Jews could not be referred to as “Chaldeans,” and as such were not summoned in this chapter. But, Daniel and his friends are among the numbers of the broader group of experts and thus, included in this general command, and so were sought to be killed. Then again in v. 18, Daniel includes himself among the religious experts by hoping not to die with “the rest of the wise men of Babylon”. By their inclusion in the numbers of the religious experts, judgement has been passed even upon the cream of the crop, as they were shown to be in chapter 1.

This failure of the court experts is highlighted through the use of some of the terms used to describe them. The terms הָלָה and חָלָה are used often in the Hebrew/Aramaic scriptures to refer to those who were experts or sages, and for those who were advisors in such settings as the courts of rulers. 146 It is interesting that at the very place where the court “experts” fail, i.e., at 2:12, the king angrily orders that those

---


145 Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, 227.

146 See above on חָלָה . p. 147.
in the professions, “the wise men of Babylon” should be put to death. It is also when Daniel speaks of the inabilities of the professions in 2:27 that we find the first of only two instances of this term occurring in a list, the second in 5:15 being equally as incongruent with the expected usage of this term. This placing of this word at these points in the stories seems to be a device to portray the professions as worthless.

Not only do the religious experts fail in their task of providing both the dream and its interpretation, they admit outright the limitation of their professions. In vv. 10-11, they explain to the king that only the gods in heaven could do what he asked of them.

The Chaldeans answered the king, “There is no one on earth who can reveal what the king demands! In fact no king, however great and powerful, has ever asked such a thing of any magician or enchanter or Chaldean. The thing that the king is asking is too difficult, and no one can reveal it to the king except the gods, whose dwelling is not with mortals.” (NRSV)

This was part of the world view of the religious experts. They did not have direct access to the gods. They were only learned interpreters of omens and were not the recipients of “symbolic” dreams and visions.  

147 Gurney, “Babylonians and Hittites”, 158-59. See, however, J. N. Lawson, “‘The God who reveals secrets’: the Mesopotamian background to Daniel 2.47,” *JSOT* 74 (1997): 61-76, who argues that these diviners did believe that they were aided by the gods. The difference between these is that the diviners worked with texts which were of divine origins, and the prophets and prophetic figures, such as Daniel, received direct revelations. Even if they did believe this generally, the point of the *Dan* stories is that they did not have such abilities.
As this scene unfolds the reader is prepared for the entry of the Jew, Daniel, who is expected, given the conclusion of the previous story. When Daniel finally appears on the scene to reveal the dream and its meaning, the reader can expect one of two routes to be taken. Either Daniel will use his superior grasp of the information that he learned, and which mastery led to his being ten times better than the experienced *hartoms* and exorcists (1:20); or he will rely upon his special abilities given by his God: the ability to interpret dreams and visions (1:12). As did the other professionals, Daniel also makes clear the significant limitations on the professions such as his. Not even skills ten times better than those of everyone else were equal to the task. At 2:27-28a, 30 he says:

No experts, enchanters, magicians, or extispices can show to the king the mystery that the king is asking, but there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries, and he has disclosed to King Nebuchadnezzar what will happen at the end of days...
But as for me, this mystery has not been revealed to me because of any wisdom that I have more than any other living being ....

It was not, then, a failure of individuals to have mastered the correct body of knowledge and skills, it was a failure of the very professions themselves to be able to deliver what was expected. The other professionals are correct about the inscrutability of the Divine, but the Divine does not have to dwell among people and thus reveal what is needed to accomplish what the king wants. The Divine has only to reveal what is needed to someone like Daniel (2:30), as happened in 2:19 and as explained in the hymn in 2:20-23. Such statements from both Daniel and the other religious experts

make it clear that the perspective is not favourable to the learned professions. These professions have no real access to the Divine.

One of the aspects of the stories that has been noted by scholars is how the kings react inappropriately to situations. At 2:46-49, after Nebuchadnezzar has learned that his kingdom will come to an end, he rewards Daniel: he did obeisance to Daniel, declared Daniel's God to be the real source of mysteries, and gave Daniel gifts and a high position in the kingdom over the religious experts! The explanation that has been offered for this is that the stories focus on the resolution of the immediate problem (interpretation of the dreams and the writing on the wall), not on the interpretations themselves. Although this explanation has merit, it overlooks the fact that, as the stories are told, there is a clear incongruity between interpretation and response. This does not just happen in chapter 2, where the interpretation might have been more positive at one time,\(^{149}\) but at 5:29 where the outcome of the interpretation is personally bad for the king.

**Comedic use of lists**

Although it relates to chapters 4 and 5 as well, we will consider the comedic use of lists at this point. In two recent articles, Peter Coxon and Hector Avalos have discussed the comedic function of lists in *Dan.*\(^{150}\) The article by Avalos is devoted to this topic; Coxon only notes this function as part of a broader discussion.

Although Avalos is concerned only with chapter 3, what he says about it is relevant to the other chapters. He says:


The main source of satire stems from the contrast between the mechanistic and automatic behaviour of the pagans and the assertive and pious behaviour of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. In fact, the mechanistic behaviour of the pagans is a good example of what Bergson regards as one of the universal themes of comedy—the human automaton. According to Bergson, a comic character is an absentminded one. This type of character does not think much about his or her actions. He/she is a pathetic, passive, and gutless individual whose actions resemble a mindless automaton.\textsuperscript{151}

Avalos acknowledges that the lists in \textit{Dan} are not all comedic. Coxon had already noted this when he concluded that the lists were used to enhance the Babylonian setting. But the repetition of the lists in chapter 3 does have a comedic edge to it, as Avalos shows. Given the negative view of the religious experts in the chapters under consideration, the various listings of them could be comedic as well, which is something already suggested by Coxon.

In chapters 2, 4 and 5 the King summons \textit{all} the wise men of Babylon’, whose professions are then listed. They faithfully answer the summons each time, and each time they fail. In chapter 2 they even stand before the king and plead with him to tell them the dream so that they can interpret it. Daniel, on the other hand, seems never to answer the first summons immediately, and he always succeeds. Here, then, the Jewish author/editor portrays the Mesopotamian religious experts as “pathetic, passive, and gutless” individuals who are exposed for what they are, “mindless automatons” who are at their wits end when the king asks something out of the norm. The Jewish Daniel, however, is an assertive individual who succeeds where they have failed, and who lets nothing concern him.

\textbf{Chapter 4}

Scholars generally agree that the account of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness in 3:31-4:34 [4:1-37] is one of the oldest stories in the collection of tales in \textit{Dan} 1-6. As

\textsuperscript{151} Avalos. “Comedic function”. 584.
in chapter 2, the problem the religious experts face is within the scope of Daniel’s
divine gift: the interpretation of dreams and visions (v. 2 [5]). Again, “all the wise
men of Babylon” (v. 3 [6]), i.e., the “hartoms and exorcists, i.e., the Chaldeans and
extispices” (v. 4 [7]), were summoned before the king to interpret the dream. Again,
Daniel is to be included among their numbers, in that he is now the leader of the
“hartoms” (verse 6 [9]). Yet again, none of the wise men of Babylon was able to interpret the dream (vv. 4 [7], 15 [18]), which is an
acknowledgment that the learned interpretation of the “hartoms” of whom Daniel was
the leader was not up to the task.

The explicit critique of the nature of the very professions in chapter 4 is
minimal, but significant; the implicit criticism may be more severe. This time, after
Nebuchadnezzar has a troubling dream, he relates the dream to the religious experts,
over whom Daniel had been made head in 2:48. This is what they had requested at 2:4
and 7, but they were still unable to interpret it, as they said they could in chapter 2.
This is hardly an endorsement of the professionals over which Daniel was head. But is
it a critique of the professions as well?

As the narration continues, Nebuchadnezzar relates why he called upon Daniel
at that point. It was not that Daniel was ten times better, having a superior mastery of
the knowledge required for such a task. It was because he had a divinely granted
ability that the others did not have; he had the spirit of the holy gods in him (15
[18]). This clearly is something that those who failed did not have, and it is for that
reason they failed, and he was able. This is again a critique of the very basis of the
profession, not of the abilities of the individual professionals.

---

152 See above on כְּכַם, pp. 133ff.
153 This phrase and concept will be discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

Chapter 5 is very similar to chapter 4. "The exorcists, astrologers and the extispices" (v. 7), i.e., "all the wise men of the king" (v. 8) were summoned to interpret the writing put on the banquet room wall by the disembodied hand. They dutifully arrive, but again fail (vv. 7-8). As in chapter 4, Daniel is specifically called upon because he is in some way endowed by the gods with abilities that the other experts did not have. Daniel's failure to appear when summoned is probably due to his not being one of the professionals in the new king's entourage, and hence the reference to "all the wise men of the king" rather than "all the wise men of the kingdom/Babylon" as we would usually find.

It is also when Daniel speaks of the inabilities of the professions in 2:27 that the first of only two instances of this term occurring in a list occurs, the second in 5:15 being equally as incongruent with the expected usage of this term.

Finally, in this chapter there is a marvelous word-play at 5:6 and 5:12, 16. This word-play finds the king "loosing his knots" in 5:6 due to the terror brought on by the mysterious finger and its writing on the wall. Whatever the meaning of this expression, it is a reaction of terror. After that editorial description of the king's reaction, at 5:12 the queen-mother tells him that Daniel can help him with the enigmatic message, because he is able to "loosen knots". That information is supposed to be helpful to the king, but in light of the narrator's use of that phrase, it becomes a double entendre. Finally, in 5:16 the king asks Daniel whether or not he is

154 A. Wolters, "Untying the king's knots: physiology and wordplay in Daniel 5," JBL 110 (1991): 117-22 argues that it means the king became incontinent in 5:6, understanding תֵבִּיצ as the term for the muscle that constricts the anus. S. M. Paul, "Decoding a 'joint' expression in Daniel 5:6, 16," JANESCU 22 (1993): 125-26 seems to adopt a less humorous play on words, understanding the word תֵבִּיצ as the word for a joint. He does not explain what "loosing the joint of his loins" means, however.

155 On the understanding of תֵבִּיצ as enigma see "Chapter 4".
able to “loosen knots”. Given that Daniel will predict the imminent demise of Darius, the reader can confidently read a double ‘yes’ as the answer to that question: Yes, Daniel can interpret the writing on the wall; and Yes, he can “loosen the knots” of Darius! The juxtaposing of these two uses of the phrase can hardly be anything but humour.

To add to the humour, as we have already noted, Darius reacts quite differently to this knot loosing news. Not only does Daniel reproach Belshazzar at 5:29 for his arrogance in profaning the sacred objects, and for not learning from his father’s mistakes, he is not bright enough to react with horror to the news that his reign will end soon and the kingdom be given to the Medes and Persians. Instead, like the Pharaoh when Joseph told him the bad-news/good-news interpretation of the lean and fat cows, Darius heaped honours upon Daniel, rewarding him with regalia and making him third in the kingdom. There is again a distinct incongruity between interpretation and response.

Conclusion

Chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5, then, are particularly critical of both the abilities of the individuals and of the actual functions of the experts. Experienced practitioners were bettered by four Jewish captives who were forced to train in their professions. Then when faced with increasingly easier challenges, the Chaldeans failed: they could not reveal the dream and so could not interpret it; they could not interpret a dream that was told them; and they could not interpret a short four word (three lexemes) divine message. In each case, when they could not, Daniel could provide what the king needed.

Even the kings are held up for ridicule, but especially Belshazzar who is portrayed as particularly dull.
What we have found in the portrayal of the officials and kings in these chapters is found in other places. The *Sibylline Oracles* 3:218-233 is a particularly relevant example, and it seems to come from the same period as the final composition of *Dan*.\(^{156}\) It is also found in *Exod* 7-8, *1 Kgs* 18, and *Isa* 40-55.

Yehuda Radday has pointed out the use of humour in the story about the ten plagues.

The first of the ten plagues called down by Moses changed the water of the Nile into blood, so that the Egyptians would have nothing to drink (*Exod.* 7.17ff.). What did Pharaoh’s professional magicians do? Instead of turning the blood back into water, they proudly displayed their art by doing ‘the same thing by their spells’ (v. 22). And when Moses brought swarms of frogs who even jumped into Pharaoh’s bed chamber (*Exod.* 8.33ff.), the magicians brought some more frogs upon the land (v.7). I think this is delightful humour at the expense of the inane court sorcerers which has been overlooked by most commentators.\(^{157}\)

This is especially interesting in the light of the magical acts of Ḥor in the second Demotic tale of Setna-a-em-wese. In what seems a contest with the magicians of Ethiopia, one conjures up fire for the Pharaoh, another produces water to put it out; one creates such a darkness that no one can see his neighbour (*cf.* *Exod.* 10:23), another makes it light again, *etc.*\(^{158}\) Surely this was what the Pharaoh’s magicians were supposed to do! Having the Egyptians exacerbate the problems by parroting Moses and Aaron seems satirical.

Another example of mocking similar figures, *i.e.*, the cultic servants of other gods, is the contest between Elijah and the prophets of Baal in *1 Kgs* 18:17-40. The author actually tells the reader that Elijah “mocked” them (18:27). Again, what the

---

\(^{156}\) *OTP*, I, 354-55.


\(^{158}\) Müller, “Hartom”, 178.
prophets of Baal could not do, the prophet of Yahweh could, even after making the task seem harder still by pouring water on the wood that would ignite.

In a similar way, Deutero-Isa scoffed at the Babylonians and their gods. Images of gods and the process of making them is derided (41:21-29; 44:6-20; 46:1-10; cf. Jer 50:38). At the same time the author declares that what the foreign gods could not do, Yahweh could. But the two most relevant passages speak specifically about religious experts in Babylon, although only the most general term, “expert” (כָּבָד) is common to these passages and Dan. In the first passage, 44:25-26a, we read that Yahweh works against the Babylonian religious experts by confounding them, and works for his servants by bringing about what they pronounce. This parallels well what happens in Dan where the foreign experts fail, but the divinely gifted Jew not only understands what the others could not, he also has his prophecies come true. In the second passage, 47:10-15, Babylon, who felt secure with all her magic and divination, is told that her experts could do all they wanted, but to no avail for their arts were worthless: “there is not one that can save you” (v. 15). It is this mockery of the inability of the Babylonian religious experts that the stories of Dan illustrate.

This comedy or satire further illustrates that the professions of religious experts in the courts of Mesopotamia are not here portrayed for emulation. When a real revelation was given, the learned interpretation by the Mesopotamian religious experts was not equal to it. However, faithful Jews who knew the Revealer of true mysteries were up to the task because their God could reveal his will to one of them. Mesopotamian religious expertise is shown to be worthless—devoid of any value for Jews except as the butt of jokes or source of ridicule, even when such Jews practiced it. Its practitioners, likewise, were merely charlatans to be jeered at or buffoons to be laughed at, not professionals to be emulated.
Contrary to the consensus view, then, the religious experts in *Dan* are not portrayed in such a way that their professions could be considered as viable options for faithful Jews. The view of *Dan* 1-6 seems to be summed by *Isa* 44:25-26a:

I frustrate false prophets and their omens, and make fools of diviners; I reverse what wise men say and make nonsense of their wisdom. I confirm my servants’ prophecies and bring about my messengers’ plans.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter we have inquired about the religious professions and professionals who are portrayed as serving in the court of the kings in *Dan* 1, 2, 4 and 5. We have concluded that the choice of names for the professions betrays a lack of significant association with the religious professions, although the administrative names do indicate such an association. We also concluded that the stories do not portray either the professionals or the professions in a good light. Both are held up for ridicule: they are neither as smart as the four faithful Jewish captives, nor do they have access to the Divine that Daniel has, and so they are anything but the א Prophet that they are supposed to be. As part of that, the kings are also held up for some ridicule. With these conclusions we have completely cut the connection with the case built up by Müller and followed by others. There is no informed connection with the so-called “Daniel tradition”, and the role of the mantic professions in the stories is not one that is positive. All of this then leads us to consider how Daniel functions in these chapters, as compared to the other courtiers on whom the kings call.
Chapter 4:
Portrayal of Daniel in *Dan* 1-6

In chapter 3 we considered the religious experts from *Dan* 1-6 and found that the stories give a significant critique of such professions. In this chapter we will consider how Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah are portrayed in relation to the other religious experts, focusing specifically upon Daniel. On the matter of the difference between Daniel and his Mesopotamian counterparts, Collins, following Humphreys and then Niditch and Doran,\(^1\) maintains that the professions are positively portrayed and that Daniel’s success as a religious expert is due to his superior wisdom given by his superior God. The role model for Jews, therefore, was that of a religious expert in the Mesopotamian courts who was faithful to his God and who would thereby climb the ladder of success. But, does Daniel function as a Mesopotamian religious expert when he interprets dreams and enigmas? In this chapter we will explore this question by considering each chapter in which Daniel is portrayed as a Mesopotamian religious expert. We will limit ourselves to material that will elucidate this role both of Daniel and his friends and thus will not be looking at chapters 3 and 6.

---

Dan 1

In the canonical form of Dan, chapter 1 sets the tone for what follows, whether just chapters 1-6 or the whole book. As such, it could indicate what the second century BCE compiler wanted to stress. In this chapter the sections relevant to our investigation are vv. 3-10, 15, and 17-21.

The chapter is concerned with how Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah (to be referred to as “the four”) remain loyal to their God when required by their captors to do something that they thought would defile themselves. The chapter begins with some historical context in vv. 1-2. It moves into a description of how Nebuchadnezzar ordered that some of the captives be trained to work in his court (vv. 3-6). Then the story moves to how the four are given Mesopotamian names, but refuse to eat food, which would defile them in some way (vv. 7-16). It ends with the four being given

---

2 There are several approaches to understanding the relationship of Daniel 1 to the rest of the book. 1) It circulated separately as a story and was brought together with the others stories by an editor; 2) It was written as an introduction to chapters 2-6 (7) when they were brought together by an editor (e.g., G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1981), 20, 38; (2-7); Jürgen Christian Lebram, Das Buch Daniel (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984); A. Lenglet, "La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7," Bib 53 (1972): 169-90; 3) It was composed as an introduction to the whole work, which was composed by one author (although views differ as to whether it was fifth century (conservative scholars; e.g., Joyce G. Baldwin, Daniel: an Introduction and Commentary (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1978));

G. L. Archer, “Daniel,” in The Expositor’s Bible commentary with the New International Version of the Holy Bible: Daniel-Minor Prophets, eds. Gaebelien, Frank Ely, Douglas, J. D, and Polcyn, Dick (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, 1985) or second century (critical scholars; e.g., Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 2d ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948); H. H. Rowley, “The unity of the Book of Daniel,” in The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament, 2nd ed. Rowley, H. H. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965; reprint, 1968)). Whether chapter 1 was composed as an introduction to the whole book or was originally an introduction to chapters 1-6/7 is not significant for our understanding of how this chapter functions at the narrative level in the final text. If it was originally part of a compilation consisting in chapters 1-6/7 and to that compilation were added chapters 7/8-12, it remains that chapter 1 introduces the main characters and sets the historical scene for the characters and narrative of the whole book because the visions rely upon that earlier material.
special abilities by God so that they excel in their training and surpass the abilities of
the professionals in the court. They thereby earn themselves places in the court (vv. 17-
21).

\textit{Dan 1:3-8}

Following the historical preamble to the book is the introduction to the
characters in 1:3-8, which we shall consider first. Verses 3-4 give the reason for the
four being in training in Babylon. It was at the king’s command that they, along with
others from their homeland, be taken to Babylon to embark on a training programme.
This helps to set the scene for some of the events in this chapter; however, some of the
specifics of these verses are not clear, but are relevant to our discussion.

\textit{Verse 3}

First, Ashpenaz is commanded לָדַ֣בְּדֹ֗ו יִשְׂרָאֵל הָמוֹרִ֜ים מְלַֽוֹתָֽהוֹתּ. In this clause it is not clear what לָדַ֣בְּדֹ֗ו means: “to introduce,” and
“to bring” being the possibilities. Nor is it clear whether reference is made to three or
to two groups. Finally, the meaning of מְלַֽוֹתָֽהוֹתּ needs to be explored.4

The infinitive יִשְׂרָאֵל can be understood in two ways. Some scholars
understand it to mean, “to present” to the king at court.5 In this they follow Theodotion

3 Klaus Koch, \textit{Daniel} (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), 2, argues that
this is not a proper name, despite the versions and most commentators understanding it
that way. He translates it in light of its Old Persian origins, as “Palastminister/
Generalquartiermeister”.

4 The relationship of Israel (v. 3) and Judah (v. 6) will be considered under the
discussion of v. 6.

5 \textit{E.g.}, D. Karl Marti, \textit{Das Buch Daniel Erklärt} (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul
Siebeck), 1901), 2; James A. Montgomery, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on
and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929),
11; Matthias Delcor, \textit{Le Livre de Daniel} (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie Éditeurs, 1971), 60-
61; and John J. Collins, \textit{Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel} (Minneapolis:
(εἰσαχαγεῖν), 88 and Syro-Hexaplar (ἀγαγεῖν αὐτῶ), and Vulgate (introduceret).

This assumes that the selection is made from among a larger group of new exiles in Babylon. 6 Others have taken it to mean, “to bring” from Jerusalem/Palestine. 7 This is how 967 seems to have understood it, because it uses φέρω and ἀγω, a pair used in Greek for the ravages of looting and taking of captives. 8 This assumes that the selection was to be made in Judah.

The hiph 'il of נָב occurs 10 times in Dan. Of those, five are found in chapter 1 at vv. 2<sup>2</sup>, 3 and 18<sup>2</sup>. In both sets of occurrences (vv. 2-3 and v. 18), it is used of the exiles in relation to Babylon and the king’s court. In v. 2, it is used to convey the idea of bringing booty from the Jerusalem temple back to Babylon. In the next verse, it is captives whom the king tells the head of his Sarisim to bring. This would seem to refer to the bringing of the captives to Babylon. The narrative at 5:13 could be read as confirmation of this. There, Daniel is described as מִלַּחַךְ אֵלָה לִדְוֹד וּדְוֹד מִלַּחַךְ מָרְיָד, “one of the children of the Judaean exiles that my father the king brought from Judah”. 9

In other descriptions of the events following the defeats of the Judaeans, there is a listing of temple booty and then human “booty”, upon which Dan 1:2 may be

---

6 Collins, Daniel. 134.


8 LSJ ἀγω 1.3; φέρω V1.2.

9 Goldingay, Daniel, 5. Note should be taken, however, of the use of verbs in 5:2-3 where γένος is used of bringing the vessels into the court, while παραδέχεσθαι is used of the bringing of them from Jerusalem.
dependent: e.g., 2 Kgs 24:13-16, 2 Chr 36:18-20, and Jer 52:17-30. In these, not only was there booty from the temple, there also was “booty” from the upper strata of Israelite society. The relationship of 1:1-2 to both 2 Kgs and 2 Chr is well established, as we have discussed elsewhere. Following close upon vv. 1-2, therefore, v. 3 could be understood as an order to bring potential trainees to Babylon.

Two facts suggest that this is not the case. First, in the related passages, except for 2 Kgs 24:16 (humans) and 2 Chr 36:18 (treasures), the verb נַבְעָל is not used, but rather נְבָעָל (6x) and לֵעָל (4x). Second, in Dan 1:18, the hiph ‘il of נַבְעָל, although with a prepositional phrase, is used clearly to mean “bring to the court”, as opposed to “bring to Babylon”, and the first use in v. 18 refers back to the usage in 1:3.

In the context of Dan 1, it seems that the bringing of the captives to the palace of the king parallels the bringing of the temple vessels to the temple in Babylon. This point, we believe will become important as we consider the relationship of Daniel to the other religious experts. These Judaeans were not entering the program voluntarily; rather, they were forced into service for the king.

The second problem in v. 3 pertains to the make-up of the group of trainees. This group is described by a series of three phrases each beginning with the preposition ב, which is used with a partitive sense here. The three phrases are joined by the conjunction ב. The phrases are: some of the sons of Israel”; וַיִּהְמַר רִבְרָד מֶשָּׁלְהוּ “some of the seed of the royal family”; and some of the nobility”. Whether this group is composed only of Israelites or is mixed with Mesopotamians makes a difference to how we understand the chapter, and so we will consider the question in detail.

Some older commentators thought there were three groups from the captives. This argument does not hold up under examination, however. It would mean that “children of Israel” was a term for commoners in contrast to such groups as royalty and nobility, a usage that is attested nowhere else. It seems to be more natural to understand these three phrases as referring to one group of Judaean exiles, one group of Babylonian royalty, and one group of Babylonian nobility, which is how Septuagint and Theodotion seem to translate them. Bevan, Stone, and possibly Collins take this position. This is a minority position, however.

The majority of scholars interpret these three phrases as moving from a general phrase to two more specific, defining phrases. One group refers to the vavs as correlative, i.e., “both ... and”. The usual correlative construction, however, is ἀλλὰ ... ἀλλὰ or ἀλλὰ ... ἀλλὰ. The first vav has also been understood to be explicative.

---

11 Cf. the sources cited by Montgomery, Daniel, 119.

12 Septuagint: ἀγαγείν (αύτῶ: this is missing in 967) ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν τῶν μεγιστάνων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπιλεκτῶν Theodotion: έἰσογαγείν ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος τῆς βασιλείας καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν φορθομιν.


14 Behrmann, Daniel, 2; Marti, Daniel, 2; Montgomery, Daniel, 125; Charles, Daniel, 13. Charles, however, bases his decision upon a conjectural emendation of v. 2, into which he wants to insert הָלֹא, הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹא הָלֹa הָלֹa הָl. No subsequent commentators seem to follow him in this emendation.

15 Cf. GKC §154a, n. 1(b), ¶3; BDB s.v. §1.h.; HALOT, s.v. §9. According to Montgomery, Bertholdt was the first critical scholar to understand the γ ... γ of 1:3 as correlative (“sowohl ... als auch”). Along with this verse, Dan 7:20 and 8:13 are two of the passages cited as having such a use of γ ... γ. (However, Charles, who cites 8:13 as corroborating evidence, follows Septuagint at 8:13, thus removing one of the conjunctions to which he here refers! Charles, Daniel, 13. 210-11.) Others are Gen 34:28; Josh 9:23; Jer 32:20; Ps 76:7.

16 GKC 154a, n. 1(e); Charles, Daniel, 13.
The phrases would thus be translated: “some of the Israelites, specifically, some of the royal family and of the nobility”. There are other examples in Dan and elsewhere of this usage. Whether the two waws are correlative or the first is explicative does not matter in the end. The difference between the two is merely that a correlative requires two more specific terms in addition to the first more general one, while the explicative needs only one more specific term, although there are two in Dan 1:3.

Against such a position, Stone finds support for a mixed Israelite-Mesopotamian group in the phrase מַלְכוּת יַדְוָי in 1:6. This, he argues, is not a reference to members of the tribe of Judah, but to those who live in Judaea in general, which he claims is what the term connotes in 2 Chr 25:12 and in the prophets. He claims that this understanding of the phrase makes the point of the Judaeans’ unswerving loyalty to Yahweh in the face of peer pressure more striking than it would be if various segments of Israelite society were introduced, only one of which (the Judahites) was observant. In addition, he does not find the unobservant Judaeans explicitly mentioned elsewhere in the chapter. We will argue that the unobservant Judaeans are assumed in the remainder of the chapter, and are found in a related

---

17 BDB s.v. 1.b.; HALOT, s.v. §5; Goldingay, Daniel, 5, 122 (on 6:29).

18 D. W. Baker, “Further examples of the waw explicativum,” VT 30 (1980): 129-36, has amassed examples of, and references to the explicative function of ג" in Hebrew and Aramaic together with references to Ugaritic, Akkadian and Greek. He shows from his own and others’ studies that this function of the conjunction is not rare. In Dan he notes 1:3 (ג"; 4:10 (ג"; 6:29 (ג"; 7:1 (ג"; and 8:10 (ג"). Goldingay, Daniel, 122, supports him in his findings for Dan and adds two more: 8:24; and 11:38. B. E. Colless, “Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel,” JSOT 56 (1992): 115, argues convincingly that 6:28 has a vav explicativum and he supports the contention that one is found at 7:1 and suggests that 6:9 also contains one. Hans Bauer, and Pontus Leander, Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen, Reprint ed. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1969), §70r suggest that the first ג in 4:22 is explicative, although they do not cite any other examples. So, the existence of the vav explicativum is well attested. with ample possible occurrences in Dan as well.

19 Stone, “Note on Daniel i. 3”, 69-71.
passage in chapters 11-12. We also will explain the use of Israelites and Judahites in a different way.

Throughout chapters 1-6, when Mesopotamians are mentioned, they usually are referred to as “Babylonians” (1:1; 2:12, 14, 18, 24, 48, 49; 3:1, 12, 30; 4:3 [6], 26 [29], 27 [30]; 5:7), “Chaldeans” (1:4), “Medes” (5:28; 6:1, 9, 13, 16), or “Persians” (5:28; 6:8, 12, 15, 28), or as being from “the kingdom” (1:20; 4:15 [18]; 6:7). In v. 3 no such designation is given and, whereas the closest such designations are to “Israel” (1:2, 3) and “Judah” (1:6), it is logical that the royalty and nobility are all Israelite.

It is best, therefore, to understand the first 1 as explicative, and to understand “children of Israel” as the generic term for all the captives from Palestine. The two other expressions would then be a further specification of the strata of society from which the selection was to be made, i.e., from the royalty and the nobility. Understanding the construction in this way means that the group of which Daniel and his three friends are a part is composed only of captives of the upper classes of Israelite society.

The final matter to consider for v. 3 is the meaning of מַהֲרָתִים. The word appears to be of Persian origins coming from the Old Iranian fratama, “first, leader, pl. the chiefs” and, so, is taken to mean “aristocrat”, “noble”. It occurs elsewhere in the Masoretic Text only in Esth 1:3 and 6:9. In the first of the Esth references, the word is used with הָא to indicate those from the provinces who were coming to Xerxes’ banquet. In the second passage מַהֲרָתִים is found in the mouth of Haman when he recommends to Xerxes that, as part of the honours to be bestowed upon a worthy individual, one of the מַהֲרָתִים should hand-deliver the royal clothing and horse to him.

The captives, therefore, were of the royal family and the nobility; they were the leaders of their society.

*Verse 4*

Not only were the trainees to be the cream of Israelite society, they also were to be the *crème de la crème*; this is made clear in 1:4. They were to have six qualifications in order to be part of this special group. We will consider each qualification in turn.

First, the captives chosen as candidates for courtiers were not to have any כָּמָל “blemishes”. The word occurs only 18 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is found five times of priests in *Lev* (21:17, 18, 21, 23) where we read that having a כָּמָל disqualified priests from offering sacrifices. According to these passages a כָּמָל ranged from having festering sores, to being blind, to having crushed testicles (a eunuch?). Elsewhere in *Lev* (22:20, 21, 25), *Num* (19:2), and *Deut* (15:21; 17:1) כָּמָל is the attribute that disqualified an animal from being a sacrifice.

In *2 Sam* 14:25 not having a כָּמָל is an attribute of Absalom and in *Cant* 4:7 this is an attribute of the Shulamite woman. The word is used figuratively of a moral blemish in *Job* 31:7, *Prov* 9:7, and possibly *Deut* 32:5, but in the last there is great textual uncertainty about the passage. Thus, of the 18/17 occurrences of this word, 13 are associated with cultic matters, 2 with people connected to royalty, and 3/2 in a figurative sense referring to moral “blemishes”. Given the cultic importance of royalty in the ancient Near East, the emphasis upon Absalom and the Shulamite woman could be cultic as well, emphasising their suitability for royal positions. Lacocque has

---

21 This spelling of the word occurs only here and in *Job* 31:7. (Montgomery, *Daniel*, 126, incorrectly cites the second example as *Jer* 31:7.) According to Torrey it is a conflate spelling of כָּמָל “blemish” and כָּמָל “anything”. (So Montgomery, *Daniel*, 126; HALOT, s.v.) Many MSS have כָּל.
concluded that this cultic emphasis of the word gives this passage a priestly context.\textsuperscript{22} Collins, however, tempers this cultic association by noting the non-cultic uses noted above, and also by citing extra-biblical texts that listed this characteristic for diviners, slaves, and scribes in the ancient Near East.\textsuperscript{23}

The second attribute required of the captives in 1:4 was that they had to be מָרֵא, “good looking”. According to v. 15, this attribute was what resulted from following their vegetarian diet for just ten days! The same expression is used of Rebekah twice in Gen (24:16; 26:7), of Bathsheba in 2 Sam (11:2), and in Esth, once of Vashti (1:11), twice of the features required of the new wife of Xerxes (2:2, 3), and once of Esther (2:7). There are parallel examples with יֶבֶר in Gen 12:11 (Sarai); 29:17 (Rachel); 39:6 (Joseph);\textsuperscript{24} 1 Sam 17:42 (David); 2 Sam 14:27 (Tamar); and Esth 2:7 (Esther). Here, then, the association is with people such as matriarchs, patriarchs, and royalty.

The third of these attributes is that the entrants were to be מַשְׂמָלָה בּוֹלֵל הָחָֽמָה.\textsuperscript{25} To be בּוֹלֵל “in” (ב) something is found only in Josh 1:7, Ps 101:2, possibly in 1 Sam 18:14\textsuperscript{26} and Amos 5:13,\textsuperscript{27} and elsewhere in Dan at 1:17; 7:8

\textsuperscript{22} André Lacocque, The Book of Daniel, with forward by Paul Ricoeur (London: SPCK, 1979), 27.

\textsuperscript{23} Collins, Daniel, 136-37.

\textsuperscript{24} See discussion of other parallels with Joseph, below at p. 233.

\textsuperscript{25} Charles, Daniel, 12, restores מַשְׂמָלָה on the basis of Septuagint and 1:17. It is more likely that Septuagint harmonized than that this dropped out. Neither 1QDan\textsuperscript{a} nor 4QDan\textsuperscript{a} preserve enough of the verse to determine whether the word occurred in those MSS.

\textsuperscript{26} Many manuscripts and several versions read בּוֹלֵל rather than לֵלֶל.

\textsuperscript{27} If its meaning at Amos 5:13 is “to have insight” rather than “to be prudent” or “to be wise”, then the occurrence there also is an example of this group of phrases. In this case the phrase מַשְׂמָלָה מַלְאָלָה would not signify the time at which the מַלְאָלָה live (i.e., “the one who is prudent on that day”), but rather would signify that into which the מַשְׂמָלָה have the insight and would be translated such as “the one who has insight into
and 9:13. Kosmala puts the Dan 1 occurrences into the same category as מַשְׂכֵּל in 8:25, *i.e.*, they are used of “… human thought, when thought is a result of learning and experience, of quick intellectual grasp or good education…”.

The trainees, then, were to be well rounded in the education that they had received at home in Israel. Coming from the king of Babylon, מְשָׁכֵּל ... probably was meant to have this “secular” meaning.

The fourth attribute, מְשָׁכֵּל, may mean something like “rich in knowledge”. In Num 24:16 Balaam says of himself that he is מְשָׁכֵּל דִּבְרֵי ה' ... “one who knows the knowledge of the Most High”. This phrase is an addition to the preface of his fourth oracle, which in all its other parts is the same preface as in the third oracle. The phrase stands between two other phrases that, seemingly, tell of the source of the knowledge of God: Baalam is יִשְׁכַּב, “one who hears El’s utterances”, and is יִנָּגֵד, “one who sees the vision of Shaddai”.

The only other occurrence of this phrase in the Masoretic Text is at Prov 17:27 where it is said, simply, that יִנָּגֵד יְאָרְרִי יִדְעַת, “the knower of knowledge is one who restrains his words”.

The phrase does occur in the Apocryphon of Josh where it appears to be used of Moses, the “man of God”.

---


29 We will consider the “religious” or Jewish perspective below.

30 Marti, Daniel, 3; Aage Bentzen, Daniel (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1952), 16.

31 See the discussion below on pp 214 ff. and 282.

Montgomery thinks the phrase ידעי הבינה is equivalent to דעה הבינה in the hymn of praise in Dan 2:21. There Daniel says of God that ידעי הבינה הוא חכם, "He gives wisdom to the wise and the ability to know to those who know understanding". There are various such accusatives of the internal object. As an example we can consider לדעת הבינה, "to know understanding", which is the most frequent of these phrases. In his questioning by Yahweh, Job is asked לדעת הבינה, "Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth?" Then Job is commanded ידעי הבינה, "Tell me if you know understanding" (Job 38:4), which seems to mean, in this instance, "Tell me, if you really do know so much". Prov 4:1 says that ידעי הבינה, "Sons, hear a father’s correction and listen in order to know understanding". This again seems to imply the collecting of knowledge, albeit this time it is knowledge about how best to live life. 1 Chr 12:33 says that ידעי הבינה, "ones who know understanding about the times in order to know what Israel should do". 2 Chr 2:11-13 refers to two people as possessing this ability. Solomon is praised by King Hiram of Tyre as a ידעי הבינה, "a wise son who knows insight and..."

33 Montgomery, Daniel, 126.

34 Paul Joüon, and T. Muraoka, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993), §125 q. These may use a cognate noun or a synonym. Excluding the examples discussed in the foregoing and following paragraphs and the next attribute in this list (discussed below), the following are the various phrases from the Masoretic Text.

Jer 23:20; Prov 1:2
Job 32:7; Prov 17:24
Prov 1:2; 24:14; Eccl 1:17; 8:16
2 Chr 2:11; 30:22
Dan 9:22
Prov 21:11
understanding”, who was given to David and who would build the temple. He then hastens to add that he would send ידעי ידני, “a wise man who knows understanding” and ידעי ידני, “who knows how to work” with various precious substances, i.e., a skilled craftsman. Whether this phrase is equivalent with ידעי ידני may not now be possible to discern. They seem, however, to be very similar in meaning.

The fifth attribute, ידעי ידני, is unique to Dan, even when the Aramaic form of the noun, ידעי ידני, is considered. The closest expression is ידעי ידני in Prov 19:25 and 29:7. It too is an accusative of the internal object, and is similar in meaning to the previous expression. However, as Goldingay notes, the verb ידעי ידני is used in Dan to denote insight into dreams, visions, and prophecies. It is used exactly this way in 1:17, and these two uses may be linked in a way similar to the use of ידעי ידני in the same two verses.

Based upon this brief examination of the third, fourth and fifth attributes in Dan 1:4, it seems wise not to try to make hard and fast differences among them. They are clearly intellectual attributes, but what the differences are is not clear. Either we have too little information and context with which to work in order to make fine distinctions, or Behrmann and Montgomery were correct to understand them as superlatives, or cumulatives, i.e., near synonymous phrases intended as a tour de force to emphasise the superior intellectual quality of the candidates. It is likely that they are meant to describe the results of their general training acquired before their capture.

---

35 ידעי ידני is a late Hebrew form. In addition to Dan 1:4, 17, it is found in 2 Chr 1:10, 11, 12 and in Ecc 10:20. See also below, pp. 257 ff. and 262.
36 Goldingay, Daniel, 303.
37 Behrmann, Daniel, 2; Montgomery, Daniel, 126.
38 Montgomery, Daniel, 121; and Goldingay, Daniel, 15-16.
The final attribute to be considered in Dan 1:4 is שָׁבַע לְעַמָּה כִּי צְרִיךְ. Bevan, Marti, and Montgomery take this phrase as the conclusion and the “capacity” is both physical and mental, thus covering all the attributes already discussed from 1:4. As such it could be translated “that is, [young men] who are qualified [literally, in whom there is the ability] to serve in the palace of the king”.

This understanding of the use here seems unlikely, however, because כִּי usually retains the concept of “strength”. Behrmann thinks the phrase is an additional attribute that refers to suitable physical strength. This is better than the previous possibility, because it retains the predominant concept denoted by the word כִּי might also refer to the power of personality or the stamina that is required of one in a court context, because the word כִּי denotes psychological, or social “power, ability” not just physical, “strength, power”. This is how McKane seems to understands it when he writes:

Daniel, along with other Israelite youths of royal and aristocratic families, is chosen to be educated for the higher civil service in Babylon. In this process of selection, regard is had to physical soundness and to an impressive presence as well as to the intellectual stature of the candidates. To be of the right calibre to ‘stand’ in the royal palace (i.e. to be functionaries of the king) they require not only sharpness of intellect but also an all-round physical and mental toughness (כִּי). These youths are selected for an arduous educational discipline—they are to be taught Babylonian language and letters (Dan. 1:3-4).

---

39 Bevan, Short Commentary, 59; Marti, Daniel, 3; and Montgomery, Daniel, 126.

40 It may, however, mean “ability” in 1 Chr 26:8, a similar passage, and less possibly in 29:2. Because of these occurrences we are hesitant to rule out the possibility.

41 Behrmann, Daniel, 2.

42 HALOT, s.v.

43 W. McKane, Prophets and Wisemen (London: SCM, 1983), 97.
As with several other attributes, this one is taken up again in the conclusion to the chapter when in v. 19 it is related that the four stood before the king after they successfully passed his testing.

The clear message of these attributes is that the young men who were selected for training as courtiers were to be the cream of Israelite society, the finest in their societal, religious, physical, intellectual and psychological attributes.44

Having chosen youths possessing such qualities, Ashpenaz was instructed לָלֻם רֶשֶׁת וְלָשֶׁן צֶדֶק.45 It seems unlikely that this is a reference to the Aramaic literature46 and language. In 2:4 Aramaic is referred to specifically as although this may be a gloss.47 In Dan, as we discussed in the previous chapter, כלים refers

44 Note E. M. Good, “Apocalyptic as comedy: the Book of Daniel,” Semeia: an Experimental Journal for Biblical Criticism 32 (1984): 49, who compares these characteristics with the description of the tree of the Knowledge of Good and evil that caused Humans to fall into sin, thus implying that these four will cause Babylon to fall.

45 This is an example of late Hebrew. if כַּשֵּׁר is meant to govern both the previous nouns (cf. Behrmann, Daniel, 2. The phrase should have been כַּשֵּׁר וַלְשָׁנָה כַּשֵּׁר and לָלֻם כְָלֵים כַּשֵּׁר (GKC §128a). Montgomery, Daniel, 127), however, disputes the claim of GKC that it is rare and cites a series of examples of this construction, especially biblical Aramaic. He concludes: “In general the usage is proper where things go in pairs, as here.”

46 סְפָר has been understood here as a collective noun meaning “literature”, following one understanding of the Greek and Latin (γράμματα and litteras, so Montgomery, Daniel, 127). It may also be used this way in 1:17. It may be more reasonable to read it as a reference to the Akkadian script or letters (cf. HALOT, 2.c.ii; J. C. Greenfield, “‘Because he/she did not know letters’: remarks on a first millennium C.E. legal expression,” JANESCU 22 (1993): 39-44). The two words together, then, would cover both the understanding the language structure (the ability to speak it, “tongue”) and its writing system (“script”). The parallel used to confirm the first understanding, “literature,” is Isa 29:11-12. It is unclear how this is the case, however. Only the first occurrence, in בִּרְוָא כְָלִים תָּרָם, could be used to justify the abstract use “literature”. The other two occurrences in the phrase כְָלֵים תָּרָם refer more strictly to the writing system, i.e., the script, not to what is produced with it, i.e., the literature; “one who does not know/understand the script” is an illiterate person. Even the first occurrence is better understood as a use of the definite מְלַכָּה to refer to a class, in a comparative phrase, “as the words of a sealed book”, cf. HALOT, § B.5 and GKC §126 q-t.

47 In 1QDan⁹ there is a lacuna at the beginning of the line before מְלַכָּה. It appears probable from this that מְלַכָּה did not occur before it. However, the end of the
not to the inhabitants of southern Mesopotamia from whom Nebuchadnezzar came, but to the Babylonians in general at 5:30 and 9:1, and elsewhere to the religious experts who appear in the lists with others. This then is an instruction to teach the trainees the Akkadian language, and the scholarly and secret literature that went with it. Whereas this language continued in use in the courts into the time of the Seleucids, it is very possible that it is knowledge of this practice that informs this phrase. This training was intended to prepare them to be courtiers, and specifically those who practised learned interpretation, and not intuitive or revelation interpretation for which there is no training.

Verse 5

After specifying the requirements for forced entrance into this elite training program, we are told in 1:5 that the four are among the chosen. They immediately face a crisis of loyalty, however: whether to eat the food prescribed by the king, or remain loyal to their God.

As part of the training programme the trainees receive food that came from the king’s own supply. The word used to denote this provision is מֵאֶד, which occurs five times in this chapter (vv. 5, 8, 13, 15, 16) and once more in 11:26. In the latter reference, it refers to people under the patronage of Ptolemy VI Philometor, and who

---


49 A loanword from the Old Persian patibaga. cf. Syriac ptbq and Greek πτομαξίς. It is divided in some MS, seemingly, because of the relationship between מֵאֶד at the beginning of the word and the Hebrew word מֵאֶד, “fragment, bit, morsel of bread”.

---

previous line is not extant in the fragments, so we cannot be sure of this. On this question see D. C. Snell, “Why is there Aramaic in the Bible?,” JSOT 18 (1980): 36; and Collins, Daniel, 156 n. 35.
led to his downfall at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.\textsuperscript{50} Rather than being a matter of defilement by unkosher food,\textsuperscript{51} it may be that it is a matter of not accepting the patronage of the king, thus owing him their allegiance.\textsuperscript{52} How that defiles one, however, is not clear, unless having a patron-client relationship with a foreign king was thought of as a violation of one’s covenant relationship with Yahweh. It is possible that there is no reason other than the desire by the author to complicate the plot.\textsuperscript{53}

\textit{Verse 6}

Due to the focus of v. 3 upon Israelites alone, we would argue that chapter 1 is devoted to how Judaeans reacted to syncretism in a foreign culture. On the one hand, there were those who did not resist; they ate the king’s food without question. However, on the other hand, Daniel, together with Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah remained loyal to the God of Israel by not eating the food. This division of the Judaeans begins clearly in v. 6 where we read that דודו יבש ותא רודיו, “there were among them some sons of Judah”. When the leader of the palace officials began the integration process by changing their names and giving them Babylonian and Persian court names, Daniel took the lead and modelled the correct reaction by determining not to defile himself with the king’s food. His three friends joined him and set themselves

\begin{footnotes}
\item[50] Cf. Polybius 28.20-21
\item[51] R. T. Beckwith, “The vegetarianism of the Therapeutae, and the motives for vegetarianism in early Jewish and Christian circles,” \textit{RevQ} 13 (1988): 407-10; Lebram, \textit{Daniel}, 47, has noted that in such passages as \textit{Tobit} 1:10-12; \textit{Esth} 14:17 Old Greek; \textit{Jdt} 10:5; 12:1-4; \textit{2 Macc} 5:7; and \textit{Jub} 22:16 there is evidence of self-imposed dietary limits that could be more scrupulous than the laws required, to the point of vegetarianism.
\item[53] Cf. Lawrence M. Wills, \textit{The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends} (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 33.
\end{footnotes}
against what the king thought best for their diet and to what their fellow Israelites acquiesced by eating the food and so being defiled.\textsuperscript{54} So the four stand over against both the Babylonians captors and their compatriots.

This division of the Israelites into two camps may be part of the reason for the change in terminology in the references to those who are taken into captivity. In v. 3 the phrase בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is used. The referent of the phrase consists in all the exiles from Nebuchadnezzar’s campaign in the traditional land of Israel. In v. 6, however, the four young men are referred to as בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל and again in 2:25, a similar reference is made specifically to Daniel. When the phrases בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל and בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵּל are used together in the Hebrew Scriptures, they often refer to the Northern and Southern kingdoms, respectively. According to the religious traditions of the Southern kingdom, the Northern kingdom was unfaithful to Yahweh and the Southern kingdom was usually faithful, and the centre of worship was in the South. There are only four occurrences of יִשְׂרָאֵל in Dan and in the remaining three, 9:7, 11, and 20, again יִשְׂרָאֵל is associated with sin. In 9:7, the emphasis is upon confession, but in 11 and 20 the emphasis is upon the sin of “Israel”. Outside of 1:6, Judah and its congeners are found eight times in 1:1, 2; 2:25; 3:8; 5:13; 6:14; and 9:7. The first two designate the king, the next five are part of phrases that designate the group of which Daniel and the three are a part, \textit{i.e.}, the exiles from Judah. So, here we may have a subtle reference to different levels of faithfulness; Israel was unfaithful, Judah was more faithful, but still did not keep the

\textsuperscript{54} It is interesting to note that they seem to have accepted the names, but not the food. The use of names will be referred to below, and so the editors may have needed the double names. On the other hand, the attitude of “this far, but no further” is illustrated again in chapter 3 where the three attend the ceremony, but refuse to bow to the statue. In what follows, they will accept becoming court experts in title, but Daniel will not act as one.
faith, these four young men, however were epitomes of faithfulness to Yahweh and thus the other captives from Israel and Judah were not. 55

55 One possible focus of the condemnation of unfaithful Judaeans may be found by a contrast of the 2 Kgs-Jer and 2 Chr passages that recount the capture of Jehoiachin at the time of the fall of Jerusalem into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar and his troops. (On the problem of the contradiction between Kgs and Chr about the fate of Jehoiakim, see A. F. Rainey, “The Chronicler and his sources -- historical and geographical,” in The Chronicler as Historian, eds. M. P. Graham, K. G. Hoglund, and S. L. McKenzie (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 69-72.) A comparison among the 2 Kgs-Jer, 2 Chr and Dan accounts about this time is revealing. Jehoiachin is given a negative review by the Deuteronomist who shows that that king had no compunction about living outside the Law (2 Kgs 24:9; cf. 2 Chr 36:9). (The same name (Jehoiakim) is used for Jehoiachin in the Greek tradition of 2 Kgs 24:6-15 and 1 Esdr 1:41, where both refer to this Jehoiakim (=Jehoiachin) as the son of the previous Jehoiakim. 2 Kings 25:27 (// Jeremiah 52:31) relies upon the connection made in chapter 24 for this information. The material in Daniel 1:1 refers to Jehoiakim being taken in the third year of his reign.) In those same sources (2 Kgs 25:29-30; Jer 28:4; 52:31-34) it is recorded that he was (would be, in Jer 28) released from prison in Babylon (possibly included as a ray of hope for the Davidic line) and elevated to sit with the other kings in the court of the Babylonian Evil-Merodach. Part of residing at the court involved receiving a daily allotment of food (Jer 52:34, אך בן בים), which he accepted until his death. When, in the same context but with a different ruler, Daniel was to receive a daily allotment (Dan 1:5, אך בן בים) of the king’s food, he refused to take it. Fewell, Circle of Sovereignty, 16-17 also links this story with 2 Kgs 25:27-30, although she does not note the similarity of language.

Here again, as we have seen in other places, Dan seems to have great affinity with or dependence upon the material in Chr-Ezra-Neh. alternating_days is found 15 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. In addition to the three locations above (Dan, 2 Kgs, Jer) it is found in Exod 5:13, 19 and 16:4 in reference first to daily tasks carried out for the Egyptians and then to daily manna; in 1 Kgs 8:59 as a request for daily assistance from God in Solomon’s prayer; and then it is found in Lev 23:37; 1 Chr 16:37; 2 Chr 8:13, 14; 31:16; Ezra 3:4; and Neh 11:23, 12:47 in reference to daily cultic activities or the daily activities of, or provisions for cultic personnel. If, in the Chr-Ezra-Neh writings, this phrase is reserved for cultic activity, its use in Dan may be emphasizing the cultic impurity that the acquiescing Judaeans brought upon themselves, and if read back into the Deuteronomist’s work, the defilement that Jehoiachin brought upon himself.

In 2 Chr 36 the release from prison and provison of food is not recounted; it says only that those taken to Babylon remained servants until the time of Cyrus (36:18). There is no mention of a reprieve for Jehoiachin, although the continuance of the Davidic line is referred to in 1 Chr 3:17-24; the hope for the future in the 2 Chr narration comes from the addition of material about Cyrus and his decree to rebuild the temple. This more negative view of Jehoiachin may be the same attitude reflected in Dan where eating the food of the king is viewed as a defiling action and where Daniel, a faithful Judaean, is the one who survives until the day of reprieve in the time of Cyrus (1:21). So, an exilic or post-exilic conflict between different groups of Judaeans about defilement or patronage may be reflected in the conflict related in Dan 1.
Verses 7-8, 15

After setting apart Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah from the others, the scene changes to the conflict over food. This conflict serves two purposes in the story. The first is to set up the contrast between what the Babylonians wanted to do, and what the four felt they could allow themselves to do. This is indicated in the accounts of the change of personal names and the eating of food. Verse 7 says that “the head of staff determined names for them”. This verb is repeated at the beginning of the name changes: “he determined for Daniel, Belteshazzar...” Then, in v. 8 we are told, “but Daniel determined in his heart not to defile himself”. This repetition of the same form of the verb seems intended to indicate a contrast between the purposes of the Babylonians and of the Judeans. The first wanted to make the Judeans as Babylonian as possible; Daniel would let them get away with as little as possible. The addition of “in his heart” in v. 8 (יהוה) may also be a heightening of this contrast: Daniel had extra determination not to defile himself, and so he alone took the matter to heart.56

The second purpose of the story is to set up the four as a group distinct from the rest of the class. Throughout the conflict, the four are the loyal ones, in contrast to the others who eat the king’s allotted food. Thus in 1:15 there is a clear contrast with the others in the group, i.e., the Israelites who did not look as healthy as the four at the end of the test period.

Dan 1:17-21

The story is brought to its conclusion in 1:17-21: Daniel’s diet does him and the others no harm, given his performance at examination time; the four excel in the

56 The phrase יָבְדֵנָה יָבְדֵנָ�
required studies; Daniel’s life in Babylon spans the whole time of the exile until at least the first year of Cyrus. Verse 17 stands as a transition point given its reversal of normal word order from verb-subject to subject-verb. There are two such reversals and these would appear to be nominative absolutes, which in Hebrew convey a contrast. \(^{57}\) The first, “and these four young men, [God gave to them] ... וְיִנְדַע (וְיִנְדַע בִּרְאֵשִׁי) contrasts the four with the remainder of the group who ate the king’s food. The reward for faithfulness, \(^{58}\) i.e., “knowledge and insight into every kind of literature and wisdom”, harks back to v. 4 where a prerequisite for entry into the training program was “insight into every kind of wisdom,” and where the course of training included the literature of the Chaldeans. For their faithfulness, then, they were given *divine* enhancement of what they had upon entrance and of what they were taught. Thus, in vv. 18-20 they were led before, and tested by, the king; and they were the top of the class, and for this reason were permitted to serve in the king’s court. But not only that, they were ten times better than all the *hartoms* (זֵרֶי צְיר) and exorcists (דָּנֶה) in the kingdom. It is important to note that this superlative ability was in the matters and skills required of Mesopotamian religious experts, which is why the four are compared with them in v. 20.

We have belaboured this point, because of what is emphasised by the second nominative absolute in v. 17: “and Daniel, **understood** ...” (וָדָּנֵל). This contrasts the divine enhancement of skills belonging to all four with something extra

---

\(^{57}\) B. K. Waltke and M. P. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 76-77. I disagree with Goldingay, *Daniel*, 20 that this is a resumptive opening. It follows directly upon the previous narrative and is linked to it with the copula.

\(^{58}\) On the view that wisdom comes from God, after hard work, through prayer and as a result of meritorious conduct, see James L. Crenshaw, *Urgent Advice and Probing Questions: Collected Writings on Old Testament Wisdom*. (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995), 206-21; and Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel*, 180-85, 239-53. See for example, *Job* 28:28; *Prov* 2:1-15, especially v. 6; *Sir* 1:26-27; and *Wis* 7:7.
given to Daniel alone. He is singled out as divinely gifted for something that was not required for selection, in which he was not trained and for which he was not tested, i.e., something not required of Mesopotamian religious experts who served in the temple or court. In addition to superior learned skills, Daniel was given the ability to understand every kind of vision and dream, seemingly a form of revelation interpretation. In the matter of interpreting dreams and visions, then, everyone else, including his three friends, supposedly relied upon omen texts and learned interpretation; he had a divine gift, i.e., revelation interpretation.

This setting apart of Daniel, I would contend, clarifies how the writer of chapter 1 wants the reader to understand what Daniel does in chapters 2, 4, and 5 and possibly in chapters 7-12. When Daniel rescues his colleagues, he does so, not with his superior learned mantic skills, but rather through revelation. It also sets Daniel apart from the other three loyal Judaeans as the one through whom divine revelations would come for the faithful and others.

Conclusion

This chapter seems directed against other Judaeans rather than being just a story of encouragement in the face of foreign opposition. Encouragement to be faithful to God is dominant, but it is put in contrast, not to possible infidelity, but to actual infidelity of the other Jews who came to be taught in Babylon. Daniel and his friends surpassed both the Babylonians and the unfaithful Israelites. One can only suppose that the situation was one in which there was infidelity to God among the Israelite royalty and nobility in the face of foreign pressures to take up defiling practices and

---

59 The noun יָגוֹר occurs 35 times in the Hebrew Scriptures, 12 of those in Dan, and it never appears in the plural. It is used in a collective sense here and in Hos 12:11. There is no need, therefore, to make a distinction between "every kind of vision" and "dreams", יָגוֹר modifies both terms.
where fidelity had to be encouraged. This is a different situation to that in chapters 2-6 where Daniel is portrayed, with his three friends, as being in opposition to Babylonians only.

Recognition of the theme of Israelite versus Israelite in chapter 1 leads to a conclusion about the nature of the use of מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ in this chapter and it is one that calls for a modification of Collins's observation about 1:4. In v. 4, being מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ in every kind of wisdom was one of the required attributes of all the entrants; it was common to the faithful and the unfaithful Israelites. The מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ that really made a difference, however, was that which came from God, as reflected in v. 17. There we read that God gave to the four faithful Judaeans מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ “knowledge and perception into every kind of book and wisdom”. It is this divine gift that enabled them to out-do both their acquiescing classmates and the experienced Babylonian professionals. The point of all this is that real wisdom comes from God; those who are truly מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ are those who are faithful to, and who have מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ from God. So, although both those who acquiesced and those who were faithful could be מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ, it was those who have God’s מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ who were to be emulated, not the unfaithful מְשָׁפְלָיָהּ. In chapter 1, then, there is a movement of ideas from a “secular” use to a “religious” use. In fact, when the king asked for young men from the upper strata of Israelite society with certain physical and mental attributes, he was supposedly thinking of secular qualities, with the possible exception of the lack of physical or moral blemishes. Fourth to second century BCE Jewish audiences would have understood these requirements at two different levels simultaneously. At one level, they would hear a pagan king list “secular” attributes he wanted in his court trainees. On a different level, they would hear familiar attributes of their own patriarchs, matriarchs, kings, nobles, priests and Levites, and some of these attributes had specifically religious overtones. One other, in particular, deserves attention here.
Although all the trainees were to be “knowers of knowledge”, Daniel fulfils this as a prophet. In the discussion above, reference was made to the occurrence of this term at *Num* 24:16 as part of a self-reference by Balaam. In *Dan*, Daniel becomes the one who hears the words of God and is the one who knows the knowledge of the Most High;\(^{60}\) he is the one who sees visions.\(^{61}\) There is, we contend, an intentional *double entendre*, as the discussion of the hymn at 2:20-23, especially 21b and 23a, will confirm. So, the author moves from a secular perspective to a religious one, showing that these attributes are really at their best when found in faithful Israelites such as Daniel and his three friends. So, if, as Collins believes, there is a connection between the מֵתוֹלֵם of chapter 1 and those in 11-12, it must be demonstrated in what way there is a connection.

**Dan 2**

Chapter 2 launches the reader into the “professional” life of Daniel the courtier. In this chapter, Nebuchadnezzar has a dream that he wants the court experts to relate back to him and to interpret.\(^{62}\) When they fail, he gives the order to kill all the experts in the kingdom, including Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. Daniel arranges for a stay of execution for the experts. Then with his three friends, he prays for and receives a revelation of the dream and its interpretation. He then relates this to the king who bestows rewards upon him.

Chronologically, the chapter is set during the time of the training of the four, in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign, at least one year before the end of their

---

\(^{60}\) On מֵתוֹלֵם in *Dan* see below at p. 223.

\(^{61}\) Cf. 7:1-2.

three-year training period. This has always been considered a problem: as something to be explained and justified; or as an inaccuracy showing the distance of the writer from the actual events; or as a lack of care on the part of a redactor. As part of the longer narrative in chapters 1-6, it presents an interesting scenario that seems to fit with the portrayal of the four in *Dan*. Even before they were finished their training, they were shown to be better than the practising experts and were promoted to high positions that were to be taken up upon completion of their training.\(^\text{63}\) This could be one reason why the four were not among those summoned to the king in this chapter. In this chronological scenario, then, 1:17 becomes more than a description of unproven gifts, it is a foreshadowing of chapter 2, in which Daniel prays for, and is given understanding of the king’s vision while he is yet in training.\(^\text{64}\) This is not an isolated example in *Dan*; the same happens with chapters 7 and 8, which in the supposed chronology of the headings take place before Belshazzar’s last night as portrayed in chapter 5; and also chapters 6 and 9, in which prayer plays a significant role, and which take place in the reign of Darius.

Although Daniel figures prominently chapter 2, we are not concerned with all of that material. The narrative first concerns Daniel at v. 12 and carries on to v. 30 where Daniel is ready to relate the dream and its interpretation (31-45). After that, the narrative concludes with the material in 46-49. Within these sections we will focus on the material that concerns Daniel’s relationship to others, whether the three or the other experts, *i.e.*, vv. 12-14, 17-18, 24, 25, 36, 48-49; and with the material that concerns how Daniel does what he does, *i.e.*, vv. 10-11, 18-23, 27-30, and 47.

\(^\text{63}\) This is not a comment on the probability of such a scenario, just what would have to be if the dates and events of the chapters reflected actual events.

\(^\text{64}\) Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty*, p. 37, notes how this scenario is not followed through at the end of the chapter where the four are promoted to positions that are at variance with those of the end of chapter 1.
The Relationship of the Four to the Other Experts

In response to the inability of the Chaldeans to produce and then interpret his dream, Nebuchadnezzar issues an order to have all the experts of Babylon killed. In this latter group, as v. 13 makes clear, we find the four. Their inclusion among those to be killed at 2:13 makes it clear that the four are considered experts of the kind the king consulted. In the discussion of the titles used in Dan, we discovered that there is a change at the precise point where the four are referred to in vv. 12-13. To that point, as Table 1 in Chapter 3 illustrates, we find references to כְּשֶׁדֶים, 1:4; לָחוֹרַתְמָנָה וַלָּאֲסָפֶתּ לָאֲסָפֶתּ כְּשֶׁדֶים, 1:20; לָלוֹלוֹ הָחוֹרַתְמָנָה וַלָּאֲסָפֶתּ לָאֲסָפֶתּ כְּשֶׁדֶים, 2:4; לָלוֹלוֹ הָחוֹרַתְמָנָה וַלָּאֲסָפֶתּ לָאֲסָפֶתּ כְּשֶׁדֶים, 2:5; לָלוֹלוֹ הָחוֹרַתְמָנָה וַלָּאֲסָפֶתּ לָאֲסָפֶתּ כְּשֶׁדֶים, 2:10a; and לָלוֹלוֹ הָחוֹרַתְמָנָה וַלָּאֲסָפֶתּ לָאֲסָפֶתּ כְּשֶׁדֶים, 2:10b. However, when the king issues orders to execute those belonging to the professions that could not do as he demanded, it was an order to kill not לָלוֹלוֹ הָחוֹרַתְמָנָה וַלָּאֲסָפֶתּ לָאֲסָפֶתּ כְּשֶׁדֶים, but לָלוֹלוֹ הָחוֹרַתְמָנָה וַלָּאֲסָפֶתּ לָאֲסָפֶתּ כְּשֶׁדֶים. This is the first of many occurrences of the term חכמים in the book. As we argued in Chapter 3, rather than understanding the חכמים to be one profession, glossed with “sages”, it is better to understand them as “experts” in the court, i.e., it is an inclusive term, an adjective that can be used of any person who is skilled in some way. This general use is found at 5:7 where its referent is a list of experts. As such, it fits well as a general designation that could include the four, which could not, given their ethnic and political uses. The overall effect of this is to exclude ethnically the four from those who were initially summoned. As this narrative makes clear, the four were not Chaldeans or Babylonians (cf. 3:8), but rather exiles from Judaea (2:25, cf. 1:6, 5:13 and 6:13). However, because the professions in essence were deemed fraudulent by the king, he made no differentiation and wanted

---

65 Reconstructed version, on which see the discussion of 2:2 in “Chapter 3.”

66 Cf. Marti, Daniel, 8, 11; and Collins, Daniel. 139.
all members, of any ethnic origin, to be killed. The narrative, then includes the four with all the experts, but clearly sets them apart, ethnically.

A second, more significant point that separates the four from the others is that they are able to tell the king what his dream was, and interpret it, as the king had demanded of the others. Once Daniel learned of the reasons for the king wanting them dead, he went home to his three friends and together they prayed for mercy from God. God revealed to Daniel what they needed to avert execution and the content of the revelation is related to the king. Although the narrative says that it was Daniel who went to the king, Daniel includes his three friends in the process in two places where the plural rather than the singular first person is used: 2:23

2:23

“you have made known to me what we asked from you for you have made known to us the king’s matter”; 

and 2:36

“this is the dream, and we will tell its interpretation before the king”. The four from Judaea, therefore, are the one group who could and did respond successfully to the king’s demand.

The work of Niditch and Doran is relevant at this juncture. In their examination of the type of folk-tale into which this story falls, they noted that it is significantly different in one respect. While the wise people in such stories succeed by means of their ingenuity, in this story it is by means of asking and receiving from God that success is achieved. Knowing via revelation versus wisdom in this story also

67 Daniel’s special role will be considered next.


69 It is difficult to know whether 2:47a (אלא ונשמך אairro הים) is intended as a reference to the God of the four, or to the God of the Jews more generally.

70 Niditch, and Doran. “Success story”, 190-91.
highlights the favour that the four receive from their God. Although not referred to explicitly, as in chapter 1, divine favour is present. They were given the time that the Mesopotamian diviners were refused; and they were graced with the humanly impossible solution to the demand of the King.\textsuperscript{71} This change from the pattern, again, highlights how these Judaeans are different from their Mesopotamian colleagues. What this difference also highlights is the contrast between revelation and wisdom. In fact, in this chapter there is a development of the concept of קֶצֶף and what it means to be a קֶצֶף. Although the other experts are afforded the title קֶצֶף in vv. 12-13, the hymn makes it clear that only those who receive מַעֲלֵה from Daniel’s God are truly קֶצֶף. This is yet another \textit{double entendre.}\textsuperscript{72}

Daniel’s Relationship to Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah

Although the four are a group distinct from the other experts, Daniel is nevertheless distinct from the three. As in chapter 1, Daniel is the character who takes the situation in hand. In vv. 14-17a, Daniel acts alone to speak to Arioch and the king, and then goes to the three to enlist them in petitioning God. Although, as noted above, Daniel includes the three when talking about the reception of the revelation, it is actually he, as opposed to they, who receives it. This is made clear in v. 19 where the reader is told that Daniel receives the vision and then breaks into praise. In the hymn, after praising God as the giver of wisdom and knowledge (2:20-22), he thanks God for making known to him what they had asked for (2:23a), and only in that way is it made known to the four who had prayed (2:23b). Until 2:36, where Daniel uses the first person plural again, it is Daniel alone who goes to Arioch and is presented to the king (2:24-25), and speaks to the king in the first person singular (2:30). After 2:36 it is to

\textsuperscript{71} Fewell, \textit{Circle of Sovereignty}, 27.

\textsuperscript{72} See a fuller discussion of this \textit{double entendre} below.
Daniel that the king prostrates himself and presents offerings, and whom the king acknowledges as the one who revealed the mystery to him (2:47b; although it is through their (see note 69) God that it is revealed, 2:47a). Finally, the differences between Daniel and the three are highlighted again when they are rewarded. Daniel is promoted to a high administrative position and is put in charge of all the experts. The three are given administrative positions at the request of Daniel.

Through this discussion, we have shown that, while there is some attempt to include the three with Daniel in the reception and announcement of the “mystery”, Daniel is distinguished as the one who actually receives it and makes it known. For that intermediary role, the king rewards Daniel, and the three are rewarded only at his request. The three play a secondary role to that of Daniel’s.

Daniel’s Role as Receiver of T1

How, then, is Daniel portrayed? Is he simply the best of the experts? In this chapter, Daniel plays the role of the mediator of divine T1, and as such is set apart from all the others.

The Chaldeans are used as a negative example to help set up Daniel in this role. In 2:10-11 they make two points: there is no one able to do what the king demanded; and, were the gods to reveal such knowledge, they would have to dwell with humans. Thus, when in v. 16 Daniel asks for time so that he might interpret the dream, the task has been set up as an impossibility from the Mesopotamian perspective, something outside the domain of humans, regardless their natural or professional abilities. In chapter 1, however, Daniel is twice assisted by his God: he makes his overseers favourably disposed to Daniel; and he enhances Daniel’s abilities with learning in general, but specifically with the ability to interpret dreams and visions. The reader is thus prepared for Daniel to enter the story.
In v. 18, the word דָּרֶךְ occurs for the first time in Dan.73 Given what it is that the king had asked to be done, the דָּרֶךְ must include both the dream and its interpretation: that is what the king demanded but the experts could not supply; and that is what the four request and what Daniel receives from God. Daniel has already been declared as gifted in the ability to interpret dreams and visions in 1:17, so the reader is prepared for the reception of a night vision in 2:19: קָאָרְךָ יִנְהַח לְגָדוֹל הָיָה רֵאשִׁית דָּרֶךְ. Daniel, thus, acts as the mediator of the דָּרֶךְ, and as such does not function merely as the interpreter. Rather, he receives both the dream and its interpretation. He apparently adds nothing to it.

This narration about the reception of the dream and its interpretation is followed by a hymn of praise.74 There is some debate about the hymn’s origins.75 Whether it is original, used by an author, or added by a redactor at a later stage in the history of the text, in the final form of the text it adds to the readers’ understanding of what it is that God has given to Daniel in 1:17, and how he knows what he does in chapter 2. Whereas this poem is the fullest exposition of the Jewish perspective of what Daniel does in these chapters, we would do well to examine it closely. This poem clearly establishes the God of Daniel as the God who knows all and reveals it to whom he wills. In it we find several themes and language that are picked up in this chapter and in subsequent chapters. The hymn moves from praise of God to acknowledgement that it is God who makes people wise by giving wisdom to them; and finally to thanks that Daniel, accompanied by his friends, has been the recipient of such wisdom.

73 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47; 4:6

74 This is a mixed form consisting in a Declarative Psalm of Praise of the Individual that is introduced by descriptive praise (Claus Westermann, Praise and Lament in the Psalms (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), 102 n. 55: cf. John J. Collins, Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984), 51, 108 (Doxology) and 111 (Hymn of praise).

a May the name of God be blessed for ever and ever,

b For wisdom and prowess belong to him

The second line of the poem, seems to have been originally intended as a preface to lines c-d: God’s is displayed in his rule over the seasons and over the political processes of the world; and God’s is revealed through those to whom he gives it. As it now is used, this line of the poem is preparation for line j: and belong to God and are given to Daniel. is generally taken as a reference to God’s power, as at 2 Chr 20:6. It should probably not be understood in this way here, however. Daniel is given this according to v. 23. At Prov 8:14, it belongs to wisdom. At Job 12:13 it is used with , and at Isa 11:2, with , , and . In the Greek translations it was also understood as a wisdom word at times. Theodotion uses for in 2:20; Old Greek uses φρονησις at v. 23; at Job 12:13 it is rendered again by σοφία.

This use also occurs at Qumran. In his commentary on The Manual of Discipline (1QS) 4.3ff., Wernberg-Møller argues that could have the meaning “wondrous, mysterious wisdom”, an argument adopted by Newsom in her work on the

---

76 MT נבורה; LXX τοῦ μεγαλου.

77 Cf., Job 12:13-25 where the two themes are intertwined in poetic material. There are other links to this poetic material in Job 12, to which we shall refer below.


79 Cf. 1QS col. 5. l 25.

80 μεγαλωσίνη 88-Syr. μεγαλειότης 967.

81 Cf. Job 22:2 where the Masoretic Text has נבורה (although one MS reads דם) and the Greek renders it with σοφία.
Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. He also argues that at *IQS* 13.8 in the phrase נבורה פלפא the word has a related meaning of “wonder, mystery”. In fact, at the parallel to *CD* 13.8 נבורה פלפא in *IQS* 9.18, we find רְזִי פֶלַא. Wernberg-Møller concludes that it is, therefore, “… natural to assume that the two expressions are synonymous ….” This semantic overlap of נבורה פלפא and רְזִי פֶלַא is significant in the context of *Dan* 2:17-30 where רְזִי is used six times (vv. 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30) of that which God reveals (נֶבֶר) to Daniel. Within the hymn of praise (vv. 22-23), however, it is only נבורה פלפא “wisdom”, נבורה פלפא “prowess”, and the king’s concern that Daniel says were given and made known (דהו and רזיות) to him. The נבורה פלפא that belongs to God and that Daniel receives, then, is probably not mere physical power, but exceptional intellectual ability, mental prowess.

21 c He changes the times and seasons;
   d He deposes kings and establishes kings;
   e He gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who can understand.

Line e is the only one to concern us in v. 21. Lines c and d relate generally to the context, i.e., not only nature, but also politics is under the control of God who brings about changes in monarchs like the changes of the seasons. This is a


84 Another possibility for the pair נבורה פלפא is that they are a hendiadys, which may occur elsewhere with נבורה פלפא: *1 Chr* 29:30 “powerful reign”; *2 Kgs* 18:20/Isa 36:5 “firm intention”; *Isa* 11:2 “effective counsel”.

85 MT אֶשֶׁר מִצְבָּחָה אַלָּא. *4QDan* פְּלַא.

86 This line serves as preparation for the revelation in this chapter, and for the many political changes dealt with in the rest of the book. Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty* deals in depth with the theme of the king’s power compared with that of God.
preliminary reference to the content of the 12. Line e moves back to the wisdom theme: God “gives wisdom to the experts and the ability to know to those who know understanding”. In this general introduction to the theme of God as the source of wisdom, the recipients may have originally been the wise in general. The same themes are found in 1:4 as general attributes of those who came into the king’s training program. However, it now serves to prepare for the more specific revelation to Daniel, the truly wise man in this context. There is a progression in the understanding of “the wise men” in Dan. Although the word is used as a general term for all the professions, as we argued in Chapter 3 it is incongruous with how they function. Daniel, the receiver of and from God, is the real 123. Real 123 is not learned, it is received, just as real 123 comes from God.

22 f He reveals what is deep and hidden,
   g And knows what is in the darkness,
   h And the light resides with him.

Line f relates directly to this context. In general, God knows and reveals what is inaccessible by shedding light on them. The verb 123 is used in Dan eight times and of those, six are used with the, which itself occurs only nine times. Mysteries about the meaning of the present and future are revealed (123); this is not a reference to items hidden in the “deep” or “dark” in a literal sense. In this context, the adjective 123 “deep” connotes hidden knowledge. The use of the phrase 123 123 123 means "wisdom". Cf. BDB on Hebrew 123. For the transliteration used here, as opposed to that given by Montgomery, see AHw. Close in form are the related stems emqu,
should be compared with מַכַּלָתָה "to hide") conotes a similar idea. It is also used this way in Deut 29:28 where it is said that the “hidden things” (סָּתָם) belong to God but the revealed things (נֶפֶלֶת) to humans; and in Job 28:21, which speaks of wisdom being hidden both (נֶפֶלֶת) from people and (סָּתָם) from the birds, and its location known only to God (Job 28:23-24). In Dan the dream and its interpretation were not accessible to humans, as the other experts acknowledged to the king; the dream came from the divine realm. However, Daniel’s God reveals what is inaccessible.

In lines g and h we have a complementary contrast of darkness and light. Carrying on from line f, God is said to know what is in darkness, i.e., what is deep and hidden. In line h, light is said to dwell with God. That word is derived from the same root as נָרָה in 5:11, and can be glossed with “light”. Given the predominance of themes about wisdom and knowledge in this hymn of praise, it seems clear that מַכַּלָתָה in 2:22 is another metaphorical reference to wisdom. In the larger context of the stories, just as wisdom belongs to God and has been given to Daniel (2:21, 23), so too, the “light” of God was evident in Daniel as a divine gift (5:11).

—

“experienced, skilled, educated, wise, wily” (so HALOT, see Hebrew חָכִים) and imqutu, “ability” (CAD).

91 See, again, Job 12:22.

92 Bauer, and Leander, Grammatik Aramäischen, §188 g say of it that it “und die Gegenform *ֹלַד (det. נַלְדָה) „Finsternis” sind Kanaanismen, da sie aramäisch überhaupt nicht zu erklären sind; vgl. auch syr. hessōkā. See Job 3:4 for a parallel in Hebrew.

93 So Haßlberger, Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis, 140.

94 Cf. Lacocque, Daniel, 97 who, writing of 5:11, makes a direct connection: “his light is a divine attribute according to 2.22”, note also the combination of similar themes to those of Dan 2:22 and here in 1 Enoch 48-49 in which there are direct allusions to Dan 7 that could conceivably be dependent upon this Dan passage.
To you, O God of my fathers, I give thanks and praise,
because you have given wisdom and prowess to me.
Now you have made known to me what we asked of you;
you have made known to us what the king wanted.

With line i, the poem moves to the specific reason for praise. The God who gives wisdom to the wise, gives wisdom and wondrous knowledge to Daniel; and the God who knows what is in darkness let Daniel know what he and his friends had asked for, *i.e.*, what the king wanted to know. Daniel, as opposed to the others, is truly wise. The other court wise men are wise in name only; Daniel has wisdom and mental prowess from God; he knows the because it was given him by God. This makes it clear that the content of the dream and its interpretation came from God.

Although this material was probably added to the story, it functions as an exposition of what takes place in the revelation of the to Daniel. Although true wisdom and light are in the purview of God, he gave them to Daniel. In addition to explaining this account of revelation, these themes are picked up again in 5:11 where Daniel is recalled as one having wisdom like the wisdom of God (the gods), and as one in whom there was light. We shall return to this connection in the upcoming discussion of chapter 5.

---

95 MT שלל. 4QDan*. 96 MT נבורה. 4QDan* [ ] *טט. On the basis of ink traces preserved after the yod, E. Ulrich, “Daniel manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1: A preliminary edition of 4QDan,” *BASOR* 268 (1987): 26 suggests the possibility of הניו, which could explain פסנתר in the Old Greek (but see discussion at v. 20 above, p. 208). However, he notes that הניו occurs at 2:22 in both the Masoretic and Qumran texts. But see below, n. 224. Nor is פסנתר the rendering of either of these forms anywhere. There does seem to have been a harmonization of the phrase with that in 2:20 (so Charles, *Daniel*, 38).
Once the praise is expressed to God, Daniel carries out his role as mediator of the Lord. However, when he goes to Nebuchadnezzar, he again sets himself apart from everyone. In vv. 27-28, he repeats what the other religious experts had said about the limits of their profession in vv. 11-12. Interestingly, however, Daniel’s list is all-inclusive: חכמה וסמכות ורומחון וגור, and thus he includes himself, for he is one of these experts. But, he claims that there is a God who could, and would, reveal what had been asked and that this God would reveal it to him, not because he had חכמה וסמכות ורומחון וגור ממעל ויהיה 97 “a greater wisdom than other living beings”, but because God wanted Nebuchadnezzar to know about the future (2:30). Daniel’s ability to tell the king what he wanted, therefore, was not due to skill in learned interpretation, i.e., a form of human wisdom in which he was trained and said to excel in chapter 1, it was something else: interpretation through direct revelation for which he could take no credit as one trained to be a חכמה וסמכות ורומחון וגור. Nebuchadnezzar reiterates this in 2:47 where he professes that Daniel’s God enabled Daniel to reveal the mystery.

In 2:27-30, themes from 2:18-23 are repeated: the dream and visions, and their interpretation are mysteries; and Daniel’s wisdom derives from God. What is new is that, whereas in v. 22 it was “deep and hidden things” (дол无形 וסמכות ורומחון) that God revealed (וילא), here it is “mysteries” (זר) that He reveals (וילא). Daniel explains this as God making known to the king (and then to him) what would be in the future, מעה ו... v. 28. 98

In 2:47, the themes of God as revealer of mysteries and Daniel as the one to whom God reveals them are again repeated. This time, however, it is Nebuchadnezzar

97 4QDan² reads םני ור “in excess of” after ב, as in the Peshitta.
98 Bevan, Short Commentary. 74 thought that this theme was derived from Gen 41:25.
who makes the claims and it is part of his acknowledgement that Daniel’s God is
supreme over both gods and kings.

Conclusion

In this chapter, then, Daniel, as one brought to Babylon to be trained, is counted
among the religious experts whose professions were found wanting in the king’s test.
In this way, Daniel’s superlative skills are condemned along with theirs. When he
saves the religious experts, he does so, not with learned skills, but by receiving a
revelation of the T1 in a vision of the night. So, he was working outside the confines of
the wisdom associated with Mesopotamian religious experts who served in the court
and temple. Daniel seems to act more as a prophet who has access to the council of
God, than as someone who interprets what another receives. He does not interpret the
dream using his own superior intellect, but merely passes on the interpretation given
him in his vision.

This chapter adds a different twist to the similar distinctions made in chapter 1
where there is a test of the trainees and the four head the class with none their equals.
When compared to the existing professionals in another test, they surpass them ten
times. Here, the test is of the professionals who have failed without trying. It is
Daniel, with the aid of his friends, who again passes the test, but this time through
divine endowment. Significantly, Daniel’s three friends, who do not receive
revelations because they were not so gifted by their God, go on to become
administrators in this narrative. Only Daniel continues in the position of a religious
expert.

99 Raymond E. Brown, The Semitic Background of the Term “Mystery” in the
New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 4-8 (especially 8) makes this
connection. See also Crenshaw, Education in Ancient Israel, 141; and James L.
Crenshaw, Prophetic Conflict: Its Effect upon Israelite Religion (New York: de Gruyter,
So, in chapter 2, Daniel is not differentiated from the other religious experts just by having his divine gift contrasted with their learned skills. If this were so, then Collins might be correct in thinking that these professions were something to which a faithful Judaean could aspire. The real contrast here is between human interpretations, which have serious failings; and divine revelations, which have no limits, given that God is the source of all wisdom and knowledge and reveals to one of his servants what no one can know through human effort.

**Excursus:**

At this juncture we will digress from a discussion of the portrayals in the chapters to deal with a set of phrases that occur seven times in chapters 4, 5 and 6 (Table 5): רוח יўרה ב and רוח אלהים [קריחין] א. Rather than deal with these piecemeal as we meet them, it seemed more efficient to look at them together and then pick up the discussion of the narratives again and refer back to this section. We will not draw firm conclusions here, rather we will consider what the options are in preparation for the narrative discussions.

The phrases give expression to how Nebuchadnezzar, the queen mother (chapter 5), Belshazzar, and the narrator of chapter 6 view Daniel’s ability to interpret dreams. It is this רוח אלהים [קריחין] that sets Daniel apart in the mind of Nebuchadnezzar. He makes this clear when he says, “none of the wise men of my kingdom are able to make known its interpretation to me, but you are able to because רוח אלהים קריחין [8] (4:15 [18]). The direct linking of the ability to interpret dreams with this phrase means that it warrants in-depth consideration for the light it might shed on how the second century editors wanted to portray Daniel.

**Table 5. Occurrences of רוח אלהים קריחין, etc.**

| 4:5 | Nebuchadnezzar (narration) |
Each of these phrases is part or all of a description of Daniel’s abilities. The first six refer to his ability to interpret and the last to his administrative abilities. The first three, in chapter 4, are picked up in chapter 5 by the fourth occurrence. The subsequent occurrences are abbreviated, with 5:12 and 6:4 [3] having רוחו instead of רוחו. The occurrences in 4:6 [9], 5:11, 12, and 14 each have additional, similar material after them, which as we will show, links the phrase רוחו הרעה in 5:12 and 6:4 [3] to the others.

Becking, in his study of רוחו at Dan 5:14, raised a number of issues with which we shall deal in this consideration of the phrase: the plural of רוחו in Aramaic; the nature of the relationship between רוחו and רוחו; the relationship of the two phrases רוחו קְרוּחַּא and רוחו קְרוּחַּא; and the possibility of intentional ambivalence in the use of the phrases.101 We shall go farther than he did, however. He did not include the רוחו phrases, and thus missed the boundaries placed on our understanding of the phrase by 6:4 [3]. Nor did he link it to the occurrence of the phrase רוחו הָיָה in the Joseph story at Gen 41:38 or the phrase רוחו קְרוּחַּא in Josh 24:19. Nor did he consider what רוחו might actually mean

100 קְרוּחַּא is found in some manuscripts, and in Syriac and Vulgate. Given the consistency of the previous occurrences, it would be natural for a scribe to want to insert קְרוּחַּא intentionally or unintentionally.

We will consider וַיָּלֶד, וַיִּלְׁשֵׁב, וַיָּלֶד וַיִּלְׁשֵׁב as a phrase, and conclude by considering the accompanying descriptions at 4:6, 15 [9, 18]; and 5:11, 12, 14.

In each instance, Daniel is said to have רוח in him. Is this something from (the) אלוהים, thus referring to the source of the רוח? This could signify some form of possession, but at the very least it would indicate source. Alternatively, is the רוח Daniel’s, thus making the phrase qualitative. This could then be a comment on his abilities. However, if it is his, then how is אלוהים to be understood?

In the Hebrew Bible, רוח has a variety of uses. It can refer to wind, which accounts for approximately one third of its occurrences and is found in Dan 2:35; 7:2; 8:8; and 11:4. It can signify “breath”, as it is evidence of the life force of individuals. רוח can be used to denote the seat of emotions and the seat of the intellect, as occurs at 2:1 and 3. It also can refer to the activity or power of God, which accounts for over 100 of its occurrences. It would seem that either seat of the intellect, or activity or power of God are the options for the phrases that we are considering.

102 NIDNTT, III, 690.
There are various occurrences of רוח and similar expressions throughout the Hebrew Bible. Some lexically similar uses do not help us to understand the use of the phrases in Dan. Thus, for example, Gen 6:17 and 7:15 refer to a "רוח of living things being in (ב) creatures". 2 Kgs 19:7//Isa 37:7 refers to Yahweh putting a רוח into (ב) Sennacherib, and thus causing him to leave for home. 1 Sam 11:6 and 16:15-16, 23 refer to the רוח that God sent on (ב) Saul to depress him. 2 Chr 9:4 uses the phrase "was not in (ב) her" to convey the idea of being overwhelmed.

More immediately relevant are those uses in which the רוח is the means by which God accomplishes tasks that humans seem unable or unwilling to undertake. The following examples will illustrate this usage. Bezalel is filled with the רוח of God and thus could do exceptional work for the tabernacle (Exod 31:2). In Num 27:18 Joshua is said to be נפל רוח ב him, and thus capable of leading the people of God after the death of Moses. This is interpreted in Deut 34:9 as his being full (מלא) of רוח הכבשה. Judges were motivated by[o] to lead

107 Cf. Ezek 37:5, 6, 10; Job 27:3.

108 Cf. 1 Kgs 7:14; 2 Chr 2:11-13 [12-14]. The two accounts are different in that the Deuteronomist's account merely mentions that Hiram/Hiramabi was fulled with wisdom, discernment and practical knowledge. The Chronicler's account first praises Solomon as being a wise son given by God, who knew... and then does he relate the boasting about Hiramabi/Hiram as...

109 This story makes an interesting link between what seems to be a reference to everyone having רוח, and רוח as a cause of special gifts. In Num 27:16, and previously in 16:22, God is referred to as יהוה אלהי הרוחות לכל بشם "Yahweh, the God of the 'spirits' of all flesh", and יהוה אלהי הרוחות לכל בשר "El, the God of the 'spirits' of all flesh". The latter is part of a plea by Moses and Aaron to God as the giver of life not to take the lives of the whole congregation for the sin of Korah. The first, however, is used by Moses as an epithet of Yahweh in an address to Yahweh where he pleads for a leader of the people of Israel after his death. That it is subsequently stated that Joshua has רוח in him, seems to be connected in some way with that epithet.

110 Cf. Sus 45 in the two versions. Theodotion says: ἐξήγειτο ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον παιδάριον νεωτέρου ὁ ὑμωνομοντα. Old Greek says that έδωκεν ὁ ἀγγέλος ... πνεῦμα συνέσεως νεωτέρων ὁμόματι (967; 88 ὁτι) Δανιήλ.
Israel to war against aggressors, such as in *Judg* 3:10 and 6:34. More closely related are the occurrences in *Ezek* 2:2; 3:24, which refer to חָוָה going (וְהָלָךְ) into (בָּע) Ezekiel. This prophet subsequently experiences a divine audition.\(^{112}\)

The most common preposition used with הנע is על. Together, the preposition and noun are associated with prophesying, as *Num* 11:29 makes clear, and as *Neh* 9:30 suggests. In *Num* 11:25 the seventy elders are given some of the spirit that was on Moses, and they were enabled to prophesy on that one occasion.\(^{114}\) We find חָוָה חָוָה מַעֲרֶת coming upon Saul (*1 Sam* 10:5-6, 10; 19:23), the messengers of Saul (*1 Sam* 19:20), Azariah (*2 Chr* 15:1, cf. 8), and Zechariah (*2 Chr* 24:20; cf., 20:14). At *Isa* 61:1, the Servant of the Lord says of himself that חָוָה חָוָה מַעֲרֶת. All of these are said to prophesy, or they act in a prophetic way without the actual word being used (Zechariah, servant of the Lord).\(^{115}\)

Three passages deserve fuller reference. We noted above that there is a connection between the Daniel stories and the Balaam story. At *Num* 24:2, it is said

\(^{111}\) *Cf. 1 Chr* 12:19 [18]

\(^{112}\) In the *Hodayot* from the Dead Sea Scrolls, the מַעֲרֶת praises God for חָוָה מַעֲרֶת נָשֵׂא “the spirit which you placed in me” (*IQH* 4.17, 5.25, 8.19, 20.12, 21.14). The material at 22.11-13 seems to draw upon (material similar to) the hymn in *Dan* 2, and specifically links having this חָוָה in him with his reception of the wisdom and mystery from God. At *4Q381* frg. 69.4 it is said that God put his spirit in the prophets to teach and show them what he wanted; and at *1IQS* 27, 11 it is said that David composed psalms “through the spirit of prophecy which had been given to him from before the Most High”.

\(^{113}\) Whether there should be a distinction made between these two expressions is uncertain. The use of חָוָה may be related more to *ad hoc* “possession” for the accomplishment of certain tasks, while the use of מַעֲרֶת may indicate continued “indwelling”.

\(^{114}\) *Cf. 2 Kgs* 2:15.

\(^{115}\) Although the prophets do not tend to attribute their prophecies to the influence of the חָוָה of God (*Ezek* and *Zech* 7:12, being exceptions) this usage was not lost on the author of *4Q381* frg. 69, l 4: “and he gave them to you by his spirit, prophets to instruct (טּוֹלֵךְ) and teach you [...].” *DJD* 11, 149-51. See also *Neh* 9:30. At 9:20 the same function (טּוֹלֵךְ) is assigned to the Spirit.
that the spirit of God comes upon Balaam and he gives his third oracle. Significantly, on the two previous occasions God and Balaam have some form of meeting (Num 23:4, 16), but on this occasion, when Balaam gives two oracles, no reference is made to any such consultation, he simply speaks the oracles. It is also stated that on this occasion, as opposed to other times (before the previous two?), Balaam did not consult נסף, some form of divination (Num 24:1). Although no consultation is held, he still speaks the word of the Lord (24:13). It may be, therefore, that having the spirit of God come upon him is an alternate form of consulting with God. Joel 3:1-2 democratizes the giving of the רוח ההולך. The רוח יוהו רוחו יוהו will be upon all and result in prophesying, dreams and visions. The fullest reference to רוח being upon someone is at Isa 11:2. There the רוח יוהו רוחו is said to rest (לוה) upon the shoot/branch so that he can rule. That statement118 is then elaborated to mean:

רְוָחָה חַכָּה מֵהָה
רְוָחָה הַנְּצָרָה מְנוּרָה
רְוָחָה יְרֵאְתָא יְרֵאָה

Significantly, the Joel and Isa 11:2 passages are directly relevant to Dan, which are concerned with prophecy, dreams and visions, and in which we find reference to דָּנָה, בָּנָה, חַכָּה.

These uses of [רְוָחָה יְרֵאְתָא יְרֵאָה] illustrate how they can indicate that an individual is somehow empowered or used by God. By means of assistance from God’s רוחו, the individual is made able to do what is not normal (fine artisan work; lead an army or nation), or not possible without the help of God (prophesy for God).

116 The "I" of this verse is named in 2:17 as רוחו אֲלָדָה/יוֹדָה.

117 As at Num 11:29 and 2 Kgs 2:15.

118 The use of רְוָחָה יְרֵאְתָא, as at 61:1, does set this phrase off somewhat, however.

119 See discussion of 2:20 above.
In *Dan*, although 6:4 [3] is the last of the occurrences of the phrases that we are considering in this section, its different perspective and context provide some boundaries that may help us to determine the meaning in the other contexts in the book. Unlike the other occurrences, the perspective here is the narrator’s. This is significant, because the narrator’s perspective is Jewish. This is not the perspective of a foreigner, as in chapters 4 and 5. The narrator relates to the readers that Daniel had distinguished himself among the other administrators, leading Darius to make plans to promote him. There is no reference to Daniel’s previous feats as an interpreter of dreams and enigmas. Here, instead of a problematic interpretation, the context is one of administrative ability, and so the phrase יִרְאוּן מִתַּנְסִי seems to have a wholly anthropological meaning: “an exceptional מִתַּנְסִי”, in the sense of the seat of the intellect. This is a comparative attribute: Daniel is exceptional in comparison with others. There is nothing in this story that could lead one to think that מִתַּנְסִי refers either to some incorporeal being that indwelt Daniel or to some influence of the gods/God upon him. Daniel was, simply, an astute administrator. Thus, when the phrases are considered below in chapters 4 and 5, this comparative human viewpoint of a Jewish narrator will have to be taken into account.

The word יִרְאוּן provides us with several problems. First is the matter of grammatical number. Although in Hebrew the plural יְרֹאִים is used as a singular when referring to the God of Israel, that practice does not seem to have been continued to any great extent, if at all, in Aramaic. In the Aramaic section of *Dan* there are 37 occurrences of the singular יְרֹאִים, and 14 occurrences of the plural. Excluding

---

120 Bauer, and Leander, *Grammatik Aramäischen*, §87 f.

121 *Dan* 2:18, 19, 20, 23, 28, 37, 44, 45, 47; 3:15, 17, 26, 28, 29, 32 [4:2]; 4:5 [8]; 5:3, 18, 21, 23, 26; 6:6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 17, 21, 23, 24, 27.
scattered references to individual gods,\textsuperscript{123} and the occurrences under consideration, these are divided respectively between references to the God of Israel and the gods of others. Within the stories, there are also ample examples of a clear contrast between individual gods, such as Daniel’s (דניא), and a plurality of gods (גדים). For example, in 2:47 Daniel’s God is the God of gods; in 4:5 [8] Belshazzar, makes reference to his god יתנ, and then refers to Daniel as being one in whom is the spirit of the holy יתנ; in 5:23 the gods of silver and gold, etc., are referred to in the same thought as Daniel’s God.

Although the practice of using singulars for individual gods, including the God of Israel, seems clear, there are two pieces of evidence that indicate that it might not have been uniformly so. Bauer and Leander point out plurals of יתנ in \textit{Dan} 6:17 and 21 that refer to Daniel’s God.\textsuperscript{124} Although BHS\textsuperscript{3} does not indicate the existence of the forms, and thus \textit{HALOT} says Bauer and Leander are mistaken, the form יתנ “your God” does occur in both locations as the Ketib in second edition of the Rabbinic Bible (1524-1525), as noted in the smaller version of David Ginsburg’s edition of the Bible, which is cited in \textit{BHK}. This would be the more difficult reading, given the otherwise consistent use of the singular form elsewhere, but may also be merely a scribal error by someone more used to Hebrew.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Dan} 2:11, 47; 3:12, 14, 18, 25; 4:5 [8], 6 [9], 15 [18]; 5:4, 11\textsuperscript{2}, 14, 23.

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Dan} 3:28; 4:5 [8]; 6:8 [7], 13 [12].

\textsuperscript{124} Bauer, and Leander, \textit{Grammatik Aramäischen}, §87 f. One occurrence in \textit{Ahikar} 126, where the determined plural יתנ is used with a singular verb, is probably a mistake, given the polytheistic origin of the story. Cf. A. Cowley, \textit{Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. Edited, with Translation and Notes} (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1923), 214; and Lindenberger, in the \textit{OTP}, II, 503.

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{4QDan} is damaged where the occurrence in 6:17 would be, but where it is found in 6:21, the form is יתנ, a morphological variant of the singular form in the Masoretic Text.
More clear examples of plurals referring to Daniel’s God are to be found in 7:18, 22, 25, and 27. In these places the plural יְהֹוָה לְשׁוֹנְיָוָה seems to refer to beings related to Daniel’s God. This Hebrew loanword יְהֹוָה לְשׁוֹנְיָוָה seems to be appropriate as a reference to the God of Israel, given its frequent use as a divine epithet or attribute. The problem with that association, however, is that in Hebrew it is never plural, even when it directly modifies יְהֹוָה, as we see in Ps 57:3 and 78:56. This, also, seems to be the case in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Given that the term seems originally to have been the name of a god different from El, that there is a singular Aramaic form יְהֹוָה that is found in Dan, and that its occurrences in Hebrew are all singular, why does this Hebrew loan-word appear four times as an indeterminate plural in the Aramaic of Daniel in reference to the God of Israel?

---

126 Extant text at 7:27 in 4QDan has the plural form. Other occurrences are either not extant or are incomplete, as at 7:27 in 4QDan.

127 S.v., HALOT. It occurs 52x as singular, but only 1 time as plural, in Ezek, 42:5, but not in relation to God. The Aramaic form of the word is יְהֹוָה (pl.) from יְהֹוָה (sg.).

128 S.v. HALOT, B.

129 James H. Charlesworth, Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991), 450-51 lists 25 occurrences of יְהֹוָה. The phrase יְהֹוָה accounts for 15 of them, and one of יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה for one.

130 Cf. KAI 222 A 11.

131 Dan 3:26, 32; 4:14, 21, 22, 29, 31; 5:18, 21; 7:25. All occurrences are written יְהֹוָה but have a qere יְהֹוָה. According to Bauer, and Leander, Grammatik Aramäischen, §13 k the form יְהֹוָה should result in the determined singular form of the qere, in which the yod goes to an aleph. The original yod is retained in the text. However, according to §51 d „, the yod should be retained as part of this pattern of word. T. R. Ashley, “A philological, literary, theological study of some problems in Daniel chapters 1-6; with special reference to the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint and medieval rabbinic exegesis of selected passages” (PhD dissertation, University of St. Andrews, 1975), 14-15 n. 14, p. 86, found that in the papyri there was no determined plural form of these words יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, יְהֹוָה, YAH (from the same papyri) and so the form יְהֹוָה is the form that should be found. However, in the later Jewish Palestinian Aramaic the forms of the qere are found. It would seem that in this case, the ketib was corrected to a different or later dialect.
Bauer and Leander suggest that יְהֵלֹהֵי may be due to attraction to the plural יְהֵלֹהֵי, or that it may be a Hebraism corresponding to עלְתָּרָם. As we have already noted, it is not found as a plural in other writings, even, for example, when modified by יְהֵלֹהֵי in CD 20.8.

Analogy with the Hebrew עלְתָּרָם is a more likely reason for the plural. This seems to be what has happened with עלְתָּרָם at Prov 9:10, 30:3 and possibly Hos 12:1. In the Aramaic of Dan this use of a plural could be signalled by four things: it is a Hebrew loan-word in a book that uses the Aramaic equivalent, which would possibly draw the reader’s attention to it; it is plural, as if it were עלְתָּרָם; there is a visual relationship between the two words עלְתָּרָם and עלְתָּרָם; and the use of the absolute state corresponds to the use of עלְתָּרָם as a proper name.

So, it is possible that עלְתָּרָם, although grammatically plural, refers to the God of Israel. If so, however, it may be understood as such only outside the confines of the narrative by the Jewish author and reader. In other words, it could be another double entendre, because why would a pagan ruler use a plural to refer to the one God? We shall return to this question in due course.

Another possible explanation of עלְתָּרָם is that it is used adjectivally to mean “divine” in the sense of a superlative quality. Other occurrences of divine terms in a superlative sense have been argued for in the Masoretic Text. Smith, for example, has argued that in 14 passages עלְתָּרָם, עלְתָּרָם, and עלְתָּרָם should be understood as “the

132 Bauer, and Leander, Grammatik Aramäischen, §87 g.

133 So too Montgomery, Daniel, 307. HALOT.

134 Unlike the determined plural עלְתָּרָם in Jer 10:11, there are none in Dan, except in phrases where it is in construct with determined forms (e.g., 5:4) and when pronouns are attached (e.g., 3:12).
equivalent of a strong superlative in genitive relationships. Others have followed him in this, and enlarged on the number of examples. Later consideration of the interchange of וַיַּזְרֵעַ and הַקָּרָן will also support the possibility of this understanding of וַיַּזְרֵעַ.

One can take two approaches to this usage. One is that the nouns for “god” lose their association with the divine and are merely intensifiers connoting “great, mighty”. The other is that the words retain the denotation of “God/gods” so that “the presence of the divine names raises a person or object to a pre-eminent degree by virtue of the fact that the person or object in question is brought into relationship with God”. Thomas found no evidence of the former usage, but he did suggest that the latter was the case. Thus, as in Gen 1, a “wind of God” could be thought of as a wind sent by God to fulfil a special purpose, e.g., to blow over the waters of Chaos, or to cause an extraordinary storm. Phrases like “pastures/gold of God” could mean pastures/gold such as God might have, or might produce, i.e., the finest. About this


137 Two examples from English slang would be “god-awful” and “god-damned”, as in “a god-awful noise” or “a god-damned loud noise”. Thomas, “Unusual ways of expressing”, 219 mentions “god-forsaken”, as in “a god-forsaken hole”. This, however still seems to retain the concept of God, in that God has forsaken the “hole”. The concept of God damning something, however, seems far removed from the adjectival use of “god-damned”.

138 Thomas, “Unusual ways of expressing”, 215. Again, two examples from English can illustrate this: “God’s country” or “God’s half-acre”.
Davidson had already noted: “probably the idea was that God originated the thing … or that it belonged to Him, and was therefore extraordinary. Sometimes the meaning appears to be ‘in God’s estimation’”. It seems unlikely, then, that the concept of “God/gods” disappeared altogether.

It must be clarified whether is being used as a modifying noun (“of God/the gods”) or as an adjective (“divine”). That is, if the term retains its association with God, is it with God qua a god as opposed to a non-god (whether angel, human, or animal), and so to be translated by a noun (e.g., “god”, “deity”); or is its association with God qua a being of the heavenly not earthly realm (thus including angels, but not humans and animals), and so to be rendered by an adjective (e.g., “divine”, “heavenly”). is an example of this latter usage in the book. Understood in this way, would find a parallel in and mean that Daniel had “a mind like a god’s”, that is, an “exceptional intellect”, he possessed “exceptional wisdom”. If the phrase is representative of this usage of , however it would have to be restricted to the shorter phrases in 5:12, 14, and 6:4[3].

The modification of by the adjective adds another level of complexity to our investigation. The adjective occurs as a plural absolute and it

---


140 Cf. Becking, “A divine spirit is in you”, 518, who considers it a genitivus qualitatis, which technically would use an abstract noun, such as “divine”.

141 So *HALOT*, 2γ “Divine being, angel”.

142 See the discussion of this phrase below, p. 237.
is natural to read the two masculine plural absolute forms together as “holy gods”.

Becking has pointed out that the occurrence of an adjective to modify a noun doubly is not likely on grammatical grounds. Thus, understanding the phrase to mean “holy, divine mind/spirit” is unlikely. He, therefore, settles upon this phrase meaning, “spirit of the holy gods”, which seems to connote some form of possession. The parallel use of אֱלֹהֵי and הן, however, seems to indicate otherwise, as we will attempt to show below.

This adjective occurs 11 times in Dan. The first occurrences are the plurals in 4:5 [8] and 6 [9]. As already noted, it is natural to want to read these as noun and modifying adjective. However, before we get to the next occurrence of the phrase in 4:15 [18], the reader encounters the use of the adjective as a substantive. In 4:10 [13] (singular) and 4:14 [17] (plural), the adjective is used to denote a heavenly being: “a watcher, that is a holy one” and “watchers, that is holy ones”. Again in 4:20 [23], 7:18, 21, 22, 25 and 27, it is used in the singular (4:20) and plural to denote these heavenly beings. Might these be narrative clues to how to understand the phrase?

As we will discuss in the next section, אֱלֹהֵי has been linked either to Phoenician usage, or to Josh 24:19. Positing Phoenician dependence seems to be unnecessary given the occurrence of the phrase in Josh. In addition, the Phoenician

143 He also concludes that the shorter version means “divine spirit”. Becking, “A divine spirit is in you”, 519.

144 Singular: 4:10, 20; Plural: 4:5, 6, 14, 15; 5:11; 7:18, 21, 22, 25, 27.

145 An explicative vav, Bauer, and Leander, Grammatik Aramäischen, §96 h.

146 Suffice it to say that the literature on this subject is vast! For a good overview of the issues, with detailed bibliography, see Collins, Daniel, 313-17. We accept the argument that the “holy ones” are heavenly beings, not the people of God, i.e., “saints”.
occurrences are definite, and those in *Dan* are absolute. While *Josh* 24:19 may have provided some stimulus for the modification (maybe it provided a needed precedent), we believe the addition of רָהַשׁ is part of the literary progression of the *Dan* stories and is linked to the “conversion” of Nebuchadnezzar. We take our cue for this from the occurrence of the phrase רָהַשׁ אֲלָיוֹת ב for which there is demonstrable dependence upon *Gen*, as we will show below.

In the Joseph story there is no indication that the Pharaoh has any kind of “conversion”—there is no admission that Joseph’s God is supreme, just that gods gave Joseph his ability. It is unclear whether the reference is to Joseph’s God, even when Joseph speaks (41:16). However, in *Dan* 2, 3, and 4, Nebuchadnezzar does make a clear admission of the supremacy of Daniel’s God. Continued echoes of this acknowledgement may be suggested by the use (or lack of it, as we shall suggest) of the cognates of the root רָהַשׁ in chapters 4 and 5.\(^\text{147}\)

Nebuchadnezzar refers to Daniel’s God in several ways that stress the supremacy of this God.\(^\text{148}\) In his confession at 2:47, he uses the superlative רָהַשׁ אֲלָיוֹת א,\(^\text{149}\) and in his third confession at 4:34 [37], מָלַעַשׁ אֲלָיוֹת.\(^\text{150}\) After the miraculous delivery of the three from the fiery furnace, beginning at 3:26, Nebuchadnezzar sometimes refers to Daniel’s God as “God most high”

---

\(^\text{147}\) The occurrences, apart from those associated with the expression in question, are at 4:10, 14, 20.

\(^\text{148}\) Ashley, “Philological, literary, theological study”, 189-201, discusses all of the names of God used in *Dan*.

\(^\text{149}\) *Cf.* רָהַשׁ אֲלָיוֹת רַב used by Daniel in 2:45.

\(^\text{150}\) *Cf.* מָלַעַשׁ as a name used by the watcher at 4:23 [27] and מָלַעַשׁ אֲלָיוֹת used by Daniel in 5:23.
or just “the Most High” (לֶאֶחְזָא קֶלֶלְאָא). None of these expresses a monotheistic faith, only that Daniel’s God “out gods” all others.

There are other divine beings referred to in Dan, i.e., the watchers, and they are referred to as גַּלַּשְׁיָרְיָא (4:10 [13], 14 [17], 20 [23]). They are clearly divine beings and not earthly, as they are said to be from the heavens (4:10 [13], 20 [23]). Based on Ugaritic, Phoenician and Punic texts and on a re-examination of the MT, Van Selms argues that when used of God or angels, the גַּלַּשְׁיָרְיָא words do not denote some moral quality, but denote that the beings are of heavenly, rather than earthly origins. Bevan makes a similar connection when discussing the use of the word גַּלַּשְׁיָרְיָא for the “watchers” in 4:10 [13]. We may compare this with the spatial references cited in the previous paragraph. The following points also should be stressed. First, elsewhere in Dan the גַּלַּשְׁיָרְיָא terms are used only of the God of Israel or of things associated with

151 3:26, 32 [4:2]. Daniel uses the term in 5:18, 21. This is similar to the phrase גַּלַּשְׁיָרְיָא “God of heaven,” used by Daniel in 2:18, 19, 37, 44, a title characteristic of the post-exilic period (see Collins, Daniel, 159 for a brief discussion and bibliography).

152 4:31 [34]. In 4:14 [17] Nebuchadnezzar repeats the words of the watcher; in 4:29 [31], it is the narrator who repeats them; in 4:21, 22 [24, 25] Daniel uses the title. It is significant for later discussions that this epithet is used in a pattern similar to the one under discussion. In chapter 3:26 the full title is used and that full form is picked up again as the first occurrence in the next story at 3:32 [4:2]. After that, in chapter 4 the shorter form is used by all parties. The longer form is not picked up again until Daniel confronts Belshazzar.


154 Bevan, Short Commentary, 91. “With גַּלַּשְׁיָרְיָא, as applied to an angel. cf. Hebr. גַּלַּשְׁיָרְיָא in Zech. xiv. 5. Ps. lxxxix. 6. Job xv. 15; the last passage clearly shews that when angels are called “holy”, this conveys no idea of moral purity or goodness, but expresses the awfulness and mysteriousness of their nature.” He finds this notion expressed in the church Father Polychronius: δακτον καλει οιον εξαιρετον οια παραι παιντας τους ανθρωπους κεκτημενον την φυσιν.

155 The other occurrences are at 7:18, 21, 22, 25, 27; 8:13, 14; 9:16, 20, 24, 26; 11:28, 30, 45; 12:7.
this God. Second, the real audience for the stories was Judaean, and to that audience the ṣâhî terms would be understood as references to their God, as is true in chapters 7-12. Thus, although “holy” may not be directly attributed to Daniel’s God in the stories, Nebuchadnezzar is portrayed as being aware that the watchers are God’s watchers, i.e., “holy ones” from the realm of the Holy One. The addition in Dan of the term jilj’7ji7 to the phrase from Gen 41 seems an attempt by the author of the story to show that this foreign king (unlike the Pharaoh of Gen 41) knew that the הוה that was in Daniel, derived from, or was affected by, the Most High God, as opposed to other gods. It is this God who is the God of heaven, Heaven itself (4:23 [27]), and thus can truly be deemed רְחֵם.

This theory can explain why רְחֵם is missing in 5:14. When the phrase in question is used in 5:11 it is part of the recounting of what Nebuchadnezzar found to be true of Daniel during his reign (Dan 1-4). Neither the queen mother nor Belshazzar, however, experiences any such “conversion”. They do not acknowledge Daniel’s God as supreme. The queen mother merely comments upon the comparative abilities of Daniel by using הוה. Belshazzar, according to Daniel (5:18-24), rejected what his “father” had learned. Thus, when he speaks to Daniel, he does not use the term רְחֵם.

The combination אָלָהוּנָה רְחֵם has generated much discussion. We have already suggested several ways of understanding it. Scholars have debated whether the

156 How we understand the phrase in question will determine whether it is or not.

157 On the unit of variation, see above, n. 100.
phrase is of pagan origins and to be translated as “spirit of the holy gods”,\(^\text{158}\) or of Hebrew origins and to be translated as “Spirit of Holy Deity/the Holy God”.\(^\text{159}\)

Goldingay and Becking seem to think that it plays on the two conceptions.\(^\text{160}\)

The traditional debate centres on the possible origins of the phrase. As we noted above, the natural understanding of the phrase is as “spirit of the holy gods”, and so it has long been understood to be polytheistic, especially as it comes from a pagan (cf. \textit{Gen} 41:38).\(^\text{161}\) Similar phrases occur in two Phoenician inscriptions. The earliest is an inscription for a temple built by Yehimilk, thought to be a king from the first half of the tenth century BCE.\(^\text{162}\) In this inscription reference is made to מַשְׁחַרְתָּהּ אֲלֵי נֶבֶל קְרֵשָׁה, “the assembly of the holy gods of Byblos”.\(^\text{163}\) The second


\(^{160}\) Goldingay, \textit{Daniel}, 80; Becking, “A divine spirit is in you”. \textit{Cf. HALOT, s.v.}"_


\(^{163}\) For a translation see \textit{ANET}, 653. Gibson, \textit{Textbook}, 19 compares מַשְׁחַרְתָּה (‘Versammlung’, Donner, and Röllig, \textit{KAI}, II, 6; III, 20; “subst. assemblée, totalité”, C.-F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, \textit{Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l’Ouest} (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965)) to the Ugaritic mp\textit{rt} bn ‘il (‘in non-mythological texts”) and pr bn ‘ilm. According to Donner, and Röllig, \textit{KAI}, II, 7, 14-15, and Jean, and Hoftijzer, \textit{Dictionnaire}, 13, מַשְׁחַרְתָּה is in the plural construct state. Although מַשְׁחַרְתָּה is definite by virtue of being in construct with a proper name, מַשְׁחַרְתָּה lacks the article even though it modifies that definite noun. Gibson notes: “in later Phoen. it would normally be used in such a position. We may have evidence here of its gradual introduction into the language. It is entirely missing from 4 Ahiram [12-16; \textit{KAI} 1; \textit{ANET}, 661], as it is from the earliest Hebr. Inscr. [\textit{i.e.}, the Gezer calendar: \textit{KAI} 182; Gibson, \textit{Textbook}, 1-3: \textit{ANET}, 320].” 19.
Phoenician inscription is from the sarcophagus of Eshumunazar and dates from the early part of the fifth century BCE.\textsuperscript{164} It makes reference to הָאֲלוֹהֵים הָרוּשִׁים, “the holy gods”, and הָאֲלוֹהֵים הָרוּשֵׁנָה, “these holy gods” (I 9 & 22).\textsuperscript{165} Bevan, Charles, Delcor, and Kratz, for example, refer directly to these latter examples as proof that the phrase in \textit{Dan} is polytheistic,\textsuperscript{166} but, (despite the irregularities in the use of the article) all three examples are determined, and the occurrences in \textit{Dan} are not. They are also somewhat removed in time and culture from \textit{Dan}.

Montgomery, and Hartman and Di Lella part from the natural reading of the words as plurals due to the similar phrase הָאֲלוֹהֵים הָרוּשִׁים that occurs in \textit{Josh} 24:19 where it is an epithet of the God of Israel.\textsuperscript{167} They think the noun-adjective phrase in \textit{Dan} derives from that text. In addition, Hartman and Di Lella suggest that רָאוֹר אַלְוַי מַעֲלֶה לִינוּן is a meshing of \textit{Gen} 41:38 (1:1 נְרִי נְרִי בְּמֹעָלָהּ) and the \textit{Josh} phrase. We will consider this possibility.

In \textit{Gen} 41:38, the Hebrew phrase is explained in the context in terms similar to those used in \textit{2 Sam} 14:20 and 16:23.\textsuperscript{168} Westermann has already linked this phrase to

\textsuperscript{164} KAI 14; PI 28; ANET, 662. Commentary: KAI, II,19; PI, 101-02, 105.

\textsuperscript{165} The second occurrence of the phrase has an anomalous lack of the article, as in the first inscription, but here it is missing from the noun, not the adjective. About the lack of an article in the second occurrence, Gibson comments: “this may be a mason’s error (there are several in the inscr.), but if not, it casts considerable doubt on Lambdin’s attempts to regularize the usage of the Phoen. article …” (PI, 114). \textit{Cf.} Thomas O. Lambdin, “The junctural origin of the West Semitic definite article,” in \textit{Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright}, ed. Hans Goedicke (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Pr, 1971): 315-33.


\textsuperscript{168} See below, p. 237.
Joseph’s statement in v. 33 where he tells the Pharaoh to look for someone “having discernment and wisdom” (כָּלָּה אַלָּלָה). On that basis Westermann decries any special religious connection, e.g., some specific kind of divine endowment or inspiration, and opts for a superlative understanding of the phrase. He concludes that it means no more than an outstanding political-economic gift, a gift of leadership. What he does not note, however, is that after the Pharaoh comments to his officials about Joseph having רָחוּם אַלָּלָה in him (41:38), he repeats to Joseph the words of v. 33 in v. 39: “After God/gods have given you knowledge of all this, there is no one at hand having discernment and wisdom like you.” This explicitly attributes Joseph’s ability to interpret the dream to the gods/God who gave the information to Joseph. Therefore, while Westermann is correct that the “wisdom” is political and economic astuteness, he is wrong to deny that it is of divine origin.

In many ways, the Daniel figure depends upon the Joseph figure. Niditch and Doran show that the two stories are linked form-critically with Ḥiqaru and on that

---


170 The word רָחוּם is used here before a hiph ‘il infinitive construct to mean “after” in a temporal sense. Cf. HALOT, רָחוֹם §B.4.

171 Cf. HALOT, רָחוֹם §A.1.

172 4QGen f. 2 col. ii. l 3, יִכְלָל “having… more… than you”.

basis (i.e., a common form) caution against making claims of literary dependence.\textsuperscript{174} Labonté, in a different way argues that the two biblical accounts have no direct dependence, but rather come simply from a common period with common literature. The work of Gnuse however, is strongly indicative of more than just a similar form; there is direct dependence. His work and ours have shown the following links, beyond similar form:

1. Both \textit{Dan} 2 and \textit{Gen} 41 take place in a “second year”.
2. The ruler has a symbolic dream.
3. The ruler is ‘troubled’ (דבע)\textsuperscript{175} in his ‘spirit’ (רוח): \textit{Gen} 41:8; \textit{Dan} 2:1, 3.
4. The ruler summons the האמנית immediately when he awakens: \textit{Gen} 41:8; \textit{Dan} 2:2.\textsuperscript{176}
5. The הוהי fail: \textit{Gen} 41:8; \textit{Dan} 2:10-11; 4:7.
6. When a member of the court recalls the previous success of the Jewish boy, the latter is summoned to interpret the dream: \textit{Gen} 41:12-13; \textit{Dan} 2:25.
7. The Jewish boy confesses that his God is the true interpreter of dreams: \textit{Gen} 40:8, 41:16, 38; \textit{Dan} 2:29-30.
8. The dreams predict the future and in some way pertain to the affairs of state.
9. Each dream has specific motifs alluding to events, and each component is interpreted.
10. The Jewish boy confesses that his God has revealed what he wants the ruler to know: \textit{Gen} 41:25, 28; \textit{Dan} 2:28, 45.
11. The Jewish boy confesses that his God has provided the interpretation: \textit{Gen} 40:8; 41:6, 16, 38; \textit{Dan} 2:18-23; 4:6, 15.
12. The cognate words הכתוב (“to interpret”), הכתוב (“interpretation”) and הכתוב (Aramaic “to interpret”) occur only in \textit{Gen} 40-41 and \textit{Dan} in the MT.\textsuperscript{177}
13. The Jewish boy declares that the course of history is determined by divine will: \textit{Gen} 41:28, 32; \textit{Dan} 2:28, 45.

\textsuperscript{174} Niditch, and Doran, “Success story”, 179-93. The \textit{Gen Apocryphon} account of Abraham and Sarai in Egypt, 19.14-20.34, is similar in many respects to the two biblical stories, as well.

\textsuperscript{175} also found in \textit{Judg} 13:25, where it is the הוהי that disturbs, or stirs Samson. The only other occurrence of the word outside of \textit{Dan} is at \textit{Ps} 77:5, used of being so troubled that the Psalmist could not sleep.

\textsuperscript{176} This term occurs in \textit{Gen} 41.8, 24; \textit{Dan} 1.20; 2.2, 12. It occurs elsewhere only when Moses confronts the הוהי in Egypt (\textit{Exod} 7.11. 22; 9.11).

\textsuperscript{177} In \textit{Eccl} 8:1 הכתוב, “meaning,” “explanation” is used. It is an Aramaic loan word (\textit{HALOT}, s. v.).
14. The ruler recognises that ‘a spirit of God/gods’ is in the Jewish boy: *Gen* 41:38; *Dan* 4:6 [9]; 5:11, 12, 14.
15. The Jewish boy is honoured by the ruler: *Gen* 41:37-45; *Dan* 2:46-47; 4:9.
16. The Jewish boy is given significant authority in the realm: *Gen* 41:40-44; *Dan* 2:48.

In addition to those, we can also note these links between the two sets of stories:

1. The hero receives a new courtly name: *Gen* 41:45; *Dan* 1:6.
2. In *Gen* 40:6 the cows are described as כֵּבָשׁ. The only other time that the plural participle of this verb is used in the Masoretic Text is at *Dan* 1:10 where the official expresses his concern about the consequences due to a change in appearance of those who do not eat the king’s food. 178
3. Parallel to that, in *Gen* 41:2 the second set of cows is described as בָּשָׂר וַסְמוֹא, and the masculine form is used of Daniel and his friends in 1:15.179

With Gnuse, then, we may conclude: “Not only did both narratives use a common visual-symbolic dream format, but Daniel appears to be a rewritten version of the Joseph figure”; or, at least, the author/redactor draws on the Joseph story, thus drawing attention to the parallels between the two figures.

This literary dependence gives part of the answer to the question of what our phrase means. By taking *Gen* 41 as a paradigm, the author/redactor of *Dan* 4 has the Gentile king acknowledge that the Judaean interpreter had נַחֲלָת רוֹעֵץ in him.

However, Nebuchadnezzar utters this in *Dan* 4 and, as we have already reviewed above, he had come to acknowledge that Daniel’s God was the supreme divinity. Thus, we would argue that the author/redactor of the story modified the phrase of the unbelieving ruler of Egypt, such that Nebuchadnezzar continues with his confessions of the supremacy of Daniel’s God, who had gifted Daniel in the interpretation of dreams,

---


179 Koch, *Daniel*, 23; it should also be noted that at *Gen* 39:6, Joseph is similarly described as נַחֲלָת בָּשָׂר (cows and corn at 41:2, 4) and Daniel et al. as נַחֲלָת מַרְאוֹז at 1:4.
but in *Dan* 5 Belshazzar does not. In doing this, the plural form of the Hebrew phrase/phrases was retained in order to signal a link to known material such as *Gen* 41:38 and *Josh* 24:19.

The adjective יְהֵרָה can be glossed with “extra, exceptional” (2:31; 4:33; 5:12, 14; 6:4),\(^{180}\) and as an adverb with “greatly, extremely, very” (3:22; 7:7, 19).\(^{181}\) In *Dan* 2:31 the statue is יְהֵרָה; in 4:33 [36] it is used to signify that Nebuchadnezzar received significantly more majesty after his recovery. The adverbial usage conveys the same: in 3:22 the fire was exceedingly hot; in 7:7 the fourth beast is exceedingly strong, or dreadful, 7:19.\(^{182}\) In 5:12 and 6:4, the word is used as a genitive of quality\(^{183}\) to indicate that Daniel possessed an “exceptional יְהֵרָה”.

After the initial reference in 5:11 back to the phrase from chapter 4, chapters 5 and 6 use the shorter forms יְהֵרָה and יְהֵרָה, in which יְהֵרָה becomes יְהֵרָה, and both become יְהֵרָה. In addition, in 5:11 and 14 another parallel set of phrases occurs with the same interchange.

*Table 6. יְהֵרָה and יְהֵרָה*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>יְהֵרָה</th>
<th>יְהֵרָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:14</td>
<td>תְמוֹנָה יְהֵרָה</td>
<td>תְמוֹנָה יְהֵרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12</td>
<td>יְהֵרָה</td>
<td>יְהֵרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4</td>
<td>יְהֵרָה</td>
<td>יְהֵרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>תְמוֹנָה חָכְמָה יְהֵרָה</td>
<td>תְמוֹנָה חָכְמָה יְהֵרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:14</td>
<td>תְמוֹנָה חָכְמָה יְהֵרָה</td>
<td>תְמוֹנָה חָכְמָה יְהֵרָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{180}\) *4QDan* adds this at 2:30, see above at n. 97.

\(^{181}\) It is related to the Hebrew root יְהֵרָה (I) whose various uses have similar meanings *TDOT*, V1. 490-91; *HALOT*. The Hebrew occurs in *Dan* only at 8:9.

\(^{182}\) In the *Gen Apocryphon* 19.23, Sarai is “exceedingly afraid”.

\(^{183}\) Joüon, and Muraoka, *Grammar*, §129 f.
In the latter two descriptions, we find both terms in the absolute state and in the same place in separate constructions. In both cases, they qualify the kind of אֱלֹהִים that Daniel displayed and the second is a repetition of the first. The first does not say that he had “divine wisdom” in him, only that his wisdom was “like divine wisdom”. This is clearly comparative, and not a reference to source. This should be compared with 2 Sam 14:20 (cf. v. 17), where David showed great knowledge and insight which were compared to the wisdom of the messengers of God:

This comparison is similar to what we find at 2 Sam 16:23, where the political advice of Ahithophel is likened to that of one who inquires (רַעֲשָׁלָם) of God, presumably a reference to a prophet. In both cases, the one described has wisdom that is comparable to wisdom from the divine realm. This comparison, in Daniel’s case, would seem to be a general reference to Daniel’s wisdom displayed in chapter 4, and more explicitly from the narrator’s point of view, to chapters 1 and 2 where Daniel is given wisdom (1:4, 17, 20; 2:20, 21, 23, 30).

When it first occurs at 5:12, in the phrases under consideration, it stands where אֱלֹהִים קַדְשׁיָּנ has been to this point. Although 5:12 and 14 come from a pagan’s point of view, 6:4 is the Jewish narrator’s; this rules out the use of רְוִירָּה as a specifically “pagan” point of view. Lys and Lacocque understand the change from אֱלֹהִים קַדְשׁיָּנ to רְוִירָּה as a movement from a theological description (the source of the wisdom) to an anthropological one (comparative) in which a clear delimitation between the realms is difficult to make. However, the change from אֱלֹהִים קַדְשׁיָּנ to רְוִירָּה, although

not necessarily pagan, is a shift in perspective from one that attributes ability to a
divine influence to one that merely compares. This is the significance of the
occurrence in 6:4: Daniel had administrative skills that were superior to those of the
other administrators and thus he was placed over them. It makes no reference to these
skills having a divine origin.

Additional Descriptions

Before we conclude the overview of the phrases, we will deal with one other
factor that we believe is relevant. Accompanying the phrases at 4:6, 15 [9, 18]; 5:11,
12 and 14, there is additional material listing the abilities of Daniel. With the exception
of 4:15 [18], which uses ""כ", the material is linked to the phrase by a simple vav. Above
on page 183 two alternatives were given: a conjunctive vav ("and") or an explicative
vav ("that is"). If the material is additional attributes, then it is only generally helpful
in our understanding of Daniel’s role. However, if they are an explanation of the
phrase רוחו של העבדים, they would be particularly helpful in determining how the
phrases were intended to be understood. The following are the relevant texts:

Table 7. Conjunctive or Explicative vav in attribute lists?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:6 [9]</td>
<td>יִדְעוּ לֹא דְּרָשָׁה יִתֵּמָהוּ</td>
<td>I know that the רוחו של העבדים is in you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;and&quot; (1) no mystery evades you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>יִדְעוּ לֹא דְּרָשָׁה יִתֵּמָהוּ</td>
<td>In whom is the רוחו של העבדים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;and&quot; (1) in the days of your father he was found to have light, insight, and wisdom like that of the gods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12</td>
<td>כָּלְכָּל בֵּית רְאוּ</td>
<td>Since there was found in him a remarkable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each description begins with the acknowledgement that Daniel has (כריוש[) or דוד תוריהו רוחת אלדחי in (ב) him. In each case, the phrase used is followed by additional descriptive phrases joined to it with a vav. The three passages from chapter 5 follow a basic pattern, using the sequence דוד תוריהו ... השכחתו הב. There are significant differences, however: in v. 12, the phrase הנניא רוחת אלדחי כריוש[ does not appear, rather, we find דוד תוריהו; and the same lexemes are not used in each extended description. In 5:14, הנניא returns, but כריוש[ does not, and where השכחתו אלדחי occurred in 4:12 we find דוד תוריהו. In 4:15 [18], a different sequence of phrase and explanation order is used. Nebuchadnezzar orders Daniel to tell him the קס of the dream, because the experts of the kingdom could not do it, but he knew that Daniel was able to do it because רוחת אלדחי was in him. This should be compared with 5:12 where מפרש תודחי is one of the additional phrases in the joined description.

Similar descriptions occur elsewhere in the Masoretic Text. At Gen 41:33 and 38-39 we find Joseph recommending to the Pharaoh that he appoint aלק לנן רוחתב "a discerning and wise individual", set him over Egypt, and let him administrate the collection of food in preparation for the years of famine. Then the Pharaoh asks his servants: “Can we find a man like this, in whom is דוד תוריהו?” (41:38) Then, addressing Joseph he answers: “Since ש[ God/gods have given you knowledge of all

185 The word ש[ is used here before a hiph’il infinitive construct to mean “after” in a temporal sense. Cf. HALOT, ש[ §B.4.
this, there is no one at hand\footnote{Cf. HALOT, נ“ §A.1.} having discernment and wisdom like you.” As we argued above, רוח אַלְדוֹרִים is explained in the context as being evident in abilities to administrate and interpret, and the source of the ability is God.

This pattern is repeated in the following examples, as well, although not always with a וּוּ.

\textbf{Table 8. Further explicative statements in attribute lists}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\hline
Exod 31:3-4 & \\
ואַלְדוֹרִים אַלְדוֹרִים

והָבַנְיָה בָּרֵ铸造 כל מַלַאַכַּת לִשְׁבַּת מָחָשְׁבַּת

בַּחֲכָמָה

and I have filled him with רוח אַלְדוֹרִים, \\
with wisdom/skill, and understanding, and knowledge, \\
and in all kinds of crafts to make

וּוּפְלְאָלְדְוֹרִים אַלְדוֹרִים

בָּרֵ铸造 כל מַלַאַכַּת לִשְׁבַּת מָחָשְׁבַּת

בַּחֲכָמָה

Exod 35:31-32\footnote{Cf. 1 Kgs 7:14; 2 Chr 2:11-13 [12-14]. The two accounts are different in that the Deuteronomist’s account merely mentions that Hiram/Huramabi was fullfilled with wisdom, discernment and practical knowledge. The Chronicler’s account first praises Solomon as being a wise son given by God, who knew כל הָבֵן. Only then is there boasting about Huramabi/Hiram as ...חַכָּמִים יוֹדֵר בִּינוֹ... יָדוּ לְעַמְּרָת בֹּהֶרֶת. \textbf{Isa} 11:2 (see above, p. 220) should also be compared with this passage.} & \\

and I have filled him with רוח אַלְדוֹרִים, \\
with wisdom/skill, understanding, and knowledge, and in all kinds of crafts, and to make

מַלַאַלְדְוֹרִים אַלְדוֹרִים

לִשְׁבַּת כָל מַלַאָכַת

Exod 35:35 & \\

he filled them with a heart of wisdom so that they could do all the work

בִּבָּרְצַת אַלְדוֹרִים כל אֵלֶּה חָכְמָה לֵב אֶלֶּה

נָתַן לוֹ לִשְׁבַּת בָּרָצָה לָמַעְלָה לֵב הָבֵן

אֵלֶּה כָל מַלַאָכַת

Exod 36:1-2 & \\

\hline
\end{tabular}
...Bezalel and Oholiab and every person with a wise heart, whom Yahweh has given wisdom and knowledge so that they might know how to do all the work ....

I Sam 10:10

and the רוח אלוהים came upon him “and” (ו) he prophesied among them

I Sam 19:20

and there came upon the messengers of Saul רוח אלוהים “and” (ו) even they prophesied

I Sam 19:23

and there came upon him also רוח אלוהים “and” (ו) he continued along and prophesied

These various examples of phrases plus accompanying material should be sufficient to establish that the examples from Dan are phrase + explicative vav + elaboration. This makes clear two points: that נַמֵּרָה רוח אלהים and are in no small way parallel to each other; and that those phrases are clarified to mean special intellectual abilities. The one refers to the source of the abilities: “He has intellectual abilities from [Holy] God”. The other focuses upon the comparative superiority of his intellect: “He has exceptional intellectual abilities”, because of the source, as the context makes clear.

Having now considered the various aspects of the words in the phrases listed in Table 5, we will return to our consideration of the narratives in chapters 4 and 5.

Dan 4

Dan 4 presents a simpler story than chapter 2. After the promotion of the three to administrative positions at the end of chapter 2, the story leads into the test of their loyalty in chapter 3 and their subsequent promotion again in the province of Babylon
(3:20). That is the last reference to the three in the book. That story leads into the account in 3:31-4:34 [4:1-37]. In this encyclical narrated by Nebuchadnezzar, we are told that Daniel again serves the king using special abilities. Nebuchadnezzar has a dream that he fully relates to the court officials, but they cannot interpret it. The events of chapter 2, however, prepare the reader to know that Daniel is able to give the interpretation. On three occasions (4:5, 6, 15 [8, 9, 18]), Nebuchadnezzar says that Daniel can do this, because הוהי אל והוא was in him. Daniel interprets the dream, its interpretation comes to pass through the change of the king’s mental state; and upon his restoration, in accordance with the interpretation of the dream, the king praises the God of Daniel, and writes the encyclical. There is no test in this story, and no threatened death for lack of success; no suspense created by a king’s unreasonable demand.

In this chapter, we reach the end of the narratives about Nebuchadnezzar. He goes from being the conqueror of Israel (1:1-2), to the deporter and patron of those whom he wanted in his courts (1:2-17); to the tester of the four whom he learns excel beyond the abilities of his own people; to the one who acknowledges that Daniel’s God is the God of gods and revealer of mysteries (chapter 2); to the protector of those who worship the God of Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah (chapter 3); to the one who praises the God of Israel as (if) a convert (3:32-33 [4:2-3]; 4:31-34 [34-37]).\(^\text{188}\) He also goes from a character that has no voice in chapter 1, to a speaking character in third person narratives in chapters 2-3, to the narrator of a first person account (with some third person narration interspersed, i.e., 4:16-30 [19-33]) in chapter 4. The changes in Nebuchadnezzar’s relationship to the God of Israel are portrayed as due to the

\(^{188}\) Cf. Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty*, 63-80, although she leaves open the question whether the narrator behind the story wants to imply a conversion, or merely prudence on Nebuchadnezzar’s part.
influence of the four, especially Daniel, upon the king as he is slowly “converted” to viewing the God of Israel as supreme among the gods.

In this chapter, vv. 5-6 [8-9] and 15-16 [18-19] relate Daniel’s role as mediator of God’s interpretation. Daniel is again initially considered as one of the religious experts, because the office he now holds is that of רֶבֶן הַדָּמָא, “head of the _hartoms_” (4:6 [9]) and they are among the experts who are summoned in 4:3, 4 [6, 7]. In the narrative, this could refer to 2:48 where Daniel is made chief of all the experts.\(^{189}\)

Here, however, one position is singled out.\(^{190}\) As in chapter 2, Daniel is not among the others when the king summons them to interpret his dream. For whatever reason, and maybe it was never intended to be supplied, in the narrative it serves to distinguish Daniel from the others. When they cannot interpret the dream, he is not among them. He speaks only after they have given up (v. 5 [8]). This could be because Daniel was an outsider in an older version of the story and this is a relic of that version.\(^{191}\) It also could be for dramatic effect. It could also be because these stories are modeled after the Joseph story in _Gen_ 41. Regardless the reason for portraying him as speaking after the other religious experts, he does just that and so is distinguished from them.

**Verse 5**

When Nebuchadnezzar first refers to Daniel in 4:5 [8], he uses the phrase רַּע הַאַלֹהִים רֹדֵּשׁ for the first time in the book. This forms part of Nebuchadnezzar’s

\(^{189}\) So Bevan, _Short Commentary_, 90, et al.

\(^{190}\) Narratively, this could be seen as a demotion! In 2:48 he is promoted to become רֶבֶן סְסֵנָה סִנָּה סְתָנִים בְּבֵית, “head official over all the experts of Babylon”. Whereas this would appear to be an administrative position, רֶבֶן being an administrative title elsewhere (cf. _HALOT_, רֶבֶן (Hebrew) and _HALOT_, רֶבֶן (Aramaic)), it would appear that the reader is not to understand that he was demoted, just moved from an administrative portfolio to become the top practitioner among the _hartoms_.

editorial description of Daniel in his “encyclical” to the nations. This narrative has as its focus a dream and its interpretation, a topic that has already been met in chapters 1 (v. 17) and 2. As in chapter 2, Nebuchadnezzar’s experts could not interpret his dream (vv. 3-4), but Daniel is successful (v. 5).

Before Daniel is addressed, Nebuchadnezzar as “editorial voice” refers to him by his Hebrew name, יְהוֹヤ. He then goes on to expand on the name with two relative clauses (... יִדְוַן יְי יִד... יִד, v. 5). The first clause explains that Daniel had a Babylonian name, Belteshazzar. All the other occurrences of this clarification are in direct speech (2:26; 4:16 [19]; and 5:12), but are editorial, as this one is—but, here the editor is Nebuchadnezzar. The second clause consists in the phrase יְהוֹヤ יִדְוַן יִד. It is important to note that these relative clauses depend upon the Hebrew name יְהוֹヤ יִדְוַן יִד. Keil and Plöger deny that יְהוֹヤ יִד in our phrase could refer to the God of Israel. They were led to this conclusion, because in the same sentence Nebuchadnezzar refers to Daniel by his court name, Belteshazzar, which is then related to the name of his god. However, as already noted, the phrase in question is dependent upon the Hebrew name יְהוֹヤ יִדְוַן יִד. The emphasis is upon Daniel’s Jewish origins.

Why Nebuchadnezzar uses the Hebrew name in addressing the readers of his letter is unclear from the encyclical. Colless has argued that multiple names are used throughout Dan for specific reasons. Berlin argues that the different ways of naming characters is a means of showing important relationships and ways of viewing characters, and is also a means of showing the point of view from which portions of a

---

192 Keil, Daniel, 147; Plöger, Daniel, 70-71.
story are told.\textsuperscript{194} Given these cautions to watch closely the use of names, it would be prudent to consider whether this occurrence of the phenomenon might be significant.

When Nebuchadnezzar refers to Daniel in 4:5 [8], he is doing so after the events are all passed; he is the editorial voice. From this point in time, he refers to Daniel by his Jewish name, and only after that explains that this is the person who is also called Belteshazzar. Berlin’s work would then lead us to conclude that from this post-event perspective, Nebuchadnezzar views Daniel as a Judaean in the first place, and as a captive of the Babylonians secondly. This introduction of the two names in this chapter, prepares the reader to understand who it is that is addressed in the next line, when Nebuchadnezzar addresses Belteshazzar in the setting of the royal court. But, from the post event perspective it also harks back to chapter 1 and demonstrates a reversal of the imposed name change. It would seem that Nebuchadnezzar speaks from a post-“conversion” perspective. Chronologically, he would have already acknowledged the superiority of the Hebrew God in this chapter (4), and in light of that “conversion” refers to Daniel by his Hebrew, not Babylonian name. The king is here portrayed as acquiescing to the resistance that Daniel and his friends showed by their not eating the food from the king’s table in chapter 1, and by their refusal to worship the image in chapter 3.

The phrase $דָּעַתְּךָ לְךָ יִדְּעוּ ה' בֵּיהַ בֶּן$ seems to be used at 4:5 [8] with the assumption that the recipient or reader of the encyclical will know what it means. There is no clear preparation for it, however. It could be intended to convey a misinformed non-Israelite idea of Daniel’s ability, or a non-Israelite conception intended to convey an accurate insight into the source of Daniel’s ability. The phrase

\textsuperscript{194} Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 59-61; 87-91.
could also hark back to chapters 1 and 2 where Daniel is divinely gifted in the interpretation of dreams and visions.

What should be remembered, is that the real audience for this letter is Jewish, not international. As we showed above, there are many places in the Hebrew writings where similar phrases are used to indicate that a person had received divine assistance. This would be an appropriate place for such a statement. We also noted that the phrase probably depends on Gen 41:38, in which there are various parallels to the present passage. Just as Joseph was acknowledged by the ruler as having רוח אלוהים in him, so too it happens with Daniel. That use of the phrase, however, lacks any reference to the assisting god being holy. To pagan ears (the ostensible hearers of the encyclical) this would probably not be problematic, but to a Jewish audience (the intended audience) it would be quite familiar, their God being the Holy One of Israel. Given the explication within it of what happened in Dan 2, a Jewish reader steeped in traditional writings such as the Hebrew Scriptures could make the connections with little effort. Doubtless, however, with this first use of the phrase there would be sufficient ambiguity that the reader would be unsure of what was intended.

Verse 6

This verse begins the recounting of Nebuchadnezzar’s conversation with Daniel. Daniel is addressed by his Babylonian name, but comment made in the previous verse about the relation between the name and Nebuchadnezzar’s god is dropped. Nothing much should be made of this, for it would be odd in life or in fiction to address someone and then explain the relationship between the name of addressee

\[195\text{ Cf. Fewell, } Circle of Sovereignty, 62-63.\]

\[196\text{ On this point, see “Chapter 5”.}\]
and an alternative name. Daniel is not addressed as just Belteshazzar, however, but as “Belteshazzar, head of the hartoms” (רבי ההרומ הつく), which we discussed above (page 243) as a possible reference back to chapter 2.

Nebuchadnezzar now prefaces his request to have the dream interpreted with his reason for asking Daniel: because רוח אלוהיםialis, “that is, no mystery overpowers you”.

Elsewhere, the term רוח, “mystery”, is used only in Dan 2:19, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 47. In that chapter Daniel tells Nebuchadnezzar that his ability to interpret dreams and visions came from the “reveal of mysteries” (v. 29). In his acknowledgement of the superiority of Daniel’s God (v. 47), the king repeats both the idea of God being the revealer of mysteries and of Daniel being the one to whom God reveals. So, it is safe to conclude that this use of רוח points the reader back to chapter 2.

The word רוח is found only twice in the MT, once in Hebrew and once in Aramaic. The other occurrence is in Esth 1:8. In Esth, 4Q259 I 10; 4Q261 frgs 5a-c, l6 and in the Talmud it denotes “compulsion, force” and in the Talmud, it also denotes “to outrage; to rape”. Behrmann thought the whole phrase was a quasi-translation of a phrase in Ezek 28:3. There the King of Tyre is asked if he thinks that he is wiser than Daniel. The greater wisdom is then described as כמו כהון לא נמסר, “they keep no secret (literally, “nothing shut up”) darkened for you”. Apart from the possibility of a similar theme there seems to be no relationship.

---

197 DJD 26, 137-38; 181-84. This connection is not without difficulties, however, as the notes in DJD make clear.

198 Behrmann, Daniel, 26. Behrmann even thought that כהון from Ezek exerted some influence upon the choice of רוח in Dan, although he does not say how.
A targum on *Ezek* renders it as "no mystery is hidden from you". This is similar to the *Dan* passage, but still a relationship is not evident beyond similar themes and would prove nothing about a possible *Dan-Ezek* relationship except one that the Targum writer made based upon the name of Daniel found in each case. The phrase must mean something like "no mystery is too difficult for you". Given the relationship already noted between *Dan* 4 and 2, the narrative referent of this is Daniel’s display of superior wisdom in chapter 2 where the religious experts of Babylon failed to recount and then interpret the king’s dream, but where Daniel succeeded. This is, in fact prepared for in 4:6 [9] where reference is made to מִלְתֵּי ה' and מֵאָז נְסָע, a link back to 1:17 and the events of chapter 2.

The juxtaposing, in both chapters 2 and 4, of the interpretation of dreams, the use of the term מִלְתֵּי ה', the reference to Daniel as the leader of experts, and the reference to and example of no mystery being too difficult for Daniel seem to confirm what was said in previous paragraphs about possible inter-textual references. Chapter 4 points back to chapter 2. If the reader is meant to think of the events of chapter 2 from these statements in chapter 4, then we may look to that chapter to shed light on what is the meaning of מִלְתֵּי ה', מֵאָז נְסָע מְלָכֵי בָּבֶל.

As we have already seen, there is a repeated acknowledgement that God is the source of the dream and its interpretation in chapter 2. Nebuchadnezzar himself acknowledges this in his “confession” at 2:47: Daniel’s God is the supreme God and the master of kings, and the one who reveals mysteries, because מִלְתֵּי ה' Daniel was able to reveal the king’s mystery. Daniel could reveal, because his God is the one who reveals. If this is that to which chapter 4 points, then it was because of Daniel’s reception of the night vision that it is known that מִלְתֵּי ה', מֵאָז נְסָע was in Daniel. Nothing in those
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199 According to Lacocque, *Daniel*, 72.
events requires that the phrase  רוחו אלהים קדוש נביה have anything to do with
“possession”. It would have to do with revelations like those that the prophets received
through visions and auditions. This is in keeping with the uses of similar phrases to
explain the impetus and ability to prophesy. In addition, with Dan 2 as the referent, the
plural forms אלהים קדוש in the phrase would be understood as references to the God
of Israel, not to gods in general.

Verse 15

After relating his dream he again requests that Daniel interpret it because the
experts could not. Then he makes an explicit connection between the phrase
רוחו אלהים קדוש and Daniel’s ability to interpret, whereas the previous
occurrences of the phrase have only implied this. Thus the רוחו אלהים קדוש being
in him is what gave him the ability to interpret the dream. Again, for the reader, this
harks back to 1:17 and chapter 2 where it is established that it is Daniel’s God that
gives this ability, and that link clarifies how the redactors understood this phrase.

Verse 16

The portrayal of Daniel continues after Nebuchadnezzar explains what he saw
in his dream. Verse 16 [19] says,  "Daniel... was appalled for about one שעה and his thoughts distressed him”. The
phrase שעה seems to indicate a specific period of time. Elsewhere it is used in
a phrase that indicates immediacy, (3:6, 15; 4:30; 5:5), but here there is a
specific limit of “one” put on the period of time. Montgomery argues that it means no

Bauer & Leander and commentators understand the שעה to be causal as in
2:47 and 6:24. Bauer, and Leander, Grammatik Aramäischen, §70 g’. Cf. Behrmann,
Daniel, 28 “denn”; Delcor, Daniel, 118 “parce que”; Haßlberger, Hoffnung in der
Bedrängnis. 169 “since”; Goldingay, Daniel, 78 “because”.

more than “moment”, which he says is the meaning required in the present verse.\textsuperscript{201}

That it stands for “hour”, as in some English versions, he dismisses as “unfortunate”.\textsuperscript{202}

In this case, הָדוֹ הָֽלֶֽקֶת would be little more than an indefinite article.

In addition to this passage, the word הֵם “thoughts” occurs in 2:29, 30; 5:6, 10; and 7:28. Of the usage in 2:29 Montgomery says, “it includes the king’s cognitions ... as well as the vision”.\textsuperscript{203} This can be true of every other case, that is, that the thought includes both the revelation and the thoughts of the receiver about it. In each case except chapter 2, the thoughts trouble the one who has them. In 7:28 it is Daniel whose “thoughts” trouble him, and those thoughts clearly include a vision. Thus, 4:16 [19] could imply a revelation to Daniel, although it would be one given in a brief period. The picture that one might be intended to call to mind is like the story of Samuel with the family of Jesse lined up before him. During this story Yahweh speaks (an audition rather than a vision) to Samuel as if he were standing beside Samuel, giving him instructions (\textit{1 Sam} 16:1, 2, 7, 12; \textit{cf.} 9:17; 10:22).\textsuperscript{204}

Verse 24

The story does not stop with the interpretation of the dream. Once Daniel has interpreted selected aspects of the dream, he proceeds to exhort the king in a prophetic manner (v. 24 [27]). This should be compared with what Oppenheim tells us about the interpretation of dreams in Assyria. A dream of evil import could be annulled by

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{201} Montgomery, \textit{Daniel}, 203-04, \textit{HALOT}, “moment, a short space of time”.
  \item \textsuperscript{202} Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 210 n. 38, still gives “for about an hour” as the “literal” translation of the phrase.
  \item \textsuperscript{203} Montgomery, \textit{Daniel}, 164.
  \item \textsuperscript{204} \textit{Lives of the Prophets} 4:4-8 also understood Daniel to have received a revelation.
\end{itemize}
means of apotropaic rituals and magic spells. Here, however, magic would not avert the negative end predicted, but repentance toward God might.

Conclusion

This chapter is similar to chapters 1 and 2 in that Daniel is included among the wise men of Babylon, and heads one of the groups. However, he is distinguished from them by his ability to interpret, through divine assistance. Again, his and his Babylonian colleagues' learned skills could not accomplish the task. The chapter may have originally differed from 1 and 2 in the means of interpretation: intuitive interpretation versus revelation interpretation. However, in its present context the material in 1:17 and chapter 2, and the details of 4:16 have given the necessary background for the reader to understand that it was through some form of direct revelation. In light of this material, we would suggest that the reader is to understand that Daniel received another revelation, one that enlightened him about the meaning of the dream.

Dan 5

Chapter 5 is the final story in which Daniel acts as an interpreter for foreign kings. It is also the first chapter in which Nebuchadnezzar is not the king. He still figures prominently in this chapter, because references are made back to him, such that he functions as a positive example when compared to his "son" Belshazzar. The chapter has some similarities to chapter 4 in its general outline: there is something to be interpreted, the court experts fail in their attempt to do so, and Daniel saves the day. This time, however, instead of communications via dreams, Belshazzar is given a message by fingers that write on the wall of his palace. In his understandable desire to know the meaning of the mysterious writing, he calls in
“the exorcists, *hartoms*, *chaldeans*, and the extispices”, and “the experts of Babylon” (v. 7), *i.e.*, “all the king’s experts” (v. 8). Although he asks them to interpret the writing on the wall, they are unable to do so. After chapters 2 and 4, the reader is prepared for Daniel to save the day. Again, as in those chapters, Daniel is included among the numbers of the court experts, for 11 states that Nebuchadnezzar had made him "leader of the *hartoms*, exorcists, *chaldeans*, and extispices". Again he is distinguished from them; he comes in after “all the wise men of the king” had failed. As Daniel did in chapter 4 to Nebuchadnezzar, he preaches to Belshazzar. Unlike in chapter 4, however, this sermon and the interpretation of the mystery hold out no hope for the king.

Although the general outlines of the chapter are similar to chapters 2 and 4, this chapter still adds to our understanding of the character of Daniel. As in chapters 2 and 4, his late entrance distinguishes him, but with a difference. Instead of just entering after the other experts had failed, Daniel is first recalled as someone from the past that could help the king, and then he is summoned to the king. This recollection of Daniel’s past achievements becomes a showcase for elucidating just how different Daniel is from the other experts. The material in vv. 11-16 presents three different views of how

---

205 Reconstructed form of the list. See *Appendix A*, pp. 364 f.

206 This is the sole occurrence of this linking to a specific king instead of kingdom. See below, n. 248.

207 There is some confusion within the stories about Daniel’s position with respect to the other experts. In 2:48 he is said to be made leader of all the experts, although no groups are listed at that point. In 4:6 (9), Daniel is referred to merely as leader of the *hartoms*, not leader of the various groups, although all the groups are listed in 4:4 (7) as they are in 5:11. In 5:11, however, Daniel is said to have been made the leader of all the groups by Nebuchadnezzar.
Daniel functions. In v. 11, Nebuchadnezzar’s point of view is repeated. In v. 12, the queen mother restates what Nebuchadnezzar thought, but from her own perspective. Finally, vv. 13-16 give the perspective of Belshazzar, who restates the information from 11-12, but with his own spin on it.

Verse 11: Nebuchadnezzar’s Point of View

Verses 11-12 present the reader with two statements of what was known about this Daniel. This repetition of material has been seen as problematic by some commentators. The beginning of v. 12, הַכֹּלֶל כְּרֵבֵל מָדֵה, is awkward; it seems to be linked to what precedes it, suggesting that Daniel was promoted to head of the experts (v. 11) “because” of the qualities to be listed (v. 12a). As Montgomery notes, however, this would read as a “superfluous repetition of v. 11”. If מָדֵה is read with the following material, and as causative, however, it makes sense of the repetition: “Since מָדֵה, now מָדֵה let Daniel be called....” This is how the Vulgate and some commentators understand the verse. This, we will argue, makes for two

208 Fewell, Circle of Sovereignty, 88-94, found only two perspectives: the queen’s, who speaks for Nebuchadnezzar; and Belshazzar’s.

209 On the question of מָדֵה see Montgomery, Daniel, 257-58; and Goldingay, Daniel, 109. As will become clear later in this discussion, this must be the queen-mother, as she has been understood since Josephus Antiquities x, 11,2. In v. 5:23 Daniel accuses Belshazzar of having everyone, including his wives and concubines, drink from the cups, but this individual is excluded from that group; she enters only when she hears the confusion caused by the fingers’ writing on the wall. She is associated with Belshazzar’s “father”, Nebuchadnezzar, about whom she knows much, and whom Belshazzar is portrayed as attempting to belittle in this chapter.

210 Behrmann, Daniel, 34; Haßlberger, Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis, 182, 184: Collins, Daniel, 249 adopts the causal use, noting only that it is repetitive of v. 11, but attested partially in 4QDan².

211 Montgomery, Daniel, 258.

212 Bauer, and Leander, Grammatik Aramäischen. §70 g.

213 E.g., Montgomery, Daniel, 258; Lacocque, Daniel, 96: Vulgate: “quia ... nunc itaque Danihel vocetur et interpretationem narrabit”.
presentations of what could be thought of Daniel’s abilities demonstrated in the days of Nebuchadnezzar.

In 4:6 [9], Nebuchadnezzar described Daniel as one in whom was the spirit of the Holy God. That explained why Daniel could interpret when others could not. When the queen mother restates Nebuchadnezzar’s opinion, however, she goes on to explain what that meant through two explanatory sentences. The explanations are as follows:

1. In the days of your father, light and insight and wisdom like that of the gods were found in him

2. Your father—your father the king—made him chief of the har tom s, exorcists, chaldeans and extispices

These are reminiscent of 4:6 [9], where Daniel was acknowledged as having in him and where he also was referred to as head har tom, and was additionally described as one who could solve what seemed insolvable. Here, however, the two descriptions are longer.

Description #2 is merely a list of the professions over which Daniel was promoted as head. This list is the same as the one in 4:4 [7]. Thus, the reference to “the days of your father” most likely harks back to chapter 4, although 2:48 is also part of the mix, as explained above in note 207.

The reason behind Nebuchadnezzar’s promotion of Daniel lies in the first elaboration in 5:11, which we will consider in detail. חדה, an abstract feminine noun, is found only here and in v. 14 in biblical Aramaic. The Septuagint translates it with an adjective, ἐπιστήμων, “wise, prudent”. Bauer and Leander, and HALOT derive it from
the root *ahr* “leuchten” and understand it to mean “Erleuchtung”, “inspiration”.\(^{214}\) Vogt, while referring the reader to Bauer and Leander, gives “intellegentia” (intellect, understanding) and “intellectus” (understanding, perception) as possible Latin glosses.\(^{215}\) It seems to signify “brilliance” in a way similar to the English use of that word to describe an intellectual quality. In *Dan* it would appear that נָרָה is a special gift from God. In 2:22, in the hymn of praise to God for revealing the נָרָה, *i.e.*, the “mystery” of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, to Daniel, נָרָה is said to dwell with God. That word is also derived from the same root as נָרָה. Above, we argued that נָרָה in 2:22 is a metaphorical reference to wisdom and sets the stage for this phrase: just as wisdom belongs to God and has been given to Daniel (2:23), so too, the “light” of God was evident in Daniel as a divine gift, as seen here.\(^{216}\)

The noun נָרָה denotes “insight”\(^{217}\) and is related to the root נָר, from which comes the BH noun נָר, “insight”, which seems to be the Hebrew equivalent.

\(^{214}\) Bauer, and Leander, *Grammatik Aramäischen*, §51g’’’.


\(^{216}\) Lacocque, *Daniel*, 97, makes a direct connection: “his light’ is a divine attribute according to 2.22”. Cf., Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty*, 88.

\(^{217}\) A unique form found only in *Dan* 5:11, 12, and 14. According to S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar* (Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1975), 150, 155, and 156, it is a feminine qutl with the Canaanite ending -an and the abstract ending -ut off of which the t has fallen, *i.e.*, qâtl + t + ān + ut. Cf. Bauer, and Leander, *Grammatik Aramäischen*, §51g’’’ (*śuklat-ān-ut*) and KB 1127 sukal-.

Koenen argues that must refer to the insight that Daniel displayed in his ability to interpret dreams. Cognates are used of the ability to understand or interpret writings elsewhere in *Dan* in 1:17 and 9:22, 25, and so its use with texts makes it appropriate here. It is particularly significant that the one who is said to have is also referred to as in 1:4 and 1:17.

The last part of the first descriptive sentence again takes us back to the poem in chapter 2. There it is said that God gives wisdom to the wise, and here Daniel is said to have wisdom like that of the gods. As we noted in our earlier discussion of this phrase (page 237), it is comparative and not a reference to the source of his wisdom, as its parallel with in 5:14 makes clear. Nonetheless, this comparatively superior ability had its source in Daniel’s God, as the link to 2:21 and all the other material leading up to this point makes clear.

The harking back to 2:21-23 highlights the ambiguity that the descriptions have. In chapter 2, Daniel’s hymn of praise was not said before the king, but in Daniel’s home. Nebuchadnezzar makes no reference to it in his praise in 2:47. So, the queen mother is here relating what was evident to others, just as in *2 Sam* 14:20 and 16:23 similar things were said about David and Ahithophel. So, while the view expressed is again an ambiguous, pagan’s comment, to the Jewish reader the real truth of it has been made clear by the editing of the stories. While the queen mother could be understood to say that Daniel was a bright lad with god-like wisdom, the reader knows that he was gifted with brilliance and wisdom by his God. In this way, the poem

---

219 TWAT, VII, 794.

220 This is discussed in detail in “Chapter 5”.

221 See above p. 237.
becomes the hermeneutical lens through which Nebuchadnezzar’s perspective (as conveyed by the queen mother) is to be understood.

Verse 12: The Queen-Mother’s Perspective

After describing Daniel and telling how Belshazzar’s father, Nebuchadnezzar, had promoted him (5:11), the queen mother tells the king to summon Daniel (5:12). In doing this, she rephrases what she had just said, explaining that Daniel possessed a remarkable spirit, i.e., knowledge, and insight, interpreting dreams, explaining puzzles, and resolving enigmas. This is parallel in structure to v. 11: ...

There are significant differences in details, however:...

The change from יִזְיוֹרָה to יִזְיוֹרָה can be explained as a merely a different perspective on the abilities of Daniel, as we observed above in the discussion of the term יִזְיוֹרָה (pages 236ff.). We have here a comparative reference to his abilities instead of an explanation of whence his abilities come.

According to Botterweck יִזְיוֹרָה encompasses “understanding and ability to engage in rational thought”. It has a BH form יִזְיוֹרָה, which is late and occurs in 1:4 and 17. The BA form is found only in Dan and occurs at 2:21; 4:31 [34], 33 [36]; and here. In 2:21 it is part of the hymn of praise and is said to be something God

---

222 TDOT, III, 480.

223 On this form, see above, n. 35.

224 The Dan fragment from Qumran that has these words (4QDan⁸) is not consistent, however. At 2:21 it has the same form as the MT. i.e., יִזְיוֹרָה Ulrich.
gives to the “knowers of understanding”, which may allude to the use of the BH form in chapter 1.\textsuperscript{225} The occurrences at 4:31 [34] and 33 [36] have the sense of “ability to know”, as Nebuchadnezzar says that his קָדָם returned to him when, in his animal-like state, he looked up to heaven. In \textit{Dan}, what these two senses (“knowledge” and “ability to know”) have in common is that God gives them, can take them away, or can withhold them entirely.

and the phrases that follow it pose some problems. is an absolute form rather than a construct.\textsuperscript{226} On analogy with vv. 11 and 14, it should be taken as one of the subjects of the verb . The intervening words are to be taken as a parenthesis, and thus explain what she meant by .\textsuperscript{227}

The words and are pointed as Pa’el participles, which seem out of place among the nouns ( and ) and infinitive construct ( ). Therefore, some scholars have suggested they be repointed as infinitives,\textsuperscript{228} which may be what the Vulgate read (\textit{interpretatio} and \textit{solutio}). Theodotion and Peshitta render the Aramaic with participles, however, and so Emerton has suggested that, like certain Hebrew participles, these might, in Wernberg-Møller’s words, “denote the action as such, or the abstract idea of a certain action or condition, with no reference to the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{225} BDB, 396; Caquot, “דעת”, 480.
\item \textsuperscript{227} Keil, \textit{Daniel}, 186; Bevan, \textit{Short Commentary}, 104.
\item \textsuperscript{228} Bevan, \textit{Short Commentary}, 103; Behrmann, \textit{Daniel}, 34; Bauer, and Leander, \textit{Grammatik Aramäischen}, §26i; Montgomery, \textit{Daniel}, 260; Bentzen, \textit{Daniel}, 40; Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 236, 249.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
agent”. In this case, they would be translated as “interpreting” and “loosing” respectively. Either approach gives a similar understanding of the text.

The phrase מַפְסֵרָה הָלֵםֶר lacks any difficulties. It is a reference back to chapters 2 and 4 and the services Daniel rendered for Nebuchadnezzar as a dream interpreter. The verb מַפְסֵר is found only here and in v. 16 in Dan and its Hebrew cognate מַפְסֵר is found only in Gen 40-41, the only other biblical incident of dream interpretation within a court context. This seems to have been a common root for such tasks, as it is also found in Akkadian in similar contexts.

Bevan claimed that מַפְסֵר הָלֵםֶר has an exact parallel in Judg 14:12-14 in the phrase מַפְסֵר הָלֵםֶר. It consists of the Aph’el infinitive מַפְסֵר, “to declare”, and the noun מַפְסֵר, “riddle”, which is found only here in BA. In BH, the equivalent of the noun is מַפְסֵר, “riddle, enigmatic, perplexing saying or question”, i.e., something that needs explaining. Although it is not used elsewhere in the Dan stories, it is
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229 Emerton, “Participles”.


231 Bevan, Short Commentary, 103.

232 The verb מַפְסֵר conveys “to as a riddle”.

---
particularly relevant to Belshazzar’s need. The ability to interpret such riddles seems
to have been part of the Hebrew image of a “wise man” (Prov 1:1-6; Sir 39:2-4). Such
a skill also figures prominently in Ahiqar in which Ahiqar distinguished himself in a
riddle contest.

The phrase כֹּסֶר אֵל is not as easy to explain as the previous two phrases.
The verb כֹּסֶר is glossed with “to loosen” and is cognate with the BH כּוֹסֶר, “to let
loose”. The second word, a hapax legomenon, is more difficult. Although כּוֹסֶר
denotes a “knot”, it is uncertain whether it refers to a knot in a rope—the loosing of
which is performed by magic—or to a “knotty matter”, i.e., an enigma. Bevan
proposed the former explanation, based upon Near East examples, and others have
adopted it. It finds support in two ancient sources, as well. In Akkadian literature
the cognate form, קִשֵּׁ루 can signify a knot made for magical purposes. CAD gives the
following examples of such a use:

“to untie the evil knots which they have tied against him”; “you tie seven and
seven knots and you recite an incantation over every (knot) you tie”; “you tie
seven and seven knots and bind them together with his own hair”; “your knots
tied fast”; “you tie sixty knots and thread in between them thirty musuk-kanu-
seeds on a red wool thread (charm for a pregnant woman)”; “her magic knots are
untied”; “it is in your power, Ea, to undo evil magic knots”; “let them sever the
evil knots”.

---

233 Plöger, Daniel, 87; it occurs in Hebrew at Dan 8:23.

234 Montgomery, Daniel, 259.

235 Bevan, Short Commentary, 104; cf. Charles, Daniel, 130; Bentzen, Daniel,
40; and A. Wolters, “Untying the king’s knots: physiology and wordplay in Daniel 5.”
JBL 110 (1991): 120-21. Porteous, Daniel, 80 is uncertain, but prefers this
explanation.

236 CAD 8, 437
Wolters also notes that “a strong argument in its favour is that Aramaic *qêtar* is frequently attested in the sense ‘(magical) knot’.” The problem with this theory is that it has not been shown that the “knots” in any of these texts are anything but literal knots in a rope or string. Although Paul understands it as literal knots, he does not explain how such an understanding fits this context. Those who adopt this explanation do not explain just how knots are relevant to the interpretation of dreams and enigmas.

Other scholars think the word signifies “knotty matter, enigma”. Its use in v. 16 favours this interpretation. There Belshazzar says

(v. 16). This reference to these two abilities in direct connection with the interpretation of the writing on the wall shows that the “knots” are enigmas like the writing that cannot be understood, not magical knots in ropes that must be untied. Plöger linked this skill at resolving enigmas

---


241 Reading with a few MSS and the Qere rather than the Ketib.

242 It is possible that the two interpretations of the phrase are related. “Knots” could have come to have the metaphorical meaning and the two uses continued side by side.
directly to the skill necessary for the actual interpretation of the writing on the wall, while he linked the former expression to the reading of the writing.

The question that remains to be answered about this verse is whether it represents the view of Nebuchadnezzar or of the queen mother. We have said previous to this that we take the latter view that this rephrasing presents her, not Nebuchadnezzar’s perspective. Whether one considers this a mere repetition with some variation, or an editorial insertion, or an explication of how Daniel’s abilities would apply to the new situation of an enigmatic divine message written on a wall, the fact remains that it has all reference to the divine removed: Daniel had merely (compared to 5:11) רָתוֹן יְדֵיָהוֹ “exceptional mind/spirit”. By itself, this might not indicate much, because in 6:4 this phrase is used by the Jewish narrator as a description of Daniel’s abilities, but the other two changes confirm the change in focus. Above we argued that הָדוֹן harked back to 2:22 and suggested that Daniel’s brilliance derived from the one with whom light dwells. The queen mother replaces it with מַעֲלַה, “knowledge, power of knowing”, thereby removing that allusion. The allusions from back to 2:21 may seem to mitigate the replacing of מַעֲלַה with מַעֲלַה, but, מַעֲלַה is common to humans, although still derived from God; מַעֲלַה on the other hand is a rare quality said to dwell with God. The change is, then, from the exceptional god-like ability to the common human characteristic. And the change from likening his wisdom to that of the god’s and replacing it with an elaboration of מַעֲלַה is clear enough.

Given the repetition (making three overviews of Daniel’s abilities), the making of the material in v. 13 separate from that of v. 12 by the use of the causal phrase, and the removal of all references to the divine, it seems clear that this is a different

243 Contra Fewell, Circle of Sovereignty, 89.
perspective. Above, we discussed the difference between the use of נָאָר as a comparative description, in relation to the description of the source of his abilities as from God. If nothing else, this is how this verse is different from the previous. It, then, presents a glowing, but toned down account of Daniel’s abilities. It does not completely obviate reference to the divine, but there is a distinct move away from it. In this way, the verse establishes a buffer between the description of Nebuchadnezzar’s view and Belshazzar’s opening description of Daniel in v. 13.

Verse 13-16: Belshazzar’s Perspective

After hearing what his father, Nebuchadnezzar, thought of Daniel, and the queen mother’s less “divine” understanding of the same individual’s abilities, we hear from Belshazzar as he addresses Daniel. His initial assertion, or more likely question, introduces information that had not been relayed to him by the queen mother, viz, that Daniel was one of the exiles from Judah. Fewell suggests that this introduction of new information is meant to signal that Belshazzar actually knows Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar is certainly portrayed as being well informed of this. The information comes from chapter 1:1, 2 and 6, at the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar’s associations with the Jewish boys; Arioch refers to it when he introduces Daniel to him at 2:25; and Daniel’s three friends are referred to as Jews at 3:8 and 12.\(^{244}\) That Belshazzar now refers to this as he begins to address Daniel certainly seems to signal that he is placing Daniel into a familiar context. Also, when Daniel speaks to him later in 5:18-21, it is also clear that Daniel was an essential player in the events he recounts, about which Daniel says Belshazzar knew (5:22).

\(^{244}\) After chapter 5, Daniel is referred to in the same way at 6:13 by those who would have him dead.
After asking Daniel if he is this person, or stating that he is, Belshazzar goes on to reiterate what the queen mother had relayed. However, she had given the king two options: to view him from Nebuchadnezzar’s perspective as one who interpreted with the divine assistance; or to view him as an exceptionally talented individual, but not necessarily a divinely helped one.

Interestingly, Belshazzar may be portrayed as more religious than the queen mother. Where she dropped the references to the divine, he puts two back. The shortened phrase, מְרְפָא מַלְאָךְ, does mark a change in emphasis from v. 11, however, because he drops בָּנָא, as was discussed above on page 230.245 He also puts back חָלָם וְרָדָה, However, he drops חָלָם כָּחָמָה אֲלָדָה, in favour of מָמָר. Although he restores some of the divine to the statements, he does not go as far as he father. So, why does he not go as far as his father?

Lacocque argues that Belshazzar is attempting to degrade what frightens him, i.e., God, by defiling the vessels from the Jerusalem Temple.246 This could be supported by Daniel’s accusation against Belshazzar in vv. 22-24. If it was for this reason that Belshazzar is portrayed as not wanting to remember Daniel or his God before he is reminded of them by the queen mother, then that could explain why he did not call Daniel when the other religious experts were summoned. This could also be why Belshazzar did not repeat the queen mother’s reference to the high position awarded Daniel by Nebuchadnezzar. Also, if Belshazzar were denigrating this God in

245 This word does occur in some Masoretic MSS, one Theodotion MS and in the Peshitta and Vulgate. The omission of the word is more difficult to explain, however, in that every other occurrence of the phrase with the מְרְפָא has had it. It is easier to explain the addition of the phrase as an attempt at harmonization than to explain its dropping out in the vast majority of witnesses.

246 Lacocque, Daniel, 94-99.
favour of his own (v. 23), he would not have used the term “holy”, if we are correct in our understanding of how it is used in Dan.

Fewell argues that Belshazzar is not portrayed as being in opposition to God, but rather as belittling his father’s accomplishments and distancing himself from all that had to do with Nebuchadnezzar. Belshazzar is actually portrayed as religious; he praises gods and for that is chastised by Daniel, because they are not the Most High God of Israel, whom Nebuchadnezzar acknowledged as sovereign (5:18, 21). Thus, he chooses to acknowledge the divine origins of Daniel’s abilities (as the Pharaoh does of Joseph’s abilities in Gen), but not his father’s belief about Daniel’s God’s supremacy.

If Belshazzar is being portrayed as belittling his father’s accomplishments, this would provide yet another reason why Daniel is not called with the other experts: as the top expert under his father, Daniel is not summoned with the other court experts, because he is no longer one of the king’s experts (5:8). Like the vessels from the temple in Jerusalem (5:2), Daniel is one of the items brought from Judaea (5:13) by Nebuchadnezzar and belittled by Belshazzar.

Verse 22-24

In the end, it is his rejection of what Nebuchadnezzar highly prized that condemns Belshazzar. Commentators have noted and attempted to explain the changed approach of Daniel in this chapter. Instead of trying to convert Belshazzar, as he did Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel simply condemns him outright; there is no chance for

247 Fewell, Circle of Sovereignty, 85-94.

248 See n. 206.
repentance. However, in light of what we have argued, the different approach can be explained. Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar are closely compared in this chapter. References to Belshazzar’s “father” are frequent, both from the queen mother and from Daniel; Belshazzar himself refers to his father. As Fewell notes, Belshazzar’s attitude to Daniel and the temple vessels is portrayed as one of disdain: both are things that his father brought back from Jerusalem (1:1-3; 5:2-3, 13), both are items that his father valued (the vessels were dedicated to his own gods, and Daniel was trained to be a member of his staff and became a highly valued expert). It is not just the disdain that condemns Belshazzar, however. It is that he knew what Nebuchadnezzar did not know at the beginning of his reign. At 5:22, Daniel condemns him for not learning from what he knew about his father’s encounters with the Most High God, and in that way Belshazzar’s disdain for his “father” is also disdain for the God whom Nebuchadnezzar came to acknowledge as the Holy God and the Most High God.

Revelation in Dan 5

The problem of this chapter in Dan for our thesis is that there is no indication of any revelation. Originally, there was none if this was a freestanding story: Daniel interpreted through his exceptional God given abilities. There is no vision or dream at night, no pause that could be explained as a moment of revelation. However, a later redactor has provided Daniel with revelations upon which to base his interpretation. This chapter has as its narrative date the last day of the reign of Belshazzar, which also

249 See Fewell, Circle of Sovereignty, 94-103, for a discussion of previous attempts to deal with this change in portrayal, and her own attempt to deal with it. She suggests that Daniel may be portrayed as being one who now likes the power that he has attained.

250 Again, Daniel also acts very similar to a Hebrew prophet: he included a prophetic condemnation of Belshazzar’s idolatry (vv. 22-24), like those found in Deutero-Isa.
is the end of the Babylonian kingdom according to Dan. The Median kingdom follows with the reign of the enigmatic Darius the Mede (5:31). Historicity aside, what we must notice is that the narrative date for chapter 7 is the first year of Belshazzar. In that chapter, Daniel becomes the dreamer, and the interpreter is an angel from God. The revelation dream and its interpretation reveal, among other things, that the Babylonian kingdom will end. In chapter 8, the narrative date is the third year of Belshazzar. Daniel again receives a vision and an interpretation. In the vision, he sees a ram with two horns, one longer than the other (v. 3). This ram charges about in every direction striking all in its path with impunity. It becomes great. In the interpretation, it is revealed that the horns of this ram signify the kings of Media and Persia. Babylon was clearly one of the powers that could not stand against the rampage. According to the chronology of Dan, then, chapters 7 and 8 precede chapter 5.

Attention to the dates of the chapters is not new. Papyrus 967 actually has chapters 7 and 8 before chapter 5. This papyrus is pre-hexaplaric, which is significant because in the Hexapla the Hebrew/Aramaic took precedence and so material would have been rearranged on that basis. 967, however, underwent no such influence and so retained this independent order. The arrangement is by king and year:

Nebuchadnezzar, chapter 1 - {no date}, chapter 2 - 2nd year, chapter 3 - 18th year, and chapter 4 - 18th year; Belshazzar, chapter 7 - 1st year, chapter 8 - 3rd year, chapter 5 - last night; Darius, chapter 6 - {no date}, chapter 9 - 1st year; Cyrus, chapter 10 - 1st year, chapters 11f. - 1st year. Whether this is a remnant of an earlier or original order, or the result of reordering based on dates cannot be determined with certainty.251

251 This is not the only place in this OG papyrus where material is found in a different order. As we have already observed, chapter 2 has a different arrangement of material. In the Ezekiel material chapters 38-39 come between 36 and 37 and it can be argued that that is the original order. J. Lust, "The order of the final events in Revelation and in Ezekiel," in L'Apocalypse johannique, ed. Lambrech, J. (1980), 179-83; J. Lust, "Ezekiel 36-40 in the oldest greek manuscript," CBJQ 43 (1981): 517-33. The Latin Codex Wirceburgensis has the same order of chapters.
Whether the Hebrew and Aramaic materials were interspersed or not, it seems that the redactor of these chapters used the regnal years to provide Daniel with the revelations that he needed in order to know about the end of the Babylonian kingdom.\(^\text{252}\) In this way, the story is changed from an intuitive interpretation to one based upon revelations. Daniel had merely to understand the possible meanings of the words (an ability that 1:17 highlights), and then read the revelatory information into them. Once Daniel figured out what the words stood for, the interpretation was clear: the end predicted in 2:39 and portrayed in the animal vision of chapter 8 would come with Belshazzar, not a later king. Daniel, then is one who was privy to the council of God, just as the prophets, and who used the information that he received to interpret the writing on the wall and to make a pronouncement against Belshazzar.\(^\text{253}\)

**Conclusion**

This investigation leads to the following conclusions. In chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5, Daniel is set apart from everyone else in a variety of ways. It is these ways, I contend, that define who the *maskilîm* were.

Daniel is set apart from the Mesopotamians. He is a Jew, who resists being assimilated into the Mesopotamian culture. Especially, his God is not theirs. One of the themes of the chapters is the relationship of the kings to the God of Israel, Nebuchadnezzar being portrayed, we argued, as experiencing something of a

\(^{252}\) Just as an example of Daniel praying may be provided in chapter 9 (1st year of Darius) as background for the events of chapter 6.

\(^{253}\) It should be noted, here, that Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: the Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979) believes it is the application of the knowledge obtained in such visions from the council of God that, on the one hand the prophets were thought to reveal in terms of actual people and events, as Daniel does here, but on the other hand, which the apocalyptists revealed uninterpreted because they had abandoned hope for the present order.
conversion process from chapter 1 to chapter 4. Also, in none of the stories is Daniel summoned with the other experts; each time his entry is after their failure. In that way, although he was one of the numbers of the experts, he is shown to be different through what he does.

Daniel is different from all the other Jews in the stories as well. Although he and the three are together blessed by their God with special intellectual abilities and special abilities with written material and wisdom (1:17a), Daniel is specially gifted with the ability to interpret dreams and visions. The three, although faithful, do not receive that privilege. Again, with the three, Daniel is different from the other Jews who were taken by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon. Only these four refuse to eat the king's food, for whatever religious reason the second century authors of the stories had in mind. We should also note that they also differentiated themselves from the other Jews through their insistence upon being faithful to other Jewish practices: when everyone else, supposedly including other Jews, bowed to the statue/idol on the plain of Dura (chapter 3), the three did not, even when threatened with death. And, lest the reader think that Daniel might have done something like that, there is the testimony to his faithfulness generally, but also chapter 6, in which he is willing to die in order to be faithful to his God in his prayers. 254

The most pronounced differences are made between Daniel and the other experts in the courts of the king. They are portrayed as being incapable of handling a true revelation from God. Although they admit that they cannot produce both the content and interpretation of a revelation in chapter 2, in chapters 4 and 5 they cannot even deal with one once they are given it. They are merely playing at being experts. Daniel, on the other hand, is portrayed as being divinely assisted in his interpretive

254 Lenglet, “Structure littéraire”, 169-90, has already noted that chapters 3 and 6 are matching parts of the organisation of chapters 2-7.
tasks. At 1:17 he, with the three, is said to be given special intellectual abilities as regards literature and wisdom. Daniel is then said to be given special abilities for the interpretation of dreams and visions. In chapter 2 the assistance comes in a dream; in chapter 4 it would appear to come in a vision as Daniel stands before the king; and in chapter 5 it comes through the dreams of chapters 2 and 7, and the vision of chapter 8. This divine assistance is referred to in chapters 4 and 5 (and 6) as being due to “the spirit of [the Holy] God in him”, and to “an exceptional spirit in him”. Daniel’s divine assistance makes him better able to deal with earthly wisdom (1:19-20), with dreams (chapters 2 and 4) and with written material (1:17 and chapter 5).

In addition to such distinctions between Daniel and the others, there is one further distinction that arises from the use of the terms חכמה and משכילה in these chapters. We noted in our examination of these, that there are two types of each. There are those who are said to be חכמה and משכילה and there are those who are really so. There are those who play at them, and those who can truly claim to be such, because they are obedient to their God, and are divinely assisted in carrying out the tasks that such attributes or titles imply. Only Daniel and his friends fall into the category of being truly חכמה and משכילה. All others were living a lie.

If the scholarly assumption is correct that there was an intended connection between the maskilim of chapter 1 and those of chapters 11-12, then there should be some evidence of this in the material that was composed in their day, i.e., chapters 7-12. Given the prominence of the interpretative task in chapters 1-6, we should expect that to appear in some way. There certainly is a significant role for this task, as we will see in the next chapter.
Chapter 5: Interpretation of Prophecies in Dan 7-12

In the investigation of Dan 1-6, I argued that Daniel is portrayed as a divinely aided interpreter of dreams, visions, and writings. If this is the intention of the final editors of the stories, then there should be evidence of it in the vision accounts in chapters 7-12. A cursory consideration of the visions reveals, however, that Daniel is portrayed as one who himself receives visions and who needs them interpreted. Rather than being at odds with the portrayal in chapters 1-6, where Daniel is the interpreter for kings who did not understand the dreams, etc., this is quite in line with the portrayal there. In those chapters, we noted that Daniel is not able to understand by himself, and so he requires divine assistance, because his ability is not natural or acquired through study; in each case his ability to interpret is of divine or heavenly origins.

Chapters 7-12 show the kind of activity that the writers thought lay behind Daniel’s interpretative activity in chapters 2, 4, and 5. This we have contended, is the reason for the dates on chapters 7 & 8 preceding that of chapter 5. At 10:1, as well, we are told that Daniel understood (יָפָקֵר) the vision revelation that he received, although only after some struggle. That opening statement is a brief summation of what follows, and is not unlike that at 2:19.\(^1\) As the revelation event unfolds in chapters 10-12, however, Daniel does not understand what he sees. He must have the vision explained by an angel. What he does not understand (12:8) was not meant for him to understand (12:9).

---

\(^1\) Chapters 4 and 5 have no general comment on Daniel’s comprehension of the material; he simply gives the interpretations.
The details just reviewed, however, are still at the narrative level and relate to the character of Daniel, not to the authors of the book. The narrative level is still significant, because it shows continuity in the final portrayal of Daniel. However, we need to consider whether Daniel’s portrayal as the epitome of the circle of *maskilîm* helps us to learn something about the authors. In this chapter, we will consider some instances where the authors of the visions found the events of their day to have been predicted in older prophetic material, and how they used that material to develop their visions’ predictions. Just as Daniel in the stories, they interpret dreams, visions, and writings, and they find in them what no one else could. They must have thought of themselves as being like Daniel, *i.e.*, divinely aided in their interpretation.

After considering some instances of such interpretative activity, we will examine two other Jewish sources that contain information on figures that functioned in just the way that the *maskilîm* did. The Dead Sea Scrolls assign such a role to both the Teacher of Righteousness and to the writers of the *Hodayot*. In the writings of Josephus, we also find his claims that Essenes were divinely aided predictors who used scriptures in their predictive work.

*Dan 7-12*

Scholars have noted that older prophetic material is reused in chapters 7-12. Some of the material is used to set a scene that was familiar, such as the use of the epiphany material from *Ezek* 1 and 8 for the visions of *Dan* 7 and 10. Such usage of older material is something that we have already met in the reuse of the Joseph story for the painting of the picture of Daniel. In the present chapter, we will consider which of the units in *Dan* 7-12 reuse older biblical material in such a way as to indicate that
the second century authors understood the original prophecy to have pointed to their day.\(^2\)

Work on chapters 7-12 has shown a tendency to find less biblical material used in chapters 7-8, and much more used in chapters 9-12. So as to gain an insight into the reuse of scripture, we will begin with the latter chapters. Another reason for doing this is to begin where we find the one explicit citation (ch. 9), and also where we find the group's self-designating material, the prediction about the *maskilim* in 11:33-12:10. We will then consider how the material in chapters 7 and 8 fits with that material.

The method followed for this study begins with the work of others. I have not looked for prophetic passages that others have not already noted. I have sought only to confirm and expand upon those of others. Nor have I looked at every passage, but rather have selected examples for each chapter. After selecting the passages, I generated two concordances to aid in the comparison. To do this I used the concordance feature in *Bible Windows*.\(^3\) One concordance was of the chapter in *Dan*, and the other was for the passage thought to have been used in *Dan*. In the latter case, I broadened the context beyond what scholars have noted, in order to check more thoroughly for links with *Dan*. The concordances that were so generated were compared for common word roots. Where there were common occurrences of words, every occurrence in *Dan* was checked against those in the other material for possible relationships. Common words such as יֵשָׁר were disregarded in the initial comparison,

---


\(^3\) *Bible Windows Ver.* 5.5. Silver Mountain Software, 1993.
because one can expect them to occur frequently just because they are common. Only when a reasonable possibility of some relationship could be established did I proceed to further analyse the passages.  

Dan 9

Chapter 9 will not occupy us long for two reasons. First, we have already considered the reuse of scripture in it back in Chapter 2, as it applies to the use of material from Chr-Ezra-Neh. Second, this chapter contains the most obvious example of the actualisation of older material in Dan, i.e., Jeremiah’s 70-year prophecy from Jer 25:11-12 and 29:10. Much ink has been spilled on the use of that prophecy. Our concern here is not to settle the issue of the chronology that it propounds, but is simply to note that the Jeremian prophecy is explicitly reinterpreted in a way similar to how other passages are reinterpreted in chapters 7-12. The major difference between this chapter and others in 7-12 is that the Jeremian prophecy is directly cited, but there are only allusions elsewhere.

4 Mike Butterworth, Structure and the Book of Zechariah (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992) tried to do something similar in his study of Zech. The problem with his study is that he did not go beyond the mere occurrence of cognate lexemes. Many of the relationships that he posits are meaningless upon even a cursory examination! See W. A. White, “Rhetorical criticism and Zechariah: analysis of a methodology for determining chiastic structures in biblical Hebrew texts” (M.A. thesis, Acadia University, 1999) for a critique of Butterworth’s methodology and work.


In chapter 9, Daniel is portrayed as pondering the significance of the prophecy of a 70-year exile found in Jer. When the contexts of the two occurrences of the prophecy in Jer are considered, we find some themes that will recur in other passages that are considered below. In Jer 25, it is because of the disobedience of Israel that Yahweh brings Nebuchadnezzar against Israel. Significantly, Nebuchadnezzar is called "my servant" (עבדי) by Yahweh. Also, significantly, after the 70 years were completed, Yahweh would punish the Babylonians because of their sin (לא לחרם). And finally, an interpreter could find in Jer 25:13-14 some justification for putting together many prophecies to explain what was happening in the second century:

I will bring upon that land all the words that I have uttered against it, *everything written in this book, which Jeremiah prophesied against all the nations*. For many nations and great kings shall make slaves of them also; and I will repay them according to their deeds and the work of their hands.

The 70 year prophecy is referred to again in Jer 29:10, and provides the key to a significant piece of the Daniel figure puzzle. This reference to the 70-year prophecy is in the letter from Jeremiah to the exiles. The introduction to the letter (29:1) says that it was sent to "the priests, the prophets, and all the people, whom Nebuchadnezzar had taken into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon", one of who would have been Daniel. In the body of the letter the people are warned (8-10):

For thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: Do not let the prophets and the diviners (משיחים) who are among you deceive you, and do not listen to the dreams that they dream (נשׁים), for it is a lie that they are prophesying to you in my name; I did not send them, says the LORD. For thus says the LORD: Only when Babylon's seventy years are completed (שב שבעים שנה לבלע) will I visit you, and I will fulfil (אניadir האור) to you my promise and bring you back to this place.

(NRSV)

Here is a clear injunction not to listen to any supposed revelations announced by prophets or diviners who went into exile under Nebuchadnezzar. Given that this prophecy is explicitly used in Dan, it is not a surprise that the command was adhered to in the portrayal of Daniel: he is never referred to in the book as a prophet, nor his messages as prophecies. Also, in keeping with this warning to the exiles, Daniel is not portrayed functioning as a diviner when he aids the kings. Chapter 7 does say that Daniel “saw a dream, visions in his head” (דניאל יראת שיא and עיניו), which might be understood as being contrary to what is prohibited in Jer. However, Daniel does not make his dream vision publicly known, rather he writes it in a book (7:1) and presumably, as in other chapters (8:19, 26, 12:4, 9), he “seals it up,” because it is for a later period. In this way, he does not violate the command in Jer; what he saw in the dream was not for the people of his day, and was not told to them.

Daniel, then, is not named as a prophet or diviner, because none were supposed to be used by Yahweh in his day. In fact, if the prophet is considered one who spoke the word of Yahweh to the people of his day, then Daniel was not one. He was given his own visions only for the distant future. In this role, he was a predictor of the future, but not properly a prophet to his day. I have also noted that the name “Daniel” is more likely to have come from Ezra 8:2 and Neh 10:7, than from other sources. There the individual so named was a priest, one of the categories specifically mentioned in the preface to the letter in Jer.

**Dan 10-12**

The vision in chapters 10-12 seems to draw from many biblical sources, such as

*Num 24:24,*, *Hab 2:2-3, Isa 8,* 9, 10, 11, 14, 12 and 52-53, *and Ezek 1, 7, 9, 14, 15, 9, 16*

---

Some of the usage is for the theophany (Ezek 1 and 8), but most provide the author with the point from which to begin an explication of how events leading up to his day were a realization of ancient prophecies. For our consideration of the material in this vision, we will focus upon Hab 1:8-11, 2:2-4, Num 24:24, Isa 10 and 52-53.

Hab 2:2-4

One of the best-known passages used in Dan 10-12 is Hab 2:2-4.

Write the vision (יְהִי הָסָר); make it plain on tablets, so that a runner may read it. For there is still a vision for the appointed time (וַיְהִי הָסָר רֹאֶה); it speaks of the end (וְיְהִי הָסָר לָמוֹן מְלֹא), and does not lie (וָלָאוּ הָסָר לָבוֹא). If it seems to tarry, wait for it; it will surely come, it will not delay.

8 Seeligmann, Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 82; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 492-93.


10 Seeligmann, Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 82; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 489-91, which also deals with Dan 9:26-27.

11 Lacocque, Daniel, 230.

12 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 490-91.


14 Lacocque, Daniel, 206.


16 Lacocque, Daniel, 206.

17 Lacocque, Daniel, 201 with reference to Dan 10:4-10.

18 Whether the author understood this as still, yet or as witness may not make much difference to the discussion. Paronomasia such as in Amos 8:1-2 (יְהִי הָסָר יִתְנָה) and Hab 1:13 (יְהִי הָסָר רֹאֶה לָמוֹי,וָלָאוּ הָסָר לָבוֹא) as it is interpreted at 1QHab 5:3, would allow for an interchange of still and witness.
Look at the proud! Their spirit is not right in them, but the righteous (צדק) live by their faith. (NRSV)

Phrasing and ideas from this portion of Hab appear throughout chapters 10-12. The beginning of Hab 2:3 is found at Dan 10:14: “For there is a further vision for those days” (כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ לֹאֹתָיו לִימָיו), with “days” replacing “appointed times”. At 11:14 reference is made to the fulfilment of a “vision” (לוֹדָנָם וּצְרָקִים), and the only vision to which reference could be made is that referred to at 10:14.

At 11:27 the machinations (כָּרְאוּ) of two kings against each other will not work, because, as Hab 2:3 states, the vision will not lie (כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ לֹאֹתָיו), “for there remains an end at the time appointed” (כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ לֹאֹתָיו), but in this last phrase, כָּרְאוּ from Hab is replaced by the subject of the vision, “an end”. There are several other references to “an end” as well. In 11:6, כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ sets the time frame for the alliance between the kings of the north and south. In 11:13 the king of the north is said to advance כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ “at the end of the times”. After the vision is over, reference is made three times at 12:4, 6, and 9 to the events taking place כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ “in the end”, or כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ “at the time of the end”.

The appointed time comes in 11:29 when, “at the time appointed (לֹאֹתָיו) [Antiochus] shall return” and thus begin to wreak havoc. In 11:35 more waiting is introduced, because “there is still an interval until the time appointed” (כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ), and at 12:7 that is stretched out from Daniel’s day by the phrase כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ “for time, times and a half”.19

Finally, as the book is concluded, and the events predicted for the end had not come, at 12:12 the writer pronounces a blessing on כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ “the one who waits” as כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ.

---

19 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 492, suggests that it was under the influence of Hab 2:2-3 that the Aramaic כָּרְאוּ וְצָרְקוּ from 7:25 recurs here in this form.
they were told to do (Hab 2:3). The יְהוָה would live by his faith in the inevitability of the prophecy (Hab 2:4), and would be brought to such an understanding of the situation by the יְהוָה וְנָשָׁל who would be rewarded as the יְהוָה וְנָשָׁל (Dan 12:3).

That material is preceded by Habakkuk’s questioning of God about how a holy God could use such a nation as the Chaldeans. Habakkuk uses the imagery of people as fish and the Chaldeans as a fisherman who uses a net to mercilessly catch everything in its path. The above material is then followed by God’s confirmation that the prophet’s understanding was accurate, and then gives a series of woes against the aggressors. Such material was relevant to the writer’s day, both in its description of the Chaldeans and as the writer believed, in its woes, which God would bring to pass upon Israel’s aggressors in his day, such as Antiochus IV.

The writer of this vision also found in God’s instructions and promises to Habakkuk an indication of why prophecies did not come to pass in previous times. God had given the prophecies to Habakkuk for a later time, and the writer understood that time to be his day. All that was required was patience and the end would come, the vision’s time was being fulfilled. It is clear from the Hab Pesher that others thought this too, to refer to a vision of the “end times”, the time of the last generation.21

Hab 1:8-11

That the prophecy of Habakkuk was thought to be coming to pass in the day of the writer comes through in the use of the description of the Chaldeans from Hab 1:8-

20 It is tempting to find in יְהוָה a word-play on יְהוָה: it is the truly wise one يְהוָה who waits יְהוָה for God to act.

11 for the various kings and their forces in Dan 11:10-40. Although these are not convincing by themselves, I include them because the previous passage increases the probability that there is dependence. The description in Hab reads:

Their horses (הכליים) are swifter than leopards (הנמרים), more menacing than wolves (הכריות) at dusk; their horses (הכליים) charge. Their horsemen (הברשים) come (רבים) from far away; they fly like an eagle (הנשר) swift to devour. 9 They all come (עשה) for violence, with faces pressing forward; they gather captives (שבה) like sand. 10 At kings they scoff, and of rulers they make sport. They laugh at every fortress (teenth), and heap up earth to take it (לけれ). 11 Then they sweep by like the wind; they transgress (עשה) and become guilty; their own might is their god (אלוהים)! (NRSV)

In Dan 11:10-40 we find the same military themes of horses and horsemen, troops and kings going and passing through lands, taking captives and fortresses. There is even a passage where Antiochus is said to adopt the god of fortresses (מלך) who would help him take the strongest fortresses (ברשים), a possible play on his own might being his god.

His sons shall wage war and assemble a multitude of great forces, which shall advance (לברך) like a flood and pass through (הכליים), and again shall carry the war as far as his fortress. .... 13 For the king of the north shall again raise a multitude, larger than the former, and after some years he shall advance (ברך) with a great army and abundant supplies. .... 15 Then the king of the north shall come (יינא) and throw up siege works, and take (לקח) a well-fortified (תמכרה) city. And the forces of the south shall not stand, not even his picked troops, for there shall be no strength to resist. 16 But he who comes (ystate) against him shall take the actions he pleases, and no one shall withstand him. He shall take a position in the beautiful land, and all of it shall be in his power. 17 He shall set his mind to come (לנך) with the strength of his whole kingdom, and he shall bring terms of peace and perform them. In order to destroy the kingdom, he shall give him a woman in marriage; but it shall not succeed or be to his advantage. 18 Afterward he shall turn to the coastlands, and shall capture (לקח) many. .... 24 Without warning he shall come (ystate) into the richest parts of the province and do what none of his predecessors had ever done, lavishing plunder, spoil, and wealth on them. He shall devise plans against strongholds (ברשים), but only for a time. .... 33 The wise among the
people shall give understanding to many; for some days, however, they shall fall by sword and flame, and suffer captivity (שָׁבַע) and plunder. ... 37 He shall pay no respect to the gods of his ancestors, or to the one beloved by women; he shall pay no respect to any other god (אֱלֹהִים), for he shall consider himself greater than all. 38 He shall honor the god (אֱלֹהִים) of fortresses (מִניִּים) instead of these; a god (אֱלֹהִים) whom his ancestors did not know he shall honor with gold and silver, with precious stones and costly gifts. 39 He shall deal with the strongest fortresses (מִניִּים) by the help of a foreign god (אֱלֹהִים). Those who acknowledge him he shall make more wealthy, and shall appoint them as rulers over many, and shall distribute the land for a price. 40 At the time of the end the king of the south shall attack him. But the king of the north shall rush upon him like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen and with many ships. He shall advance (כָּבָד) against countries and pass through (לָבָר) like a flood. (NRSV)

In the light of our discussion below of chapter 7, the occurrence of “leopards” and “wolves,” and the use of “eagle” are also suggestive of connections with that chapter. 22 The fourth beast was more ferocious than the other three, and here the horses of the Chaldeans are more swift. When it is interpreted as the Syrians, and then specifically as Antiochus, it helped the author of 11:10-40 make sense of what was happening in his day and leading up to it, and provided him with language to describe the events.

The author of Dan 11, then, found in Hab 1:8-11 a prediction of the events of his day. The Chaldeans become the enemies of Israel in his time. They are more ferocious than those who came before. They take fortresses and captives, and are deterred by no one. However, in all of this, they would overstep the bounds, “they transgress and become guilty” and their spree of violence would be “only for a time”. In the end, they would fall, just as God had told Habakkuk would happen.

22 That they fly like an eagle is suggestive of Nebuchadnezzar who is portrayed in chapter 4 as having eagles’ talons and in chapter 7 as having the wings of an eagle.
Num 24:24

I have already found a possible allusion to Balaam’s oracle in Dan 1:4 where it is required that the entrants into the training programme be דועת אלוהים, which means something like “rich in knowledge”. In Num 24:16 Balaam says of himself that he is רוחה תוריה “one who knows the knowledge of the Most High”. This phrase is an addition to the preface of his second oracle, which in all its other parts is the same preface as in the first and third oracles. The phrase stands between two other phrases that, seemingly, tell of the source of the knowledge of God—Balaam is ממהר אלוהים שרא, “one who hears El’s utterances” and is כל אלוהים ראית, “one who sees the vision of Shaddai”. This oracle was also of interest to the writers of the Testimonia (4Q175), because a significant portion of it, vv. 15-17, is cited there.23 In Dan 11:30, it is לציים קטים “ships of Kittim” that will impede the progress of Antiochus. This is a reference back to Num 24:24, where “ships shall come from Kittim (ץים קטים) and shall afflict Asshur (Asshur) and Eber; and he also shall perish forever”. Here, again, a prophecy against Assyria was seen to be against Antiochus Epiphanies the Syrian due to the parallel in details.24 In this the authors of Dan 11 do what the translators of the Septuagint version and Vulgate did in making these “Kittim” into the Romans.25 The writers doubtless took comfort in the last clause: “he [Antiochus] also shall perish forever.”

23 Garcia Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 356-57.


25 LXX: ἡξοντι Ρωμαίοι (vs. TH: εἰσελεύσονται ἐν αὐτῷ οἱ ἐκπορευόμενοι Κίττιοι); VG: venient super eum trieres et Romani.
Various parts of *Isa* seem to have been of interest to the writer of *Dan* 10-12. Ginsberg noted several places where there is dependence, 26 and was followed in his approach by such scholars as Lacocque 27 and Fishbane. 28 Like Habakkuk’s vision, which would await its time to be fulfilled (2:3), the visions of Isaiah were taken to be for a future time as well. As Fishbane notes,

Indeed, the very fact that the latter prophecies had been sealed up (יְלֶנֶג) among Isaiah’s disciples [sic] (Isa. 8:16b) while the prophet himself ‘awaited’ (יְבָבְל) YHWH who has hidden his face’ (v. 17a) may have had special relevance for our apocalyptic author—who also sealed up a set of prophecies (cf. הַיְלֶנֶג, 12:9; also verse 4) for a future time, and praised those faithful ones who would ‘await’ (יְבָבְל, 12:12) their fulfilment amid the purifying tribulations of their suffering (12:10 cf. 11:35). 29

Ginsberg noted connections between “pride” in *Isa* 10:12 and *Dan* 11:37; and between *Isa* 10:24-25 (26:20-21) and *Dan* 11:36b, where it was only a matter of waiting until the Lord’s anger was spent (cf. 10:5ff, 24-36). 30 Lacocque noted two connections: *Isa* 10:5-15 influenced *Dan* 11:32-33; 31 and *Isa* 10:22 influenced *Dan* 26 Ginsberg, “Oldest interpretation”, 400-04.

27 Lacocque, *Daniel*, 201 and commentary on chapters 10-12.


30 In addition to this and the major connection that he made with the Servant Song, Ginsberg, “Oldest interpretation”, 403-04 also found a connection in *Dan* 12:2 to *Isa* 66:24: the corpses of rebels rot and burn and become an abhorrence יכפ. However the apocalyptist makes them rise in *Dan* 12:2, for the purpose of everlasting reproach and abhorrence יכפ. Ginsberg notes that these are the only two locations of this word in the Hebrew Bible. Montgomery, *Daniel*, 472, also thinks that Daniel borrowed from *Isa* here. As well, he found that the resurrection of *Dan* 12:2a (preceded by the annihilation of Seleucid Syria) was inferred from the Servant Song, and from *Isa* 26:19 and 20 (יְבָבְל is found in both). “This juxtaposition evidently suggested to him a connection between resurrection and the passing of the Lord’s indignation (end of v. 20) – and of ‘Assyria,’ the staff of the Lord’s indignation, with it.”

11:22 (which is actually a citation of Dan 9:26, according to him.) Fishbane noted connections between Isa 10:22-25 (and 28:22) and Dan 11:36 (9:26-27), as did Haßlberger. Together these scholars have noted the following connections.

The series יֶהָרְצַת ... יַשְּׁשַׁה יִתְּנָה is found in both Dan 11:36, and Isa 10:23 and 28:22 (cf. 19:22, 25). Haßlberger followed previous commentators in noting the similarities in the use of יַנְּרְרִיוּת in Isa and Dan. Unlike others, however, he noted the combination יַנְּרְרִיוּת ... יַשְּׁשַׁה. He would not go as far as Seeligman in referring to the passage as an actualising commentary on the passage from Isa. Fishbane, however, found two further relationships with Isa 10, and was willing to see the passage as an actualisation of the older prophecy. Verse 22 (with Isa 28:15, 17-18) uses the verb יַשְּׁשַּׁה in a way “suggestive of the ‘rush’ of military onslaught”. That verb is also found in Dan 11:10, 22, 26, 40 where it “dominates the political and military panorama” that unfolds. The other relationship is with Isa 10:25, which predicts an end to divine יַשְּׁשַּׁה ‘wrath’ and is used in Dan 11:36. “The latter term would have been associated in Daniel’s mind with the immediately preceding designation of Assyria as the rod of divine יַשְּׁשַּׁה (cf. Isa. 10:5).” Dan, then, combined portions of Isa 10:22-23 and 25

---

32 Lacocque, Daniel, 226.

33 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 489-90, and cf. 492 n. 85.


35 Thus, he names the chapter “Mantic interpretation of Oracles”.

Fishbane suggests that the writer was encouraged by the forecast that a remnant would remain and that there would be a time of decreed destruction, not only of the enemies of Israel (v. 23), but also of the faithless in Israel as well (v. 22). About these links, he concludes:

Through these learned citations, associations, and lexical links, it is clear that the author of the apocalyptic scenario in Dan. 11 saw in Syria the fulfilment of old doom prophecies spoken concerning Assyria. If it was the geographical proximity of these two historical states which helped foster his exegetical association, this could hardly have been the decisive factor. More significant, one may presume, was the fact that the great Isaianic oracles against Assyria had not yet been fulfilled.

What Isaiah predicted was coming to pass in the time of Antiochus, as an insightful one such as Daniel could have easily predicted. This meant that God would bring Antiochus to his end.

A more detailed consideration of the relationship between two passages turns up some other significant connections. First, an overview of Isa 10 is in order. Beginning in 10:5 Yahweh reveals that Assyria is the rod of his anger, sent against Israel. However, Assyria would overstep its bounds and, like Nebuchadnezzar (chapter 4), take the glory for what God had allowed him to do (10:5-11). However, when Yahweh was done punishing his people, he would turn against boastful Assyria (12-20). In the time of Assyria’s destruction by God, the remnant of Israel would turn from relying upon their conqueror and rely upon their God. Thus, in the midst of God’s

---

37 Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 490, although these comments are to 9:26-27.

punishment through Assyria, Israel was to keep in mind the ultimate outcome of it all: the full end of it would result in Yahweh’s anger turning against Assyria “and in that day his burden will depart from your shoulder, and his yoke will be destroyed from your neck.” (20-27, citing 27).

The king of Assyria is described in *Isa* as being punished for his arrogant boasting (פַּרְיְגָּדְלָה לָבֹּם “the fruit of the greatness of heart”39) and haughty pride (רוּת עִנֵּי חַפָּארָה “glorying of the haughtiness of eyes”; 10:12). In v. 15 some related rhetorical questions are asked:

Shall the axe vaunt itself (דִּבְרָה יָפֵר) over the one who wields it, or the saw magnify itself (פַּרְיְגָּדְלָה) against the one who handles it? As if a rod should raise the one who lifts it up (מַרְבִּימָה), or as if a staff should lift (דָּוִד) the one who is not wood! (NRSV)

The word plays between the two sections seem clear enough: the king of Assyria dared to exalt himself to the place of God and to think that he had assumed the role of the one in control. The result of this hubris would be the destruction of the forces of the King of Assyria (10:16ff.).

In *Dan* 11:36-37, Antiochus is described as follows:

The king shall act as he pleases. He shall exalt himself (ודָּוִד) and consider himself greater (וַדַּוִּלים) than any god, and shall speak horrendous things against the God of gods. He shall prosper until the period of wrath is completed, for what is determined shall be done. He shall pay no respect to the gods of his ancestors, or to the one beloved by women; he shall pay no respect to any other god, for he shall consider himself greater (וַדַּוִּיל) than all. (NRSV)

Thus, the meaning that the writer seems to have taken from the cited *Isa* prophecy is clear enough: Antiochus is the fulfilment of the King of Assyria whose hubris would bring him down under the wrath of Yahweh. This point is substantiated by the use of 39:1:1 פַּרְיְגָּדְלָה לָבֹּם for “insolence of heart, pride” see also *Isa* 9:8. It produces fruit, i.e., boasting.
the roots יָדוֹן, שִׁלְלָה in *Isa* 10:6-7 and *Dan* 11:24 (and 25). In the former passage, although Assyria is the servant of God, and sets about the business of punishing Israel by taking spoil, seizing plunder, (לָשָלַל שִׁלְלָה וֹלָם וַיֵּשֶׁג) and treading them down like the mire of the streets,” “this is not what he intends, nor does he have this in mind (וּלְבָרַךְ לָא כְּלֶהֶמָו), but it is in his heart to destroy שָלְלָה (כִּי לָשָלַל שִׁלְלָה) and to cut off nations, not a few.” Similarly, in *Dan* Antiochus is involved with “plunder, spoil, and wealth” (בֹּאָה וְשָלָל וּרְאוֹשׁ), but shall also “devise plans (רָשַׁב מַחֲשֶׁבָה) against strongholds.” After this, he goes about conquering Egypt, Libya, Ethiopia, and other nations (11:44), until he gets news from the north and east, which sets him into a fury “to bring ruin (לִשְׁלָמָיו) and complete destruction to many”. However, the writer has already noted that it will be stopped, for God will ensure that it only happens “for a time” (11:24).

The relationship of *Isa* 10 material to the hubris and fall of Antiochus is clear enough. But what is the connection to the use of Assyria by God as the instrument of his punishment of Israel, if there is one? Fishbane makes only a passing mention to the use of יָדוֹן in *Isa* 10:5 and 25, noting that the author of *Dan* 11 would have made the connection with 10:5. Although the implication is muted, the writer of *Dan* 11:30 and 36 seems to have concluded that Antiochus, as the fulfilment of the King of Assyria, was acting against Israel as the rod of Yahweh’s anger and staff of his fury. This could then be the implication of the first reference to Antiochus’ anger in 11:30; his anger was the means by which God’s anger was expressed. More in keeping with the hubris theme, maybe he had usurped God’s role by becoming angry. However, in reaction to his hubris and overweening anger, Yahweh would turn divine anger against this “king of Assyria”, just as predicted in *Isa* 10:24-25. The possibility that the interpreter had such an understanding of the passage is furthered by the use of יָדוֹן “pollute, profane” in *Isa* 10:6 where it is used as the characteristic of the nation of Israel for which God
was punishing it. In *Dan* 11:32, Antiochus leads the “violators of the covenant” into this state of impurity.\(^{40}\)

Lacocque suggests that the writer was trying to “make the people understand … that Isa. 10:5-15 [27] was not just to the then king of Assyria, but to the present king as well”.\(^{41}\) It would take a highly detailed knowledge of the passages to catch the connections; more than one could expect an audience to get from such a composition as *Dan* 10-12. Instead, it is more likely that the author thought that the prophecy of *Isa* was for his day, and he showed to his and his group’s satisfaction that this was the case. The Many would simply learn from the prophecy given to Daniel, possibly without any knowledge of its origins. It is interesting that it is only implicit, and then only when the source of the imagery is known, that Antiochus came to punish Israel because of the “violators of the covenant” who had been polluted.

Fishbane concludes about these chapters:

The epigonal character of Dan. 9-12, particularly of chapters 11-12, thus presents an imposing concatenation of prophetic authorities used by the author of our apocalypse. Simply on the basis of the texts referred to above, citations have been identified for *Dan* 11:10, 22, 26-7, 30-1, 33, 35-6, 40, 45, 12:1-4, 7, 9-10, 12 — and this excludes conflated citations in single verses. Certainly, a proclivity to compose such a prophetic patchwork attests both to a scholarly attentiveness to authoritative sources received in the prophetic *traditum* and to a sense of apocalyptic immediacy. And, surely, just this is the desired impact of the concatenation upon the reader. By strategically and cumulatively assembling numerous prophetic pronouncements the author leads us into the mental world of wise believers, Daniels’s [*sic*] מַעֲשֵׂי לְאַלְמָנָה, and the tangle of authoritative texts

\(^{40}\) Goldingay, *Daniel*, 273, translates it “Such as have acted wickedly in relation to a covenant he will turn into apostates ….”

\(^{41}\) Lacocque, *Daniel*, 230. The bracketed addition is our extension of the passage. Ginsberg, “Oldest interpretation”, 401, makes a similar claim: “The choice of the initial phrase conveyed to the reader that the events in question were a fulfillment of Balaam’s oracle about Assyria.”
which encoded their universe and provided an atmosphere of confidence in the inevitability of the apocalyptic forecast.  

Without our going through every possible passage used by the writers of *Dan*, it is clear from this one example in *Isa* that the writers found in the prophecy against Assyria a prediction of the fall of Antiochus. With this prophecy the author exegeted the situation of his day by relating those events using language drawn from the prophecy.

Significantly for this study, the Dead Sea Scrolls provide confirmation of the approach being argued here for *Isā*. There are several copies of pesherim on the text of *Isa*: 3Q4; 4Q161; 4Q162; 4Q163; 4Q164; 4Q165. As one might expect from the Dead Sea Scrolls pesherim, the prophecies against Assyria are read as prophecies for the pesherist’s day. 4Q161 is the fragments of a pesher on *Isa* 10:20-11:5. In this the Assyrians of *Isa* are interpreted as the Kittim (frags. 8-10 (col. III) on *Isa* 10:33-34). In the comments on vv. 24-27, the analogy of Egypt led the pesherist to read in some sort of exodus of the members of the congregation. This seems likely, because the “prince of the congregation” is also mentioned in the commentary on the verses. Vv. 28-32, which mention an advance through various places, is interpreted as having to do with “the final days”, and an advance by the Kittim “from the plain of Akko to do battle againstPale[stine ...],” which would end with the Kittim being “pla[ced] in the hands of Israel, and the meek [of the earth...] all the peoples and soldiers will weaken and [their]

---


43 The texts, translations, and bibliographies are readily available in García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 226-27; 312-29. For commentary see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 70-138, and 260-61.

the heart will melt [...]. Unfortunately this pesher and 4Q163 on Isa 10:19-24 are too broken to glean much more from them, but the sense is clear: what Isaiah prophesied was events in the pesherist’s day, not in his own day. It is just this type of interpretation that lies behind the prophecies of Dan 11. In fact, in this pesher, the Kittim also play a role, although it is a very different one.

Isa 52-53

Another actualised text that will concern us is that which gave the maskilim the theological underpinnings for what they did and who they were. Brownlee and Ginsberg, independently realized that Isa 52:13-53:12 lay behind the description of the maskilim in Dan 11:33-12:10. The maskilim clearly understood themselves to be the fulfilment of this passage.

The most significant connection is between the self designation and the use of the form in 52:13, “Behold my servant yaskil”. Following Torrey’s lead, Ginsberg believed that an ancient group could also have taken the form as a name, “Wise One”. Ginsberg and Brownlee noted several other connections between these two passages. Others before them had noted that the maskilim are given in 12:3 the epithet “justifiers of the Many”. It was assumed that this came from Isa 53:11, “my

45 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 314-15.


47 H. Louis Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948); Ginsberg, “Oldest interpretation”, 400-04;


49 See also Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 493.

50 Ginsberg, “Oldest interpretation”, 403, however, did not himself take the form to be nominal, but rather understood it as a verb meaning “to succeed”.
Servant shall justify the Many” (omitting לזרד作為 a dittogram of לזרד). Also, the resurrection of large numbers in 12:2 was seen as a development of what can be understood as the resurrection of the Servant in Isa 53. Ginsberg, however, claimed that in Dan the Servant and the maskilim are identified as one and the same, and the Many of Isa are the Many of Dan 11:33, 34, etc. Thus, the maskilim justify the Many by instructing them and inducing them to take the right path (Dan 11:33). Ginsberg noted that the ultimate glory of the maskilim in 12:3 is quite reminiscent of the exaltation of the Servant at 52:13. Brownlee understood 12:10 to be a broadening of the Suffering Servant to include all the faithful Many, because they too suffer. Ginsberg, however, concluded that the Many of Isa 52:13-53:12 were identified with the masses in the time of the persecution of Antiochus, and the Servant with the minority of steadfast anti-hellenisers.

In addition to the connections that they noted, we will consider others. First, is the use of the roots בָּהוּ and בָּהוּ. In Isa 53:3, it is twice said that the Servant is “despised” בָּהוּ. In Dan 11:33, the maskilim are said to fall “by plunder” בָּהוּ. Admittedly these two words are not from the same root, but in unpointed text they could easily be mistaken, or supplied sufficient similarity that the maskilim could play with them. Thus, the authors could have read the Isa text as saying that the servant was “plundered”.

In Isa the Servant helps ‘many,’ the nations, and kings (52:14-15) to see and understand בָּהוּ. In Dan, it is part of the role of the maskilim to make the Many understand בָּהוּ, even as the maskilim are martyred. It is also possible that the teaching role explains how they understood the phrase מָשָּׁה עֹז אֵלְבָרֹד. Rather than “Behold my servant yaskil/Enlightened one”, as Ginsberg proposed, it was understood

51 Note, however, that at Dan 11:21, Antiochus is said to be בָּהוּ “despicable”, so the root was known to the authors.
as “Behold my servant will instruct”.  

This would tie in with 53:11 where it is said that the servant would “justify many” by his knowledge. The broader context of Dan also applies in that Daniel “teaches” kings, and through their pronouncements, he teaches the Babylonian and Persian nations.

Excursus: The maskilim

Whether the maskilim took their name from Isa 53, as Ginsberg maintained, or found a connection to a pre-existing title, is unclear. This relationship needs to be further developed, given that it is this latter word that lexically links chapters 1 and 11-12. In Dan 11:33, 35 and 12:3, 10 we have a reference to what is most likely the group behind the development of Dan. Its self-designation, maskilim, is the hiph‘il participle of שלל, a root that is found in Dan 14 times. As part of our attempt to discern what we can about this group, we will consider the use of the words formed from this root generally, and then more specifically in Dan.

In his work on wisdom vocabulary, Norman Whybray considered 40 words from the semantic field of knowledge. Based upon his findings, he broke them down into four categories: a) words from the root שלל itself; b) other characteristic terms occurring only in the wisdom corpus (5 words); c) words characteristic of wisdom, but occurring so frequently in other contexts as to render their usefulness in determining sapiential influence questionable (23 words); and d) words characteristic of wisdom,

52 Also possibly “Behold my servant will have insight”.

53 Cf. the second Servant Song, in which the Servant is said to be a light to the nations, Isa 49:6.

but occurring only occasionally in other OT traditions (10 words). Of the 40 words, only 6 occur in Dan; and \( \text{שָׂכָל} \) belongs to group d).

The words of the root \( \text{שָׂכָל} \) are found in the Semitic languages only in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac. The verbs are denominatives of the abstract noun \( \text{שָׂכָל} \), “insight”, and may be used with an ingressive sense, “to become wise, sensible”, or with a stative sense, “be wise, sensible”. As a general wisdom word, it does not denote a special intellectual ability (such as \( \text{שָׂכָל} \) may imply), but rather a universal human ability; the use of common sense, and human thought, when thought is a result of learning and experience, of quick intellectual grasp or good education. In the Old Testament the root appears 96 times: 61 as the hiph ‘el; 1 as the hithpa ‘el, 16 as the Hebrew noun; 1 as the Aramaic noun; and 14 as the technical term \( \text{מַשְׁקִיל} \) in the Ps titles. The root is used mostly in wisdom contexts and is found mainly in exilic and postexilic materials. In the historical books the noun appears 7 times, of which 6 are in the Chronicler. The verb occurs 15 times, of which 10 are in the Deuteronomistic history and 4 in the Chronicler.


56 Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \) in TWAT, VII, 782; HALOT, s. v.

57 Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 781.

58 Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 785.

59 H. Kosmala, “\( \text{מַשְׁקִיל} \),” JANESCU 5 (1973): 235; Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 785.

60 Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 783, 794. The infinitive is used mostly substantivally, and corresponds to the noun (Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 783). K. Koenen, “\( \text{מַשְׁקִיל} \) – ‘Wechselgesang’: eine neue Deutung zu einem Begriff der Psalmenüberschriften,” ZAW 103 (1991): 109-12; and Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 793-94, argues that the technical term in the titles to the Pss is not from the root \( \text{שָׂכָל} \) I “insight”, but from \( \text{שָׂכָל} \) II “to cross over” and was used for an antiphonal chant.

61 Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 785.

62 Koenen, “\( \text{שָׂכָל} \), 784.
In the latest material, the hiph ‘il always means, “to be insightful”; 63 in the Deuteronomistic history, aside from Deut 32:29, it always means, “to have success”. 64 In the prophetic books the verb appears once at Amos 5:13, 6 times in Jer, and 3 times in Deutero-Isa. Most appearances of the root are in the Writings, as one might expect for a wisdom word. In Eccl it appears 13 times as a verb and 6 times as a noun. Most of these are with a profane, not a theological sense. 65 In the Psalms the verb appears 7 times, the noun once, and there it is always a theological sense with reference to the knowledge of God, his works, or laws. This is also the case in the book Job where the verb appears 3 times and the noun once. 66

There are in these occurrences of this root, some instances of particular interest to this research. In our investigation of Dan, I have noted several connections with the material in Chr-Ezra-Neh. There is, again, significant material in those works that may help us to understand the use of this term in Dan. The יִדְרָאִל root occurs 10x in total, but there are only two groups with whom it is used: Kings David and Solomon, and the Levites.

At 1 Chr 22:12 David wishes for Solomon that Yahweh would give him “insight and understanding” יִדְרָאִל עֲבֹדֵי so that when He puts Solomon over Israel he would keep the Torah יִדְרָאִל of Yahweh (cf Deut 29:8). This must mean that, with

63 This is the usage in later Hebrew, so Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, (New York: Choreb, 1926) 990, 1574.

64 Koenen, יִדְרָאִל, 784. The use of wisdom obtained and possessed, leads to success in life. This is the origin of the use of the word with the meaning of “to succeed” (W. McKane, Prophets and Wisemen (London: SCM, 1983), 67-68; Kosmala, “מָשָּׁק”, 235; Koenen, יִדְרָאִל, יִדְרָאִל, 785, 792). Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, 990 and 1574 does not refer to any such usage in later material.

65 Koenen, יִדְרָאִל, 784.

66 Kosmala, יִדְרָאִל, 235-36; Koenen, יִדְרָאִל, 784.
insight and understanding, Solomon would be sure to govern in accordance with the Torah of Yahweh, *i.e.*, that he would “guard” its observance in Israel, not merely that he would himself live according to it. We here already noted, and will again how, in *Dan* 1, the use of שָׁלֵלָלָה moves from a non-religious, to a theological usage: although one might be considered שָׁלֵלָלָה by others, to be truly שָׁלֵלָל one must be obedient to God and be divinely endowed with שָׁלֵלָל.

At *1 Chr* 28:19 the writer says that David “taught, gave insight into” (דַּעַת) the building plans that Yahweh had given.  The recipient of this would be Solomon, to whom David was explaining the plans (28:9-18). Then, at 2 *Chr* 2:11, Huram praises the God of Israel for giving David a son “who is endued with insight and understanding” (יוֹדֵעַ שָׁלֵלָה ובֹּנֶה) and who would build the temple. Significantly, when in the next verse something similar is said of Huram-abi whom Huram was sending to help Solomon, it is said that he was “endued with understanding”, but nothing is said about insight. It would appear that because Huram-abi was not from Israel (and not a king or Levite), he could not have insight into what the God of Israel wanted; he was not one who was obedient to this God. Solomon, after being instructed by his father, knew the plan of God, but Huram-abi would only carry out skilfully what Solomon told him to do.

At 2 *Chr* 30:22 it is Levites who are שָׁלֵלָה. In the context, both the priests and Levites took part in the sacrifice for the Passover. Both realized the need for the celebration (30:15); the Levites took the blood to the priests, and the priests sprinkled it (30:16). It was only the Levites, however, whom Hezekiah commended. Where they act alone in the account is in the sacrificing of the sheep for

---

67 *Contra* Kosmala, “*maškîl*”. 236 who translates this “David conceived” the plan of the temple building after God’s personal direction and design. The context is one of transferring information from David to Solomon.
those among the people who were unclean (30:17-18). When Hezekiah realized what had been done, he perceived a problem and prayed for the people, that God would overlook their transgression of the regulations. Yahweh does overlook the transgression, and heals or restores (רְפָאָה הַעֲנָנִים) the people (30:19-20). What the Levites did, then, proved to be acceptable to God under the circumstances. Thus, when Hezekiah spoke to them, it was not because they “showed good skill in the service of the Lord” (NRSV), but because they knew what to do, because of their “good insight” into how to deal with such situations in the service of Yahweh.68

Although David and Solomon understood the plan for the temple, according to Neh 8 it was Levites who had the insight into the Torah of God. In Neh 8, where we also find the names Mishael (v. 4) and Azariah (v. 7), Ezra the priest and scribe has the Torah read so that the people can hear it. In v. 8 we are told that at the time of the reading the Levites also made it plain (מְבַפֵּר) and expounded (מְסַקִּילָם) it, they helped the assembly to understand (וַיְבָא הַפְּלֵימָן). In v. 13, again the leaders of the people, the priests, Levites, and Ezra gather “in order to gain insight into the words of the Torah” (לֹא יִתַּחְפְּסֵי לַבְּלֵי הַתּוֹרָה). This is the function of the maskilim in Dan who “justify the Many” by teaching them.

We also learn from Neh 9:20, in the prayer of repentance, when all the people had been called together for the praise of God (9:5f), that it was He who “has given [his] good spirit to enlighten them” (וְהוֹדַע אָדָם אֶלֶף לַחֲכָרָם). Within the context of Chr-

68 Cf. the Song of Moses, Deut 32:29 where the people of Israel are said not to perceive the significance of their continued existence after their idolatry; they had not been wiped out and so God had been gracious. About 2 Chr 30:22, M. Gertner, “Terms of Scriptural interpretation: a study in Hebrew semantics,” BSO(A)S 25 (1962): 22, argues that, with Neh 8:7 where the Levites are called מְסַקָּלִים, מְבַפֵּרִים וּפְלֵימָן, “expounders”, they are so referred to “because they taught and interpreted the holy texts.” This context has nothing to do with the teaching of Torah, but rather how to apply it in a situation that was not covered in the cultic material of the Torah.
Ezra-Neh, the Levites instructed the people, just as David instructed Solomon.  
Possibly, it was not all Levites who were so gifted, because only some are specially noted 
as possessing “insight”: at I Chr 26:14, the Korahite gatekeeper named Zechariah is 
called a “counsellor with insight” (זָכָרוֹת בַּשְׂדָה); and at Ezra 8:18 Sherebiah, a son of 
Levi, is said to be a man of “insight”.

The root שָׁלַל is used for both the acquisition, and the dissemination of 
knowledge. In this, it is similar to the English “learned.” However, alongside the 
common use of the root as found in a work like Prov, שָׁלֵל has a definite religious 
context in which it takes on a special slant. In literature such as Pss and Chr-Ezra-Neh 
the focus of the knowledge that is gained and disseminated is God. God is also the 
source of the knowledge that is learned and taught. We have already discussed how in 
chapter 1 there is a move from a general usage of the root in 1:4 to a religious use in 
1:17. We will now, then, turn to Dan to determine whether there is a consistency in 
usage throughout the book. This review of the use of the root שָׁלַל is to serve as the 
background for our examination of its occurrence in Dan.

The word group has 14 occurrences in Dan (about 15% of the total number of 
ocurrences), and consists of the Hebrew verb (9 times: hiph'il. 1:4, 17; 9:13, 22, 25; 
11:33, 35; 12:3, 10) and noun (one time: 8:25), and the Aramaic verb (one time: 
hithpa'el 7:8) and the noun שָׁלַל (three times: 5:11, 12, 14). The chapters in which 
the root does not occur are 2-4, 6 and 10. We will now consider each of the 
ocurrences, comparing them with the uses outside Dan.

69 Note another parallel with David below on p. 329.

70 G. H. Wilson, “Wisdom in Daniel and the origin of apocalyptic,” Hebrew 
377 incorrectly cites the number of occurrences as 19.
**Dan 1:4, 17; 9:13**

The occurrences at 1:4, 17 and 9:13 denote “having insight into something”. In each case, what is understood is indicated by the preposition ב. In 1:4, the meaning is clearly ‘profane’, due to its being part of a pagan king’s instructions. In light of the meaning of the word, this would seem to indicate that the boys were already to have had training in the various kinds of wisdom: they had already been to school and, supposedly, it was on that basis that they were chosen. The next occurrence, at 1:17, however, indicates that beyond what they learned in Palestine, and what they learned in Babylon, God gave them more insight; it moves into the ‘sacred’ sphere. The occurrence in 9:13 is religiously oriented as well, but in a negative way: Israel did not try to understand; its problem was not due to inability but due to unwillingness (cf. 12:10).

**Dan 5:11, 12, 14**

The Aramaic noun שאלתמה is found in the Bible only in these verses. It corresponds to the abstract Hebrew noun ואל and means “insight”. In each occurrence it is one of the attributes assigned to Daniel on the basis of what he had done in earlier times. They seem to hark back to the use of the Hebrew verb in 1:4 and 17. The suggestion of a relationship between chapters 1 and 5 is further strengthened by the occurrence of parallel phrases: שאלתמהו (1:17) and מדלית השכלנה (5:11, 12).

---

71 *Contra* Wilson, “Wisdom in Daniel”, 378, who understands 9:13 as “to give heed to YHWH’s esoteric truth.”

72 Koenen, “ואל様々な, sākal”. 787-89, includes these occurrences under the usage meaning “etwas einsehen”, along with Ps 101:2 and Amos 5:13, on which see his interpretation at Koenen, “ואל様々な sākal”, 784.

73 See the additional discussion under the section “Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10”.

74 See above, notes 217 and 218 on page 255.
In chapter 1, however, Daniel is specially singled out to receive the ability to interpret visions and dreams. Significantly, it is this ability that is required in chapter 5.

Dan 7:8

Here the Aramaic verb is found in the hithpa'el. In the section of the chapter to which this verse belongs there are major subdivisions that employ a formula of seeing, i.e., "In my vision of the night I looked, and behold" (vv. 2, 7 and 13). Within each of those sections changes of scene are indicated by another reference to visionary activity. The usual expression is "While I was watching" (4b, 6, 9, 11a, 11b, 21). Once, in v. 8, is used. The reason for this difference is not the mere substitution of a synonym to add some variety, but is that there was no change of scene in v. 8. Instead, Daniel notes that he was looking with special interest at the ten horns, and was trying to understand their significance when a new one sprouted up. The special interest afforded the horns in the vision is also afforded them in the interpretation, which reveals the significance of the vision. is not, therefore, being used as a mere replacement for the usual

---

75 See below on the echo of these in 9:25.

76 Cf. the JPA Ithpa'el of סכל "to look at, reflect; to become wise," Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, 991; and the Syriac Ethpa'al of skal meaning "to inspect, consider closely; to be capable, understanding; to understand, perceive, recognize" Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, 377; and the MH hithpa'el of סכל "to look at, observe; to reflect, keep in mind," Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, 990.

77 Otto Plöger, Das Buch Daniel (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965), 104; Z. Zevit, "The structure and individual elements of Daniel 7," ZAW 80 (1968): 388. M. Haller, "Das Alter von Daniel 7," TSK 93 (1921): 83-87 argued that vv. 8-11 are a second century interpolation into an earlier anti-Hellenistic vision from about 300 BCE. If this is the case, it is interesting that the סכל root is used instead of the chapter's formulaic introductions.

As in later Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac, the root here indicates an active looking or contemplation, i.e., an attempt to discern the meaning of what is seen in order to gain an insight into its significance.

_Dan 8:25_

There is a difficulty with the “somewhat harsh” grammar of the text here, to which even the versions attest. Whether one emends the text or leaves it as found in the MT, probably means what Kosmala and McKane suggest, i.e., something like “skill”. It is a neutral word and refers not to Antiochus’ deception, but to his

---

79 Koenen, “םָקַל sākal”, 794, seems to suggest it is merely a synonym by explaining its use with “betrachten, sehen”.

80 Montgomery, Daniel, 350.

81 See Collins, Daniel, 340-41 for a good review and discussion of the problems, and the proposed emendations. The common emendation is to read “He will destroy powerful people and his shall be against the holy ones”.

82 See discussions and literature in Montgomery, Daniel, 350-51; Haßlberger, Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis, 12, 68; and Goldingay, Daniel, 195, 199-200.

83 Kosmala, “maškil”, 235; McKane, Prophets and Wisemen, 16. It is found with this meaning at Sir 32:4. The proximity of the description of Antiochus as “one who understands riddles” may be an indication that Antiochus was
skill at it. Antiochus is here credited with being an astute politician who had insight into the politics of the Jews, insight that allowed him to use the “deceit” referred to in v. 25. This ‘profane’ use is like the first occurrence (1:4).

Dan 9:22

At 9:22 the angel Gabriel says that he had come “to make [Daniel] understand” (לָדוּשַׁלֵּלָהּ בְּנֵיהָ). This is similar to the occurrence at 1:17, where it is God who gives the four מְדוּשַׁלֵּלָהּ; here, however, it is one of his intermediaries, an angel.85

Dan 9:25

Gabriel here instructs Daniel to “know and understand”, and the object of those verbs is the material in the בּ clause that follows.86 This is divine knowledge, not subject to the ability of humans to deduce, given that its meaning is not plain from the text that Daniel was considering, and thus he needed an interpreting angel. I indicated above that there was a possible connection with 1:17 and 5:12. In each of these cases to know and to understand are collocated: מְדוּשַׁלֵּלָה 1:17; מְדוּשַׁלֵּלָה 5:12; וַדִּיוֹדֵד וֹהֶשֶכָל 9:25. What the Queen-mother had noticed and reported in chapter 5, was made possible as a gift of God (1:17), and is here required of Daniel as he is informed about the ‘real’ meaning behind the Jeremian prophecy of a 70 year exile.

---

84 McKane, Prophets and Wisemen, 16.

85 Koenen, “םָכַל’, 787, 789-90, classifies this as a causative of “etwas einsehen”, i.e., “jdm. etwas / jdn. einsichtig machen”. The direct object of the instruction is מְדוּשַׁלֵּלָה.

With the occurrences of the form מָשָׁכֹלְלָם at 11:33, 35; 12:3, and 10, we come full circle to where we began the examination of מָשָׁכֹלְלָם in Dan. The reason for the investigation was to help clarify how מָשָׁכֹלְלָם was used in these verses, and how it might be related to Isa 52:13, i.e., how the latter might have been understood by the second century authors-compilers of the book. It would, therefore, be beneficial to summarize the usage in Dan at this juncture.

In 1:4, the hiph‘il verb is used of all the entrants into Nebuchadnezzar’s training programme. This is the common usage found in the wisdom writings and at 8:25, where the noun is used of Antiochus. At 1:17, and 9:13, however, the verb is used in its religious sense of “to be insightful” about matters having to do with God and God’s ways in the course of history. At 9:22, we find the causative sense of the religious use. When the Aramaic noun occurs at 5:11, 12, and 14, the reader-hearer can read into it both senses: from the Queen-mother’s perspective it is simply “insight” into the meaning of dreams; from the readers’-hearers’ perspective it is “insight” into real divine disclosures to kings. The Aramaic hithpa‘al of מָשָׁכֹלְלָה at 7:8, is used in a context where Daniel is seeking to understand the significance if a vision from God.

Both unfaithful Jews (1:4) and foreign rulers (8:25) may be “insightful”. True “insight”, however, comes from God (1:17) and is sometimes given by angels (9:22). It is only the faithful who understand מָשָׁכֹל (God’s truth for what it is (9:13).

The ma‘skīlīm, then, would appear to have considered themselves to be such faithful, insightful ones, who knew about God’s ways in the course of history. Just as they found references to their enemies—especially Antiochus—in scripture, so they found themselves in Isaiah’s prophecy of the suffering servant. Thus, they included...
themselves in this *ex eventu* prophecy that begins with Persian kings at 11:2, and moves beyond the death of Antiochus.

In 11:33 it is difficult to determine whether the מָשָׁלִים of the people are the “learned” from among the people (the stative use; although one might expect a partitive בְּ) or the “teachers” of the people (the causative use). Clearly their function is to teach בְּ (causative, as with some occurrences of וְדָא) what they understand (12:10; דע). It is quite possible that we have a *double entendre* here. These people were both the learned, who were given insight into the mysteries of God, and the teachers, who taught the Many about what they had learned.

The *maškilîm* would not live a charmed life, but would suffer persecution and some would die, according to 11:35. This martyrdom probably is part of the reason for the inclusion of chapters 3 and 6 among the tales. Unlike the four Jewish men, however, some of the *maškilîm* did not come out of the “furnaces” or “lion’s dens”; but the faith of the group remained intact. The martyrdoms serve to cleanse a group referred to as “them”, which is either a reference to the Many, to the living *maškilîm*, or to the *maškilîm* who died. The Many are not likely envisioned, because they are set on the right track through the teaching of the *maškilîm*. The purification may be of the *maškilîm*, who take care to remain pure as part of being *maškilîm*. But in light of the

---

87 This is how *B. Bat.* 8b, understood the occurrence at 12:3 (Maurice Simon and Israel W. Solóki, *Baba Bathra Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices* (London: Soncino Press, 1935), 38): “In a Bariitha it was taught: They that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: this applies to a judge who gives a true verdict on true evidence and to the collectors for charity: and they that turn many to righteousness like the stars for ever and ever: this applies to the teachers of young children. (Footnote: Because they also turn their pupils to righteousness.)” *Contra* Koenen, “דָּא sâkal” who does not include these in his groupings in section “4” of the article. In section 2 (p. 784), he does refer to the group, and translates the participle as “Einsichtigen”, which presumably would put them into the first category “einsichtig sein” (p. 786). He concluded that the causative does not occur without a personal object, *i.e.*, someone who is taught, as in *Dan* 9:22. However, the learners are understood from the context in *Dan.*
reference to resurrection in 12:2, this is more likely the purification that would come with martyrdom.

In 12:3 the maškilîm are interpreted as ‘suffering servant’ figures, who not only teach the Many, but also do it so as to set them right, which is probably the outcome of the former.\(^{88}\) Being likened to the light and stars of the sky also elevates these maškilîm. This is probably a comparison to the angels of heaven,\(^{89}\) as made evident from 8:10.\(^{90}\)

After Daniel is told that no more information would be divulged, the angel launches into a recapping of chapter II in 12:10-13. This may be an addition to the chapter, as there are differences from the previous material: “the Many” become “many”; the purification is broadened to include more than the maškilîm.\(^{91}\) What else we learn is that the wicked will continue to do as they had done all along and as a result will not understand what Daniel had sealed up. Only the maškilîm would understand it, and doubtless they are those who brought together the stories with these visions.

British scholars of a previous generation such as Rowley, held the view that the book was composed in its entirety during the second century BCE. This approach to the text understood the stories in chapters 1-6 as thinly veiled portraits of life under such rulers as Antiochus Epiphanes. Although that view has been set aside in favour of a more complex composition history, there are nonetheless parallels between the events in the stories and events from the time of the visions (e.g., issues centred on kosher

\(^{88}\) Cf. Collins, Daniel, 393.

\(^{89}\) It may be this association of the Daniel of chapter I and the maškilîm of this verse that led later readers to assume that Daniel had become an angel, which led to his inclusion among angels in incantation bowls, although it is more likely the Daniel of 1 Enoch from which that angel derived.

\(^{90}\) Collins, Daniel, 393-94; cf. Deut 4:19 and 1 Enoch 104:2-6.

\(^{91}\) Collins, Daniel, 400.
food, and idol worship; and hostile monarchs and martyrdom). Although one has been noted, *i.e.*, the word מַשׁכִּילִים for the four of chapter 1, and the righteous teachers of chapters 11-12, it has not been developed as fully as it might be. There are three other parallels that are relevant to the maskilím and chapter 1. First we find foreign rulers who conquer and attempt to subjugate. In chapter 1 it is Nebuchadnezzar, and in chapter 11 it is “the contemptible man” (11:21), Antiochus Epiphanes. There is also a group that is not faithful to its God, *i.e.*, the acquiescing Israelites of chapter 1, and the violators of the covenant (11:32) in chapter 11. Finally, there are those who learn from the maskilím. In the story of chapter 1 it is possible to include two groups: the other, unfaithful Israelites together with the Babylonians who see the results of the faithfulness of the four, and the readers/hearers of the book who learn from the stories and the visions. The parallel in chapter 11 is the common people, the Many, whom the maskilím are said to instruct (11:33).

Such parallels between the characters lead us to conclude that the associations that scholars have made between 1:4 and the occurrences in 11-12 are justified. It is also clear, then, that there is an intentional development of the use of this word. In *Dan* 1, 2, 4, and 5, Daniel predicts through the interpretation of dreams and riddles for foreign kings. In chapters 3 and 6, he and his friends are proved to be pious, devout Jews, who were willing to die rather than deny the ways of their God and religion. These traditional stories, which have been recast to portray something about the 2nd century maskilím, shed light on those who seem to have used Daniel as a picture of themselves.

---

92 Whether reference is made to them as those who eat the king’s מַשׁכִּיל in 11:26 is unclear, but it is possible, given the links that we are noting. In either case, the word does occur in both chapters.
Although many Jews may have been called *maškilîm* (1:4; cf. 8:25), the word had a 'mere' secular use (*Prov* and *Eccl*). *Maškilîm* like Daniel, however, were learned men who were faithful to their God (chapters 1, 3, 6, 9, 11-12). They were not mere wise men (1, 2, 4, 5). Unlike Israel in the past (9:13), their fellows in the exile (1), or the violators of the covenant (11:30-12:10), they attempted to understand (7:8; 9:1-2, 21-22, 25). Due to this faithfulness, they were able to understand divine mysteries, because God enabled them to understand (1:17), and provided them with the insight that they needed when they received the revelations of divine mysteries through dreams, visions, and angelic visitations (9:22; chapter 10). This understanding also applied to their reading of writings (1:17, chapter 5, and chapter 9). Their role was as teachers of righteousness, who would be God's servants in bringing the masses into a right relationship with God. They knew about the end times what the masses needed to know (12:10). Doubtless due to the public nature of their task, and their willingness to take a stand as Daniel (chapter 6) and the three (chapter 3) had, some died. This, however, was no deterrent to the faithful, for those who died were purified. For their faithfulness and role as teachers of the divine mysteries, these individuals would have a special place among the angels in the resurrection.

In *Dan* 9 and 10-12, we find the pattern used by the writers. They found prophecies that were relevant to their situation. Most of them centred on the Assyrians. A recurring theme is that the aggressors overstepped Yahweh's intended task of mere punishment, by being overly brutal. Such material as that from the prophecies of *Hab* and *Jer* justified the writers in their thinking the prophecies about one nation in one time were really about another nation in another time. Even something with one meaning (*e.g.*, 70 years), could mean something else when combined with another text. The authors, who were attempting to teach the people about God's intentions for Israel
and Antiochus, found themselves predicted in the Suffering Servant who would teach the Many, be persecuted, and die only to be raised and then exalted.

**Dan 7**

Chapters 9-12 show the approach of the authors of the visions to the actualisation of previous prophecies in their day. They looked for prophecies that fit with what they saw happening around them, and that had some prediction about the outcome. Chapter 7 does not seem to be dependent on as many older prophecies as chapters 9-12. Research has shown it to be composed of material from a Canaanite background, albeit as transmitted through an Israelite tradition. It also relies upon Mesopotamian representations of animals and *Mischwesen*. The relationship to other imagery from the Near East is well discussed and need not be rehearsed here. The chapter does, however, use older material that the authors considered to be “scripture”, in the sense of authoritative writings.


In addition to those sources, we should note the work of Paul A. Porter, *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary-critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1983) who contends that the *Summa izbu* series of birth anomaly omens (see Erle Leichty, *The Omen Series Summa Izbu* (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1970) for the text) is the influence behind the *Mischwesen* of *Dan*. Given the widespread occurrence of such kinds of iconography, however (J. H. Charlesworth, “Folk traditions in Jewish apocalyptic literature,” in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium*, eds. J. J. Collins and J. H. Charlesworth (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 103-09), it seems unwise to overstate the importance of this one text. It is just as likely (arguably more likely) that the general belief in the importance of anomalies as omens kept the text alive (they were copied as late as 100 BCE) in official circles, and that it in turn had an influence upon some segments of society (cf. E. C. Lucas, “Akkadian Prophecies, Omens and Myths as Background for Daniel Chapters 7-12” (PhD dissertation, University of Liverpool. 1989), 116-45).
The basic structure of the vision and many of the themes of this chapter are taken from the dream of chapter 2. These two chapters, as Lenglet showed, are matching parts of the chiastic structure of chapters 2-7. In chapter 7 we find both the theme of earthly powers coming to an end not through human agency, and a form of ranking of the different powers. The writers of Dan 7 took the vision of chapter 2 very seriously. It was not mere window dressing to paint an interesting story about the character they named Daniel. They considered Nebuchadnezzar’s dream to be a real dream from God. However, it was a dream filled with meaning beyond what Daniel revealed to the king, and in this vision of chapter 7, the deeper meaning is revealed by making use of texts and themes rooted in Israelite traditions and beliefs.

When the dream was given to Nebuchadnezzar, it revealed that he, as the king of Babylon, was the finest of the rulers and that each after him would be of lesser quality. That dream was to a sovereign about his dynasty, and about others to follow. But, to Israelites, those nations were more than just powers to follow Nebuchadnezzar; indeed, he was more than just a fine ruler over his nation. As commentators have noted, the choice of animals in Dan 7 is in line with the portrayal of countries by animals in the Old Testament scriptures. They are portrayed as animals in part because, in their relations with Israel, they were ferocious predators. This aspect of the world powers was not revealed to Nebuchadnezzar; it was revealed only that those who came after him would be of lesser quality than he. As both dreams are presented, the


96 See for example, Montgomery, Daniel, 286-92; and Goldingay, Daniel, 148-50.
focus is not really on the second and third elements in the dream, but on the first and last, as is consistent with the use of such progressions in other literature.  

Hos 13:7-8 and Jer 5:6

Two pieces of prophetic material seem to have played a role in the reshaping of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in order to reveal its “deeper meaning”. Commentators have noted the similarity among the animals listed in Dan 7:3-7, Hos 13:7-8 and Jer 5:6. These require some consideration.

In the vision of chapter 7, Daniel sees four beasts (תְּדֵמָה) rise from the sea:

The first was like a lion (לֵוֶת) and had eagles’ (נַשָּׁ֑א) wings…. Another beast (בָּאָרָאָלָא) appeared, a second one, that looked like a bear (בִּלְוַת)…. After this, as I watched, another (בָּאָרָה) appeared, like a leopard (נַלְוַת)…. After this I saw in the visions by night a fourth beast (לֶוֶת), terrifying and dreadful and exceedingly strong. (NRSV)

In Hos 13:7-8, similar creatures are used when Yahweh threatens:

So I will become like a lion (שָׁלֶש) to them, like a leopard (לֵוֶת) I will lurk beside the way. I will fall upon them like a bear (בִּלְוַת) robbed of her cubs, and will tear open the covering of their heart; there I will devour them like a lion (לֵוֶת), as a wild animal (לֶוֶת) would mangle them. (NRSV)

Likewise in Jer 5:6 Yahweh says:

Therefore a lion (לֶוֶת) from the forest shall kill them, a wolf (בָּאָש) from the desert shall destroy them. A leopard (לֵוֶת) is watching against their cities; everyone who goes out of them shall be torn in pieces-- because their transgressions are many, their apostasies are great. (NRSV)


In both these latter cases, the material forms part of judgements against Israel for its faithlessness to Yahweh. The relationship of the lists is illustrated in Table 9 below.

**Table 9. Animals in Dan 7:3-7; Hos 13:7-8; and Jer 5:6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Hos</th>
<th>Jer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נמר</td>
<td>שהל</td>
<td>ירדה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דב</td>
<td>נמר</td>
<td>זאב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נמר</td>
<td>דב</td>
<td>נמר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ליבא</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חיה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admittedly, the lexemes are not the same in each of the passages. While *Dan* and *Jer* have the more common נמר for ‘lion’, *Hos* uses the rarer forms שהל and ליבא. It is easy to understand how the composers of this vision in *Dan 7* would have simplified the latter two terms and used the former most common word. A more significant difference occurs where *Jer* uses זאב ‘wolf’ and *Dan* uses נמר ‘bear’. The word used in *Jer* for a wolf, זאב, does not appear in the *Dan* passage.

---

99 It is also instructive to note the occurrence of similar animals in *Hab 1:8* discussed above: “Their horses are swifter than leopards (תנברעה), more menacing than wolves (תנברעה) at dusk; their horses charge. Their horsemen come from far away; they fly like an eagle (תנברעה) swift to devour.”

100 נמר 58x; זאב 35x in BHS; Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim* cites both Hebrew and Aramaic occurrences.

101 שהל 7x; נמר in Aramaic. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, 1548, lists 2 occurrences for Aramaic and 3 for Hebrew.

102 זאב masc., and ליבא fem., ‘lion, lioness’ are found 14x in BHS. Hebrew only in later literature, Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, 698.


104 זאב 12x elsewhere in BHS.
occur, it would most likely be in the Aramaic form as דִּבְּאָל. The latter form is morphologically close to the Hebrew דִּבְּאָל (דִּבְּאָל), "bear", which is used in Dan 7:5, but which elsewhere has the Aramaic form רָבָּא. It is quite possible that there is a play on words here. Gen. Rab. 99.2 shows that this play on words was not lost on ancient exegetes, because it makes a link between the דִּבְּא of our Jer passage and the דִּבְּא of our Dan passage!

For the Lord God will do nothing, unless He reveals His counsel [secret] to His servants the prophets (Amos 3:7). Jacob coupled two, corresponding to two, and Moses coupled two, corresponding to two. [Jacob blessed] Judah with the Babylonian empire in mind, for each is likened to a lion (לֹאֵל). The former: Judah is a lion’s (לֹאֵל) whelp Gen 49:9; the latter: The first was like a lion (לֹאֵל) (Dan 7:4). By whose hand shall the empire of Babylon fall? By the hand of Daniel, descended from Judah. [Jacob blessed] Benjamin in allusion to the empire of Media, the former being likened to a wolf (לֹאֵל) and the latter being likened to a wolf (לֹאֵל). The former is likened to a wolf (לֹאֵל): Benjamin is a ravenous wolf (לֹאֵל) that, etc. (Gen 49:27). And the latter is likened to a wolf (לֹאֵל): And behold another beast, a second, like to a wolf (לֹאֵל) (Dan 7:5). R. Ḥanina said: the word is written לֹאֵל [defectively]. That is R. Johanan’s view, for R. Johanan said: wherefore a lion (לֹאֵל) from the


106 Found as דִּבְּא and דִּבְּא in Hebrew, and as דִּבְּא and דִּבְּא in Aramaic (Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, 282; Dalman, Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch, 90). It is “primarily a wild, carnivorous, and untameable animal like the lion, with which it is often connected, or like the leopard, which is mentioned along with the lion and the bear (Isa. 11:6f.; Hos. 13:7).” TDOT, III, 71.

107 BDB 179. In Syriac it occurs as דִּבְּא and rarely as דִּבְּא, ‘bear’ (Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, 81).

108 See above, n. 18.

109 There is an explanatory note here: “לֹאֵל instead of לֹאֵל. This, in his opinion, shows that its meaning is that of the Syriac and Aramaic דִּבְּא, wolf.” Midrash Rabbah, Translated under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. H. Freedman and Marice Simon (London: Soncino Press, 1939), 974 n. 3.
forest slays them (Jer 5:6) alludes to Babylon; A wolf (תָּנָן) of the deserts spoils them (ib.), to Media.\textsuperscript{110}

Thus, one drawing significance from the lists of animals in Hos 13 and Jer 5, because they are both related to Yahweh’s punishment of his people, could do so through the word play that the Gen. Rab. points out, and through a simplification of two terms to one. In addition to that, the vision uses the order of Jer, and adds the fourth ambiguous creature from Hos.

Both of these prophetic passages are in contexts where Yahweh expresses his displeasure with his people. As above, these shed light on the exegete’s understanding of the subjugation of Israel from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to Antiochus: Israel was not an innocent bystander in the events of history. The rising of the four world powers in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream was for the punishment of Israel.

As with the Isa material, Hos was interpreted by a pesherist as applying to his day in 4QpHos.\textsuperscript{111} Unfortunately any comments on the passage under consideration have not survived, nor has any pesher on Jer. The approach of the Hos Pesher to that biblical book, however, is sufficient to show that the approach of the writers of Dan 7 was in keeping with other second temple interpretations of the book.

Dan 2

The reuse of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream is more complex than the mere application of an animal related scene to convey a different slant on the message of the

\textsuperscript{110} Basic English translation from Midrash Rabbah, 973-74; Hebrew text from_bases_1861 (Tel Aviv: Machbaroth Lesifrut Pub. House, 1956), 778-79.

\textsuperscript{111} The text and translation of 4Q166-167, with bibliography, are found in García Martinez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 328-35. For commentary see Horgan, Pesharim, 138-58. That Hos was thought to apply to the pesherist’s day is clear from the application of Hos 5:14 to the “last priest” (4Q167, Frag. 2, ll 2-3). On this issue see Horgan, Pesharim, 139-40 and 149.
dream. None of the animals is normal; each is a complex form, a *Mischwesen*. The last three figures are increasingly mixed in form: one like a bear (7:5); one like a leopard with four wings and four heads (7:6); and one that lacked a definite form having iron teeth and bronze claws and, eventually, eleven horns, one of which had human eyes and a mouth that spoke, and which went to war (7:7-8, 19-21).

Such imagery could be based upon passages such as *Jer* 49:19-22, where there is mixing of metaphors in which Yahweh comes as a lion (תָּאֹלֶם, *cf. Hos* 13:7), and, in Babylon, as an eagle (תֵבִא). However, Near Eastern iconography and literary descriptions of *Mischwesen* seem to play no small part in these descriptions, even if they are the literary creation of the writer of the story. Whatever the significance of their increasingly mixed nature, the purpose seems to be to evoke a sense of terror (*cf.* 7:15). The most unnatural is reserved for the lowest point in the decline, the one that ends as a representation of Antiochus Epiphanes. Although the decline in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream had to do with the relative quality of the rulers/kingdoms in general, the decline in *Dan* 7 shows that the real decline is a move away from order toward chaos, as was evident from the way these kingdoms treated other countries, especially Israel. That God used such creatures seems to convey the idea that the

---

112 *Cf. Ezek* 17:3 where the eagle is used in a metaphor for Nebuchadnezzar.

113 For the debate, see Bryan, *Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality*. As he notes on 255, a serious challenge to his thesis is posed by the use of *Mischwesen* in *Ezek* 1, where they make up the *Merkabah*: surely, if such mixed beasts are impure, Yahweh would not be portrayed as having them for his throne. As will become clear in the following, I would have to agree with Bryan’s approach to explaining their use by God: *Mischwesen* could indeed be used by Yahweh for their ferocity, to convey the sense that “holiness is dangerous”. In any case, there is no guarantee that the author of Daniel would use the *Mischwesen* with the same understanding of them as the author of *Ezek*.

period between the sixth and second centuries BCE was like no other in the history of Israel; God was exceedingly angry at his people’s continuing faithlessness.

Throughout chapter 7 there are other uses of the material from chapter 2 for the setting, the vision, and its interpretation. It starts with the editorial introduction, including that Daniel “had a dream and visions of his head as he lay in bed” (הלאהشاهدוהרזוייראשהעלמלככב). This is just what is said of Nebuchadnezzar in 2:28, 20: “your dream and the visions of your head as you lay in bed” (הלאךרזוייראתהוןמלככב). Just as Daniel was disturbed (בראשהעלמלככב) by the dream vision in 7:15, Nebuchadnezzar was in 2:1 (וית деятельוועללי), and 3 (וית_activelle), but cf. the Aramaic account of fear at 4:2 which uses רכז (בראשהעלמלככב). Just as Daniel gave thanks to God because what he had requested from God for the king (the dream and its interpretation) had been made known to him (2:23, יוקדזרעברעמעמלככת; 2:30 יוקדזרעברעמעמלככת), so in 7:16 he asks for himself and, again, the interpretation is made known (ריכבאהсаיבהתמכהעלמלככת; דנהרובערלחקורמאמהמלככת). In the dream, Daniel sees four great beasts (7:3) and a little horn (8, 20) “come up” (סልך) out of the sea. This same root is used of the thoughts (רעייני) that “come up” in Nebuchadnezzar’s head in 2:29. As I argued for 4:16 [19], רעייני includes both the content and what is thought about that content. Here, then, the reference in 2:29 is taken to refer to the statue that the king sees “come up”, and so here is used to refer to the things that “come up”.

---

115 This is used in 7:28 to summarize what was in the dream.
In 2:38, the king is said to be ruler of humans, animals and birds.

In 7:3-4, the first figure, which is a thinly disguised reference to Nebuchadnezzar as the epitome of the rulers of Babylon, is described as one of four beasts (דָּרְショー), a lion having the features of a bird, i.e., eagle’s wings, and being made to stand on feet like a human’s (רָוֹלָא חַנָּעַש), and was given a human’s mind (רְאוֹלָא חַנָּעַש). The third beast and the fourth beast also have features of a bird (7:6 “four wings of a bird” גֶּפֶּן אָרְבָּאָעָע, 7:19 “claws of bronze” יָרָבָא עַנָּו). And the fourth beast grows a horn on which are eyes like the eyes of a man (רְאוֹלָא חַנָּעַש 7:8).

In 7:4, the first creature is made to “stand” (רַפָּא), and in v. 5, the second is commanded to “arise” (רַפָּא). It is not stated who makes the first beast stand, although the results are clearly intended to convey the idea that it was God, as in chapter 4 where God punishes and then restores Nebuchadnezzar when he acknowledges the sovereignty of God. Also, the command to the second creature must be from God, to whom such prerogative belongs, as 2:20-21 makes clear. It is to the latter passage that I wish to draw attention, for in that, it is said that God “removes kings and sets up kings”. In a similar way, the third beast has “dominion given to it” (מְלָאוֹן יְרוֹב לֵא) just as God did for Nebuchadnezzar (2:37-38), and the corresponding third kingdom (2:39). So, just as God “sets up” each of the kingdoms represented by the materials of the statue in chapter 2, so he is involved in the “setting up” of the beasts that arise out of the sea. The picture, then, is not of God suddenly discovering unclean beasts from Sea, who had wreaked havoc, rather, these beasts existed because God brought them into being! This is similar to the Old Testament

116 In 4:22 his dwelling is with the beasts of the field (אָרְבָּא עַבָּאָא), because he becomes like one, and in 4:30, his hair is as long as eagle’s feathers and his nails like birds’.
motif of God being the creator of the “beasts” of the sea such as Leviathan and Rahab, which are reflexes of the Canaanite chaos monsters.

The description of the fourth beast also is a development of the fourth kingdom in chapter 2. It is said to be “dreadful” (7:7, 19, יִלּוּלֵי חָצָר). This is the adjective used to describe the statue at 2:31. It is also described as “strong” (7:7, חֲזָר בָּא), which is also an attribute ascribed to the iron found in the fourth level of the statue (2:40). Iron is also one of the elements found in the fourth beast (7:7, 19; so is bronze 7:19). The significance of the iron in 2:40 was that it breaks (מָשַׁק) other things, which is what the fourth beast does (7:7, 19, 23 מָשַׁק). It may be this feature that brings the fourth beast (and this level in the statue) under judgement. Giving the right to crush other nations is the prerogative of God.117 At 2:34, 44, 45 it is the rock that appears (from God) and “breaks” (מָשַׁק) the statue and crushes it, iron (and bronze) and all. If this observation is correct, then it was this unauthorised “breaking” that would bring down the fourth kingdom and beast.118

In 7:11 the fourth beast is killed, in parallel with the crushing of the feet of the statue in chapter 2. As part of the parallel to the collapse of the statue due to that destruction, the other three beasts in chapter 7 are stripped (מָשַׁק) of their dominion119

---

117 Notice the same language in Mic 4:11-13, where Yahweh commands Zion to “break” (מָשַׁק) the many nations that gathered against it.

118 This is relevant to the work done by Bryan, as it applies to Dan 7. As in Ezek 1, God can use Mischwesen, (Bryan, Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality, 255) but, they overstep their bounds and are punished. This very tension, which is inherent in God’s use of the “unclean”, is addressed in Hab, which is a book of interest to the writers of Dan. When it is announced that God would use the “Chaldeans”, the prophet protests that the eyes of the Holy One are too pure to look upon such iniquity (1:12-13). To this Yahweh responds with the injunction to wait for the vision, which awaits its time (2:2-3), which includes the ultimate destruction of the Chaldeans (2:17-3:15). Interestingly, God tramples the sea in Hab 3:8 and 15, in a poem dependent upon the same kind of traditions found in Dan 7.

119 Although not part of chapter 2, in the poetic material in 4:31-32 [34-35], the dominion (מָשַׁק) belongs to God.
and their lives prolonged for “a season and a time” (אָמוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל). In the poetic material at 2:20-23, it is again Daniel’s God who changes “times and seasons” (שִׁיטָן הָמוֹנֶה) and “removes” (נָפָל) kings.

The remaining parallels that we must note provide us with a complex intertwining of Nebuchadnezzar, the beasts, and the human like figure of 7:13. At Dan 2:37-38 we read:

You, O king, the king of kings--to whom the God of heaven has given (יְהוָה) the kingdom (מלכי), the power (חכמי), the might (לם), and the glory (רות), into whose hand he has given human beings (בני אנוש), wherever they live, the wild animals of the field (זרעים ביר), and the birds of the air (חלזון השמיים), and whom he has established as ruler (נashi) over them all--you are the head of gold. (NRSV)

This complex of ideas recurs in chapter 7. At 7:14 we read the following about the human like figure:

To him was given (יְהוָה) dominion (מלכי) and glory (רות), and kingship (מלכי), that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion (מלכיה שלמים עולם) that shall not pass away, and his kingship is one that shall never be destroyed (_calibration). (NRSV)

Then it is said that the holy ones of the Most High would “possess the kingdom” (7:18, רוח הקודש מלכי), where the verb רכש is from the same root as the noun translated “power” (ласт) in chapter 2:37.120

There is a relationship between the descriptions of Nebuchadnezzar and his power, and that of the “one like a son of man” and the power that one receives. The clue to the connection is found in the description of the first beast. It seems that in the writer’s mind, human features were indicative of that which God approved. At 7:4, the

---

120 It is also said in chapter 4 that Nebuchadnezzar, like the human figure, ruled over “all peoples nations and languages” (3:31 [4:1]).
description of the lion with eagle’s (נוף) wings finishes with clear parallels to the
description of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness in 4:30, complete with a reference to an
eagle’s (נוף) feathers. As I argued earlier, there is a conversion process through which
Nebuchadnezzar goes in chapters 1-4. This is reflected in the description in 7:4 of the
removal of eagles’ wings from the lion figure, and then its being stood on its feet like a
human (זאנד) and being given the mind of a human (לטב). The beast is
gradually made more human like. The heavenly figure is also human like. It has
authority similar to Nebuchadnezzar’s, and is clearly approved by God.
Nebuchadnezzar seems to have been held in high esteem; a special, possibly faithful,
instrument of Yahweh in his role in the cleansing process of the nation of Israel (cf. Jer
25:9 “my servant”). Nebuchadnezzar, however, could not be other than he really was,
the ruler of an aggressor against Israel, and so the lion never actually becomes like a
human in an unqualified sense, it only stands like one and has the mind of one, and
finally is divested of its rule (cf. Jer 25:12-14). The figure with heavenly origins,
however, is “one like a son of man” in an unqualified way. Unlike a ruler such as
Nebuchadnezzar, this humanlike figure’s rule would not pass away (7:14).


122 It is not said that this figure is a human, only that it is “one like a son of
man”. Porter has argued that it is a fifth beast, but with human features, not animal.

123 Porter makes two interesting points about the beasts that we should note.
First, as in the omen texts, the named beasts of Dan 7 and 8 are only such in
appearance, thus the use of “like.” Also, he suggests that, the “one like a son of man”
probably is an animal with human features. Here he refers to Morma Hooker’s work on
the son of Man in Mark to support his argument M. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark:
A study of the Background of the Term ‘Son of Man’ and Its Use in St Mark’s Gospel
and refers also to the similarity with Rev 5 in which an anomalous lamb is enthroned
and is the opposite of a ten horned Mischwesen with characteristics drawn from all four
beasts of Dan 7 (Rev 13:1-8; 17:14 etc.).

124 The relationship to the Ugaritic combat myth Baal is well discussed in the
literature. For the text see ANET, 129-42; John C. L Gibson, and G. R. Driver,
Dan 7, then, contains a full-blown reuse of chapter 2, but from the perspective of second century Jews, not a Babylonian king in the sixth century. It presents the kingdoms as the agents of God for the punishment of Israel. The fourth kingdom, however, oversteps the bounds established by Yahweh, and exceeds the punishment intended by God. For this reason, it, like the fourth level in the statue in chapter 2, is crushed, leaving the other three powers subjugated, caged as it were.

Significantly, this reuse of the material from the stories, especially the dream, shows that to the writers, the dream of Nebuchadnezzar was not just a story. They accepted this dream as a true revelation from God, but in need of elaboration from the perspective of Israel, and as a way to explain the second century situation. The elaboration from the perspective of Israel was based upon Yahweh’s revelations to the prophets. Thus, the dream of chapter 2 and its interpretation were for the author of chapter 7, scripture.

Dan 8

In this chapter, one focus of scholars has been the origin of the Ram (גָּלְבָּן) and Goat (לָאָמָר). Cumont suggested that they had their origins in a Zodiac, based upon what was known from a fragmentary text.125 In this Zodiac the ram represents...
Persia (cf. 8:20) and the goat, Syria. This is similar to the figures in chapter 8. As Collins notes, however, in *Dan* the goat represents Greece prior to the death of Alexander the Great. Others have noted how the ram and goat are symbols of power. I would suggest that this chapter’s association with the temple and sacrifices influenced the choice of the ram and goat for the animals. The visionary is concerned with the temple and cult in vv. 11, 12, 13, 14, and 26. Reference is made in *Dan* 8:13 to cessation of the “continual burnt offering” (דְּכָל דֶּבָּר בִּילֵא). In *Num* 28-29 where regulations are laid down for it, the ram and the goat are for sacrifices repeatedly associated with the continual burnt offering.

*Dan* 8 uses לְדָּרֵת לַחֶשֶׁר for the goat except at 8:21 where we find לוֹדֵא לַחֶשֶׁר. It is likely that this dual reference is the result of a gloss, where the more normal לוֹדֵא defines the late and rarer form לְדָּרֵת. There is only one other passage where the ram (לְדָּרֵת) and goat (לְזֵאָב) appear together, *2 Chr* 29:21-23. There the ram and לְזֵאָב appear together in v. 21 as part of a list of sacrifices to be carried out. In v. 23, however, where לוֹדֵא should come again in the sequence of the sacrifices that were actually carried out, the more common term לוֹדֵא appears. The two terms are then related either as synonyms or as a more specific term לוֹדֵא that can be referred to by the more general term לוֹדֵא. The author of this vision in *Dan* 8, therefore, seems to have lighted upon these particular animals for the vision because they are part of the cult that was stopped. Contrary to the animals in chapter 7, these are clean, as animals legislated for use as sacrifices. If there is a relevance to the animals beyond the

---


127 59x.

128 6x: *Dan* 8:5, 8, 21; *Ezra* 8:35; *2 Chr* 29:21.
association with the דָּרֵך, it would be that the animals are sacrificed, an indication of the end of these nations!

As chapter 7 is a development of chapter 2, so chapter 8 is a development of chapter 7. There is an actual reference to the vision of chapter 7 at 8:1. Whereas chapter 7 took the sequence of four kingdoms from chapter 2 as the basis for its vision, chapter 8 takes the animal imagery, and especially the sprouting of horns, for its use from chapter 7. 129 It begins with a ram taking over the world and then a goat dominating the ram. 130 The focus of the vision is clearly set upon Antiochus Epiphanes, the little horn in 8:9-12, which is interpreted in 23-25.

The description of the little horn, Antiochus, is drawn from the taunt in Isa 14:12-15 about the fall of Helal ben Shahar (Day Star son of Dawn, the king of Babylon), and from the context of the taunt. 131 This figure’s hubris led him to think of himself as a god who would rule over the world. In the end, however, he is reduced to death and the abode of the shades; unlike other kings, however, he dies without a proper burial. The concentration in Dan 7 of themes and terms from that material is significant. In Isa it is Yahweh of Hosts (יְהֹウェָה הָוָּאִים) who speaks after the taunt in 14:22, 23, 24, and 27; in Dan it is “the host of heaven” (הָוָָאִים; 8:10), and “the

129 It should be noted that such imagery seems to have been part of the milieu of the Maccabean revolt. See 1 Enoch 90:9ff. Zech 2:18-21, may be the origin of the imagery for both Dan 7 and 1 Enoch 90.

130 As the vision begins, it is reminiscent of the vision of Pharaoh in Gen 41 in which two sets of cows (יִתְנָף) stand on the bank of a river, and one overpowers the other. There are significant differences, however. In Gen the animals are the same, here they are different. In Gen one set, the emaciated ones, eat the well fed ones. Here the two merely clash, with one dominating the other. Cf. Ezek 34.

prince of the host” (וֶהֵם מַהֲלָא; 8:11) against whom the little horn makes attacks. In Isa Helal ben Shachar boasts: “I will ascend to heaven (הַלְּכָכָרָא); I will raise (חָרָא) my throne above the stars of God (לְכֶלְכָכָרָא); I will sit on the mount of assembly on the heights of Zaphon (חָרָא אַל); 132 in Dan the Ram charges from the west to the other three directions of the compass, including the north (חָרָא אַל; 8:4). When the little horn on the goat took over (9-10), it “grew exceedingly great toward the south, toward the east, and toward the beautiful land [i.e., west]. It grew as high as the host of heaven (יִלְעַת הַשִּׁמְשִׁים).” This latter reference to heaven could be a play on “heaven” (לֶכֶלְכָר) and “Zaphon” (חָרָא) in the north (חָרָא אַל) in Isa 14:13. In 8:25 it is explained that “in his own mind he shall be great” (כִּהֲמוֹן יִדְבָּר) and likewise, in Isa 14:13 the writer charges: “You said in your heart, ‘I will ascend to heaven’…”

Helal ben Shachar (14:20) and Antiochus (8:24-25) both destroyed (יִבְשַׁח) people under their rule. The writer of Dan 8, finding in this material from Isa a prediction of the fall of Antiochus, took comfort in the realization that as Helal ben Shahar was doomed to fall from heaven (יִלְעַת מַשָּמְשִים; 14:12), so, in a role reversal, would be the little horn which would cast down to the earth (יָרָפָא אֵזוֹחָא) some of the stars (8:10). Yahweh would break (יִבְשַׁח) Antiochus, as he had sworn to break (לְשַׁבָּר) the Assyrian in his land (14:25). Thus, in the end “his yoke shall be removed from them, and his burden from their shoulders” (14:25).

In addition to Isa 14 being used, Hab 2:3 is also used. The writer of the vision makes it clear that the older prophecy against the king of Babylon, as updated in the setting of the sixth century, really was for a later time. Using the language of Hab 2:3 (חָוֹז הַלְּכָרָא רְפָא לְכָרָא כִּי יְעַר), he answers Daniel’s question about how long until the vision would come to pass (8:13), by saying “that the vision is for the time of the

132 Although not part of this chapter, the allusions to chapter 7 should be apparent here, with the use of throne (7:9), the clouds (7:13), and Most High (7:18, etc.).
end” (8:17; הַמָּצָּר הָיוֹם; 17) (8:17; מַלּוֹאָם כָּל). Like the prophet Isaiah (8:16; מַדְּמֹר כָּל) and later in the vision of 10-12 (12:4 כָּלֵי מַדְּמֹר כָּל), the visionary is to seal up (מָלַל) the vision.

Conclusion

The material that we have covered to this point is sufficient proof that the authors of the visions understood themselves to be divinely aided interpreters of what they considered to be authoritative scriptures. They understood their task to be that of finding those prophecies that referred to their day. From those texts they wrote prophecies that any maskil like them could have written, given that such aided interpreters would have known to what the prophecies referred. One such person from a previous time was Daniel, which was why they could put his name on these mostly ex eventu prophecies. The writers of the visions in Dan had a similar approach to their scriptures as the pesherists whose works are found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

One of the interesting insights that such a study provides is an indication of what they considered to be “scriptures”. The texts that were found to have been used, both in this chapter and in previous ones are: Gen, Exod, Lev, Num, Isa and Deutero-Isa. Jer, Ezek, Hos, Hab, Dan 2, Chr-Ezra-Neh.

One of the significant discoveries made through our examination of the prophecies used by the writers of the visions is that the nations that come against Israel, including the Syrians under Antiochus Epiphanes, do so as the instruments of God. The view would seem to be that after the return from exile, Israel was still in need of punishment at times, and so God sent nations against them, just as he had sent the Assyrians and Babylonians. Even Antiochus Epiphanes seems to have come against Israel as an instrument of God, but he was more like Belshazzar than Nebuchadnezzar, more the feet of clay than the head of gold. This fits well with what Jeremiah
prophesied, that the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar, the servant of God, would come as the means of His punishment, but later under some other monarch would overstep the bounds and need to be punished. The Syrians too seem to have come as part of the plan of God to punish the violators of the covenant within Israel. Antiochus, however, overstepped the bounds with some of his actions, and thus would incur the wrath of God. This is a very deuteronomistic point of view. Significantly, however, this point of view does not surface in the visions, so much as it lies beneath the surface affecting what one sees happening above it. The time for self-criticism was past by the time that Antiochus Epiphanes came onto the scene with his programme for the Jews. The visionaries wanted only to highlight what would happen to Antiochus, and how the events of their day would be turned around by God, as he had revealed would happen centuries before in the prophecies of the prophets.

Second Temple Examples

The maškilîm were not the only ones who thought they had divine aid when interpreting such prophecies. There were others. In order to give a bit of context to the previous investigation, we will look to two bodies of literature for help. The Dead Sea Scrolls come from a context that is very close to that of Dan. They also give us some information about roles that were similar to those of the writers of Dan, and were portrayed by them in the book. As well, Josephus related some incidents about Essenes that highlight some of what we have noted about the writers of the visions of Dan.

The Dead Sea Scrolls

We have already made reference to the pesherim in our consideration of the actualisations of the prophetic material within the visions. Among the scrolls as well.
are references to two specific individuals or roles that we must consider: the Teacher of Righteousness, and the writer(s) of the *Hodayot*, especially the *Maškil*.

In the *Hab Peshar* there are two places where it becomes clear that the Teacher of Righteousness is an individual with a prophetic-like role. In col. 2, ll. 1-10, the pesherist elaborates on *Hab* 1:5:

[... The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with the Man of the Lie, since they do not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God (מָשִׁיק).... They are violators of the covenant who will not believe when they hear all that is going [to happen] to the final generation, from the mouth of the Priest whom God has placed within the community, to foretell the fulfillment of all the words of his servants, the prophets, [by] means of whom God has declared all that is going to happen to his people Israel.

And in col. 7, ll. 1-8:

God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen <to> the last generation, but he did not let him know the consummation of the era. Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants, prophets. *Hab* 2:3 For the vision has an appointed time, it will have an end and not fail. Its interpretation: the final age will be extended and go

---

133 Unlike the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Maškil*, the Interpreter must find out what is hidden; it is not revealed to him: “And every matter hidden from Israel but which has been found out by the Interpreter, he should not keep hidden from them for fear of a spirit of desertion.... As it is written (*Isa* 40:3): «In the desert, prepare the way of ****, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God». This is the study of the law which he commanded through hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit.” *IQS* 8, ll. 11-16 (García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 88-91).


135 Cf. *IQ22* 2, 6; the Mosaic Law came from the mouth of God.

136 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 12-13. Cf. *4Q381* frags. 76-77, l 8, “and you will pay attention to the wisdom which issues from my mouth...” (García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 762-63).
beyond all that the prophets say, because the mysteries of God are wonderful.\textsuperscript{137}

The Teacher of Righteousness speaks what comes from the mouth of God. What God makes known to the Teacher of Righteousness is not a new vision, but the true meaning of an old vision that Habakkuk had received. Habakkuk's vision had been filled with meaning for a day that was far in the distance, and God had made it known to the Teacher of Righteousness that the day had come, and revealed to him the significance of that vision. The final sentence cited makes it clear that this same hermeneutic was to be applied to all of the prophets.\textsuperscript{138}

The second Qumran role/figure is the writer(s) of the \textit{Hodayot}. We should note especially the \textit{Maškil}, if for no other reason than the title that he is given and its relationship to \textit{maškilîm} in \textit{Dan} 11-12. This title is associated with a specific range of knowledge and authority (\textit{IQS} 3:13-16; 9:12-21).\textsuperscript{139} The main role, however, is that of teaching (\textit{IQS} 3:13, 9:17-18),\textsuperscript{140} although he may have had others, such as governor of the calendar,\textsuperscript{141} and possibly even an apotropaic function (\textit{4Q510} 1 4-5).

\textsuperscript{137} García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, \textit{Dead Sea Scrolls}, 16-17.

\textsuperscript{138} In the \textit{Apostrophe to Zion} found in the \textit{4Q88} and \textit{11Q5}, the writer encourages Zion to accept the vision (\textit{מֵיתוֹן}) or prophetic dream(s) (\textit{מֶהָרְאָב}) about it.

\textit{4Q88} (\textit{4QPsf}), col. VIII, \textit{ll} 13-14, "Accept a vision (\textit{מֵיתוֹן}) spoken in your regard, a dream (\textit{מֶהָרְאָב}) of prophets requested for you!" (García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, \textit{Dead Sea Scrolls}, 280-81);

\textit{11Q5}, col. XXII, \textit{ll} 13-14, "Acquire a vision (\textit{מֵיתוֹן}) spoken in your regard, dreams (\textit{מֶהָרְאָב}) of prophets requested for you!" (García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, \textit{Dead Sea Scrolls}, 1176-77).

It is difficult to know whether such revelations are in addition to those found in the prophets, or whether they are those given by the prophets and relevant to Zion for the writer's day.


\textsuperscript{140} Koenen. "םָכֶל" \textit{sākal}. 794-95.
In the *Hodayot*, the writer(s) make some explicit claims that are similar to those applied to the Teacher of Righteousness. The most explicit statement is found in *IQH*, col. 20, ll. 10-13, where we read:

"For the God of knowledge (כומץ discretionary הָמוֹן) has established it and no-one else with him. Blank And I, the Instructor (משהיל), have known you (וֹדֵד הָרוֹשֵׁה), my God, through the spirit which you gave in me (ברחא אשרש נאה הַבָּם), and I have listened loyally to your wonderful secret (כָּסָר פָּלְאָבָה) through your holy spirit (כְּרִית). You have [op]ened within me knowledge of the mystery of your wisdom (דְּרֵחַ בָּרָה שֶלֹכָה), and the source of [your] power..."

Here the composition is by one who uses the designation יָשָׁלִיל, Instructor."  

In other locations the writer(s) gives thanks to his God for the spirit that his God has placed in him or upon him, e.g., *IQH*, col. 4, l. 17 "[I give] you [thanks] for the spirits which you placed in me (כָּסָר אשרש נאה הַבָּם),"  

and *IQH*, col. 4, l. 26, "I give thanks because you have spread [your] holy spirit upon (ודימורה וריה קִדְרְשְׁךָו) your servant." In other Dead Sea Scrolls material, as in the Hebrew Scriptures (cf. Neh 9:20), it was the קיוד of God through which prophecies were given: *CD-A* col. 2, 12-13, "And he taught them by hand of <the anointed ones> with his holy spirit and through seers of the truth, and their names were

---

141 Newsom, "Functions of the *Maškîl*, 378-81.

142 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 192-93.

143 The parallels with material in *Dan* are significant. It makes this researcher wonder whether there is more than just a comparative relationship. Although J. C. Trever, "The book of Daniel and the origin of the Qumran Community," *BA* 48 (1985): 89-102, may have overstated the case by positing that the Teacher of Righteousness was the author of *Dan*, positing a close relationship is not unreasonable.

144 There is no indication of who the "I" is in the following material.

145 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 148-49.

146 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 148-49.
established with precision”; 147 4Q381 Frag. 69, l 4, “And through his spirit prophets
were given to you to teach (יִנְנָל) you and show you …” 148

It is also a theme elsewhere that God instructed the writer(s) of the Hodayot and
gave him special knowledge. We see this in the following: 1QH, col. 6, ll. 8-11,
“[Blessed are you,] Lord, who puts wisdom (בְּלֵךְ) in the heart of [your] servant to
kn[ow ָו (לֹא)] all these matters, to unders[and (לַאַהְבּוֹ) …] to restrain oneself
when faced with deeds of wickedness, …. You teach your servant (יִנְנָל)
….”, 149 1QH, col. 7, l. 15, “But I, I know (רַדְו), thanks to your intellect (בְּלֵךְ)
….”, 150 1QH, col. 9, l. 21, “These things I know (רַדְו) through your knowledge
(מַהְרִית), for you opened my ears to wondrous mysteries (רַדְו) although all I
am is a creature of clay”; 151 and 1QH, col. 19, ll. 27-28, “Blessed are yo[u, Lord,]
because you have given [your] ser[vant] the insight of knowledge to understand your
wonders (יִנְנָל רַדְו הָאַהְבּוֹ, בְּלֵךְ אַהְבּוֹ) …” 152

Given that light appears in both the Dead Sea Scrolls 153 and in Dan as a wisdom
term, 1QH, col. 12, ll. 5-6 may also be a reference to special knowledge: “I give you

147 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 553.
148 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 762-63.
149 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 152-53.
150 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 154-55. This is a chant
for the Maškil.
151 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 158-59.
152 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 190-91.
153 E.g., 4Q511, Frag. 18, col. 2, ll. 7-8, “And I detest all deeds of impurity, for
God made the knowledge of intelligence shine (יִנְנָל) in my
heart” (García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 1032-33). Cf. 4Q511,
Frgs. 48, 49 + 51 (fragments 44-62, col. 2), l. 1, “Because he has placed [the wisdom]
of his intelligence [in my] hear[t …]” (יִנְנָל הָאַהְבּוֹ); García Martínez, and Tigchelaar. Dead Sea Scrolls, 1034-35); see also 11Q5, col. 27, l. 3 in
the paragraph above.
thanks, Lord, because you have lightened (נְלַכְתָּנִי) my face for your covenant and […] I have looked for you. Like perfect dawn you have revealed yourself (יִרְצָהֲנֵה) to me with perfect light (יִרְצָהֲנֵה). This is confirmed in 11.27f. where this writer also says that he teaches the Many and passes on the “light” that he received from God.

In addition to the Teacher of Righteousness and the writers of the Hodayot, there is at least one other passage that is relevant to our work in Dan. In a composition about David, 11Q5, col. 27, ll. 2-4, and l 11, we read:

And David, son of Jesse, was wise (.§ם), and a light (noon) like the light of the sun, and learned (לָאֵפֵר), Blank and discerning (נֵפְזָה), and perfect in all his paths before God and men. Blank And YHWH gave him a discerning and enlightened (וֺוִוֵוֵו) spirit. And he wrote psalms (inלֶפֶר) and all these he spoke through (the spirit of) prophecy (נֵפָר), which had been given to him from before the Most High.

Here the writer uses נְלַכְתָּנִי to describe David, all of which are found in the same or cognate form in Dan. This portrayal of David may be based upon such passages as 1 Sam 18:14-15 (and 18:30, although this lone occurrence of the qal of the verb is problematic), in which David is said to have been מְשָכִיל, and that YHWH was with him. Although probably intended to convey the idea of “successful”, later interpreters might have understood מְשָכִיל with the more common sapiential denotation, or more likely, with the religious force of special knowledge of God. As in 1 Chr 28:19, the 11Q5 material implies that the writing of the psalms was the result of the “discerning and enlightened spirit” which YHWH gave David.

154 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 166-67.

155 García Martínez, and Tigchelaar, Dead Sea Scrolls, 1178-79.

156 Note another parallel with the Levites above, p. 297.

157 See above, p. 295.
which is also described as נדיב, “a spirit of prophecy”. In this way David is like the prophet/seer Levites in the Chronicler who prophesied when they sang.\textsuperscript{158}

These figures or roles from the Qumran material come from a similar period to the \textit{maškilîm} of \textit{Dan}. They reveal divine knowledge. The Teacher of Righteousness speaks what he hears from the mouth of God — mysteries hidden in past prophecies.

The \textit{Maškil} and other writers of the \textit{Hodayot} teach with knowledge received because they were endued with God’s spirit, just as the prophets were. They too knew secrets of God, being taught them by God, so that they could teach them to the appropriate people in the community, the Many.

\textit{Josephus}\textsuperscript{159}

Although he is a few centuries removed from the time of the final composition of \textit{Dan}, Josephus also provides some interesting examples of the kind of people who fill a role similar to that portrayed by the writer(s) of \textit{Dan} and described in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In \textit{War} and \textit{Antiquities} he relates stories about three different 'אוסדריאית, 'Essenes’. We will not be concerned with the veracity of the accounts, or


their sources, or their relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls or the Qumran community, but rather with the portrayal itself.

Before considering the stories of the Essenes, it may be helpful to note the distinction that Josephus seemed to maintain between the classical prophets (of whom Daniel was one\footnote{See above, “Chapter 2”, “The Daniel of Josephus”.}) and those who came after the time of Artaxerxes (\textit{Apion} 1.8 [1.41]).\footnote{Presumably this terminus is chosen in order to include Esther among the prophets. L. H. Feldman, “Prophets and prophecy in Josephus,” \textit{JTS} 41 (1990): 386-422.} Although people after the time of Artaxerxes predicted the future, Josephus only once calls anyone but the biblical prophets by the title προφήτης.\footnote{Cleodemus, in \textit{Antiquities} 1.15 (1.240), although as Feldman, “Prophets and prophecy in Josephus”, 400-01, points out, it is most likely a quote from Alexander Polyhistor.} The reason would seem to be that, due to the “failure of the exact succession (την … ἀκριβῆ διαδοχήν) of the prophets” (\textit{Apion} 1.8 [1.41]), there was no way to verify the credentials of one who would be a prophet. This then is not a matter of degree of accuracy or of inspiration, but a technical reason focused upon the passing of the office from prophet to student.\footnote{Feldman, “Prophets and prophecy in Josephus”, 405, \textit{contra} Gray, \textit{Prophetic Figures}, 34, 109.} According to Josephus, however, prophecy in the sense of predicting the future did not cease and those who practiced this art he called μάντες.\footnote{See Gray, \textit{Prophetic Figures}, 107-10, for a discussion of the use of the μάντης group of words by Josephus. One major flaw in her overall argument is the discussion of \textit{Antiquities} 6.14.2 (6.327). There, Josephus relates how Saul had banished “the diviners, ventriloquists and all practitioners of such arts, except the prophets” (τούς μάντες καὶ τούς ἐγγαστριμύθους καὶ πάσαν τὴν τοιαύτην τέχνην … ἔξω τῶν προφητῶν). The point that Gray makes is that the word is here used “not to distinguish certain figures from genuine prophets, but rather to point to types of prophecy that required a certain degree of technical expertise” (p. 110). By ‘prophecy’, she means, ‘prediction’. It would seem, however, that Josephus does just what she says he does not. There were various types who predicted the future, but only those who were specially enabled to do so by God and who were verified as in that tradition, \textit{i.e.}, the prophets, were allowed to stay. One who had predictive abilities, but}
Among those who predict the future in the works of Josephus (himself included among the numbers\textsuperscript{165}), there are three Essenes who do so and seemingly with the aid of scripture. These accounts have commentary by Josephus and further explanation in an additional passage in \textit{War}.

The first account we will consider is of a prediction (μαντευμα) by Judas the Essene, in \textit{War} 1.3.5 (1.78-80) and \textit{Antiquities} 13.11.2 (13.311-313).\textsuperscript{166} The story relates how this μαντις (1.80) had predicted that Antigonus would die on a particular day at a location named Strato’s Tower. When Antigonus passed Judas and his disciples at the temple in Jerusalem on that day, but too far from the predicted location, Judas was distressed because he had apparently given a false prediction. However, Antigonus was killed on that day at a different location by the same name.

Josephus relates two pieces of data relevant to our investigation. Judas was known for his ability to predict the future. Josephus writes of him that “he had never failed or deceived men in his predictions before” (οὐκ ἔστιν δὲ παῖσας ἡ ψευσθεὶς ἐν τοῖς προαπαγγέλμασιν; \textit{War} 1.78); and that he was one “who never missed the truth in his predictions” (συνεποτε δ’ ἐν διαψευσάμενον τὰληθές; \textit{Antiquities} 13.311). Josephus also notes that Judas was in the company of a large number of acquaintances (διδασκαλία) in how to tell the future (τοῦ προλέγειν τὰ

\textsuperscript{165} \textit{War} 3.8.3; \textit{Life} 42 (208) in which he ascribes his ability to predict to his study of scripture and his priestly lineage.

\textsuperscript{166} See Gray, \textit{Prophetic Figures}, 92-95 for commentary and bibliography on this story.
μέλλοντα).\textsuperscript{167} How they were being taught is not evident from the passage, but as I shall discuss below, it may well have been through the study of the writings of the prophets, at least in part. However, the specificity of the prediction is not something that is paralleled elsewhere, and how this would be based upon the writings of the prophets is in no way clear from Josephus’ account.\textsuperscript{168} A parallel may be made with how the specifics of \textit{Dan} 11 arose out of the nexus of the writer’s knowledge of his day and certain parallels to the prophecies. Some such similar practice could be in evidence here.

Judas, then, predicts the future in some detail, in a way similar to what Daniel does in the visions in chapters 8 and 11-12. Like the \textit{maskiim} in 11-12, and writer(s) of the \textit{Hodayot}, Judas also teaches others, but more specifically he teaches others how to predict as he does.

The story of Menahem and Herod, found in \textit{Antiquities} 15.10.5 (15.372-379),\textsuperscript{169} relates how this Essene, like Judas, “had foreknowledge of future events given him by God” (πρόγνωσιν ἐκ θεοῦ τῶν μελλόντων ἔχων; 15.373). He predicted the rise of the boy Herod to king. Herod remembered him later, and had a favourable view of the Essenes because of this man. At the end of this story, Josephus adds: “We have thought it proper to relate these facts to our readers, how strange soever they be, and to declare what had happened among us, because many of these Essenes have, by their

\textsuperscript{167} “His acquaintances (τοὺς γνωρίζοντας), (they were not a few who attended upon him as his scholars)” [Ἡσαύ δ’ οὖν ἄλλοι παρεδρεύοντες αὐτῷ τῶν μαθητῶν]; \textit{War} 1.78; “to his companions and friends (ἐν τοῖς ἑταίροις αὐτοῦ καὶ γνωρίζοντας) who abode with him as his scholars, in order to learn the art of foretelling things to come” (οἱ διδασκαλίας ἔνεκα τοῦ προλέγειν τα μέλλοντα; \textit{Antiquities} 13.311-312).

\textsuperscript{168} Gray, \textit{Prophetic Figures}, 94, 105-07.

\textsuperscript{169} See Gray, \textit{Prophetic Figures}, 95-101 for commentary and bibliography on this story.
excellent virtue, been thought worthy of this knowledge of divine revelations \(\text{καὶ τῆς τῶν θείων ἐμπειρίας ἀξιούντων}^{15,379}\). We have already noted that Judas was teaching some disciples to predict the future, so one had apparently to be both a member of the group and found worthy by God.

Like Daniel, Menahem’s ability to predict the future came from God, although the story itself does not make clear how this happened. That the ability was given to the Essenes due to their virtue is similar to the connection in *Dan* 1 between unreserved obedience to God (not eating the food of the king) and the reception of the special abilities.

Josephus relates a story about another Essene named Simon who interpreted a dream for Archelaus: *War* 2.7.3 (2.111-113); and *Antiquities* 17.13.3 (17.345-348).\(^{170}\) When Archelaus had the dream he wanted it interpreted and so called the “the diviners \(\text{τοὺς μάντεις},\) and some of the Chaldeans” (*War* 2.112), or “those diviners \(\text{τοὺς μάντεις}^{171}\) who were concerned with dreams” (*Antiquities* 17.345-346). Among their number was Simon. Each diviner gave his interpretation of the dream, but they contradicted each other; only Simon gave the accurate interpretation of the dream.\(^{172}\)

\(^{170}\) See Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 101-05 for commentary and bibliography on this story. There are some similarities to the dream of the Pharaoh in the Joseph story (*Gen* 41:14-36). Although quite different in many ways, the similarities suggest some connection, Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, II, 162 n. 846. Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 102-04, however, does not find the similarities sufficiently convincing as evidence of literary dependence.

\(^{171}\) Unlike the *Dan* stories, there is no coercion referred to in this story. It seems reasonable, therefore, to refer to Simon and the other Essenes who predict as \(\text{μάντες},\) mantes, or diviners of the future. See the discussion at Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 239-41.

\(^{172}\) Josephus seems to be blind to the element of hindsight at work here, possibly because he was trying to make the story fit those in *Dan*. At the time, Simon’s would have been just another interpretation, possibly different only in its ingenuity. It is more likely, if such actually happened, that its clarity came with a fulfilment that was in keeping with his interpretation, not at the time that they were given. This is similar to the situations involving false and true prophets: at the time there is no difference
The similarities to the stories of Dan are clear enough. Like Daniel, Judas finds himself among the numbers of diviners in a ruler’s court who were called upon to interpret a dream. As with Daniel in Dan 2, 4, and 5, only Simon can help. Where this story differs is in the interpretation scene; everyone gives an interpretation, whereas in Dan it is only he who does.

Josephus explains in War 2.8.12 (2.159) how he understood such mantics to predict the future, and how they were able to pass this on to their disciples.

There are also among them those who profess to foreknow the future (τὰ μέλλουσα προγνώσεων), being educated in sacred books (βιβλίων θεών), various purifications (διαφόρων ἁγνείας), and sayings of the prophets (προφητῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν); and it is but seldom that they err in their predictions (ἐν ταῖς προαγορεύσεσιν ἀστοχοῦσιν).

The sacred books need not be just biblical works. To insist upon that would be reading back into that period a later concept of canon. Doubtless, the prophetic material represented by the Major and Minor Prophets were covered by that term. It may also include a variety of works such as those found at Qumran. The “sayings of the prophets” are not the same as the sacred books. Whether they are collections, such as between them, the difference comes in the accuracy of their predictions or in the winning of societal acceptance.

According to Josephus, however, Daniel was one of the greatest of the prophets (Antiquities 10.11.7 [10.266]), not a μάντις.

See Gray, Prophetic Figures, 83-92 for commentary and bibliography on this passage. In War 3.8.3 Josephus relates how he had been given foreknowledge of various events in symbolic dreams from God, and again in a moment of ecstasy. He arrived at his interpretation of the dreams by his own ability and due to his priestly study of the prophets’ prophecies. At 3.8.9 (3.399-408) Josephus relates how he predicted the rise of Vespasian to the position of Caesar, and the fall of Jotapata, among other predictions. According to rabbinic tradition, the one who made the prediction was R. Yohanan b. Zakkai (Geza Vermes et al., The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135) by Emil Schürer, 2d ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-1987), I, 494 n. 41).

Cf. also War 2.8.6 (2.136).

Cf. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, 240; and Gray, Prophetic Figures. 85.
the *Florilegium* (*4Q*174) and *Testimonia* (*4Q*175), or some form of oral tradition, is unknown.\(^{177}\) The connection between prediction and purity is not clear, but it seems reasonable to hypothesize that a virtuous life and faithful observance of all the purity rituals were connected in no insignificant way.\(^{178}\) Thus, those who would be in tune with God sufficiently to understand the divine plan for the future had to be at a high level of purity.\(^{179}\) It may also be that they used certain rituals to prepare themselves for ecstatic experiences.

The combination of books and purity rituals are found in *Dan*. Special knowledge of writings is specifically noted in 1:17 and is linked to the retaining of purity. In 9, it is reflection upon the prophecy of Jeremiah that leads to the fasting and prayer that precede the reception of the revelation through the interpreting angel. In chapter 10 it is, similarly, mourning rituals that precede the revelation. Similarly also in chapter 2, but without the fasting, the revelation comes after prayer.

In this period, then, we find Jewish “prophetic” figures that predict the future by using the prophetic material available to them, and with divine assistance. In the cases of the pesherists, the Teacher of Righteousness, and the Essenes of Josephus’ writings, the predictions go well beyond what \(\textit{it}\) says, and extract from the text the “mysteries of God”. This is similar to what we find in *Dan* where so much is made of

\(^{177}\) Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 89. On the existence of such collections and their use, see Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 150-58.

\(^{178}\) In a similar way, Ben Sirach in his description of the scribe connects the study of the writings with purity of life: *Sir* 39:1-5: “On the other hand he who devotes himself to the study of the law of the Most High will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients (σοφίαν πάντων ἀρχαίων ἐξητήσει), and will be concerned with prophecies (ἐν προφητείαις ἀσχολῆσαι)... He will set his heart to rise early to seek the Lord who made him, and will make supplication before the Most High; he will open his mouth in prayer and make supplication for his sins.” (RSV) See Eric Heaton, *The Book of Daniel: The Kingdoms of the World and the Kingdom of God* (London: SCM, 1967), 19-24 for a comparison of Ben Sirach and “the author” of *Dan*.

three words (chapter 5), or of other prophecies (chapters 7-12); certainly more than is evident from any ‘normal’ reading of the text. All these figures teach others: the Teacher of Righteousness teaches the readers of the pesherim and of the community; the Maškil, the community; and the Essenes, rulers and disciples.

Conclusion

At the opening of this chapter, we set out to determine whether the portrayal of Daniel in 1-6 was really used as the portrait of the second century BCE writers of the visions of 7-12. The evidence certainly would support such a conclusion.

The portrayal of Daniel and the three in chapter 1 fits well with that of the Maškilim of chapters 11-12. We found in both the same set of players: faithful and faithless Jews; a king who was an aggressor and assimilator; teachers and learners. The portrayal of Daniel remained consistent as well. As in chapters 1-6, so in 7-12 Daniel does not rely upon his natural ability to interpret, but instead relies upon divine assistance through dreams, visions and interpreting angels. This approach to interpretation is found, as well, in the Dead Sea Scrolls where the Teacher of Righteousness, and the Maškil and other writers of the Hodayot are said to know what they do through divine assistance. The Teacher of Righteousness, especially is said to have insight into the true meaning of past prophecies which were given by God for his day. Josephus’ portrait of some of the Essenes as predictors through the use of scriptures rounds out the picture with some examples in a narrative.

The practices of such interpreters were found to be a significant source for the actual predictions in chapters 7-12. Chapters 7 and 8 expound the dream of chapter 2, but do so by meshing it with other predictions and prophetic and cultic material, as well as with the use of some common Near Eastern literary and iconographic themes. Chapters 9-12 have similarities to the writings of the pesherists in the Dead Sea Scrolls.
The similarities are not with the techniques of writing, e.g., a lemma followed by its interpretation. The similarity is with the process of using a previous prophecy to explicate the events of one’s own day. While the pesherists were explicit about that, the writers of 7-12 placed the results of their interpretations back into the sixth century BCE setting, with Daniel as the recipient of the revelations. Their justification for this could well have been that, whereas the prophecies were really written for their day, any maškilîm of the past would have come to the same conclusions, because the interpretation did not come from their own imagination (that is what those who played at being maškilîm did), but rather came from their God, who was the same God as the earlier maškilîs, i.e., Daniel’s.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

In this chapter we will be reviewing what we have learned from the research that has been explained in the body of the dissertation. We will review those conclusions that contribute to our understanding of both Daniel and Dan. We will also consider what areas of further research might bear fruit.

In “Chapter F” we set out the problem. Since Hans Peter Müller wrote his articles on the figure of Daniel and the relationship between “mantic wisdom” and apocalyptic thought, there has been much written on this topic, and his proposal has become the scholarly consensus. That consensus has been forwarded mostly through the writing of John J. Collins. However, what has been produced has suffered from a fuzzy definition of the basic phrase, “mantic wisdom”. As Müller meant it, it was a synonym for “divination expertise”, but, when translated into English, it took on the sense of “predictive wisdom”. In addition to that there is the problem of the types of diviners to whose practices one could look in order to come to a better understanding of this supposed branch of wisdom. The confusion from the lack of clear definitions and classification of practitioners of this wisdom led to the mixing of such disparate groups as learned court diviners in Mesopotamia and African ecstatics. Our initial assessment of the arguments for Daniel being related to a mantic wise man tradition found them to be tenuous. There were other viable possibilities, including that the character of Daniel was modelled after biblical characters such as Joseph. There was sufficient confusion about the origins of the Daniel figure, the main gateway into the mantic theory, to warrant a fuller examination of it. Thus we undertook a detailed examination of the relationship among the Daniels that form the putative tradition that has been suggested
as the source of the hero of *Dan*. That would aid in our examination to look at the relationship between the first half of the book, which developed over a few centuries, and the second half, which was written during the turbulent final years of Antiochus Epiphanes. The question that lay behind the examination was, what can the Daniel character tell us about the group that wrote the visions of chapters 7-12?

In “Chapter 2” we began the investigation with an examination of the various figures that have been set forth as part of a “Daniel” tradition. We focussed upon whether Daniel can be said to be based upon a mantic wise man tradition, or whether some other tradition deals with the evidence better. We concluded that:

1. The name “Daniel” cannot be assumed to provide us with some extraordinary tie to a tradition. It was found in Arabic, Amorite, Eblaitic, Assyrian, Old Babylonian, Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Greek. Doubtless as more lists of names are compiled, more Daniels will be found. With the meaning “El has judged”, the name offered those who named infants, and those who gave names to literary characters alike, a meaningful name for times of crisis, when God was expected to, or was assumed to have judged.

2. After a detailed examination of the Dn’il character from *Aqht*, and a comparison with the Danel in the *Ezek* texts, we concluded that the bases upon which Müller came to his theory about Dn’il being a magico-mantic wise man behind the *Ezek* references, were not there. Dn’il was not a practitioner of mantic wisdom in the Aqhat story; there is nothing to indicate that he saved his children, which is what *Ezek* 14 refers to; but he was righteous, although that was not very helpful for the consensus argument. If the association with the King of Tyre in chapter 28 was on the basis of Dn’il being a king, that was found not to be part of the present understanding of the story. Finally, given that a millennium of silence stands between *Aqht* and
the biblical texts, it is not likely that the story that is extant today would be what the authors of the *Ezek* passages knew, if they had such a story in mind. There is, then, too little to connect the Dn’il of Ugarit and the Danel of Ezekiel, and almost nothing except the name to connect the former with the Daniel of *Dan*. With this connection gone, Müller’s argument is placed on very shaky ground. There is nothing to suggest that the authors or redactors of the stories in *Dan* chose the name because of the association with a mantic wise man of the distant past. This opens the door again to further discussion on this matter.

3. Despite the previous conclusion, we also concluded that, given the information that is available to us from *Ezek* 14, some form of the Dn’il tradition could possibly lie behind it. However, what that “tradition” was like is not known. So, reliance of the writers of *Dan* on the passages in *Ezek* provided little support for Müller’s argument. The material in 28:3 was found to be part of an accretion to the text, and was very possibly based upon the information found in 14:14 and 20. To say that such a connection is a “tradition” is hardly helpful. That means that some of the connections that Müller had made were based upon a false premise.

4. We also concluded that the occurrence of a Danel in *Jub* 4:20 did not support Müller’s theory. That literary figure may be no more than a character based upon the information available in *Ezek*.

5. We concluded that there was nothing much to support the angels of *1 Enoch* or of the incantation bowls being part of a Daniel tradition. They were associated with magic, spells, and the revelation of esoteric knowledge, but that is not surprising given the story, and the use to which they were put in incantations. There is evidence that some prominent figures were thought to
be transformed into angels, but what that might tell us about the Daniel of \textit{Dan} is unclear, even if they were related.

6. The most significant conclusion from the research for “Chapter 2” was that there is good evidence for the source of the name for the character in \textit{Dan} being a priest from the exile. A priest named Daniel is referred to at \textit{Ezra} 8:2 and \textit{Neh} 10:7 as one of the returnees from Babylon. All four names used for the Jewish boys in \textit{Dan} are found among the lists of names at \textit{Neh} 8:4, 7; 10:7, and 24. We demonstrated that \textit{Dan} relies upon \textit{Chr-Ezr-Neh} in no small way for some of its historical outlines, and for some of the material for the prayer in chapter 9. This link at the later stages of \textit{Dan}’s development, the same point at which we noted the dependence upon \textit{Ezek}, in which we find the reference to another Daniel, shows that the names could well have come from these materials and information from both were joined together into a single character. The tradition of the priest is also found in the Old Greek of \textit{Bel}. Josephus may also have known the tradition from the Old Greek story and used that to make links between himself (a priest and of royal descent, and one who could predict the future) and Daniel (possibly a suggestion that Daniel was a priest (\textit{Ant} 10.265), of the tribe of Judah (1:6) and could predict the future). Later in \textit{4 Ezra}, Daniel and Ezra were linked as brothers, and therefore were thought to have been from the same period after the exile.

It is our conclusion that with the research presented in “Chapter 2”, the consensus position has been found seriously wanting. The one line of argument that is foundational to the theory that Daniel is being purposely portrayed as a mantic wise man, namely that he is based upon the Ugarit figure, is lacking in evidence. It
remained to be determined whether this theory could be substantiated through a close examination of the portrayal of Daniel.

In “Chapter 3”, we examined the roles of the functionaries in the stories in chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5, of whom Daniel is said to be one. The list of administrators found in Chapters 3 and 6 were used only for comparative purposes, because the stories are about administrators, not court diviners. Our interest in the chapter was to determine whether the stories contained any clues to whether the writers were actually such functionaries. One of the criteria was to determine whether the professions are portrayed positively, as scholars have contended.

Our survey of the use of the titles for the court experts, and the lists in which they occur led us to conclude that the writers give no evidence of real knowledge of such experts. At best their knowledge was that of onlookers who had a negative assessment of such practitioners.

1. We concluded the titles that are used of the court experts are not precise in any sense. Their derivation is mixed. מדרון and מדרון are used as an ethnic designation, “Chaldeans” (e.g., 5:30), and as the title for a non-specific diviner, “chaldean”, as in the list at 4:4 [7]. We also discovered that there is a nuanced usage where it is employed as both, in order to exclude the Jews in the reader’s/hearer’s minds from the numbers of the courtiers. Thus until the Jewish boys enter in 2:12 the experts are “Chaldeans”, but once the Jews are included among the number, the generic term becomes “wise men”. We concluded that מדרון, although ultimately of Egyptian origins, comes from reliance upon the stories about Joseph, and Moses and Aaron before the Pharaoh. Most significant is the Joseph story, upon which the Daniel stories, especially chapter 2, are known to be dependent for themes and vocabulary. מָלָש בֶּן is of Mesopotamian origins and denotes an exorcist. מָלָש also has a
connection to Mesopotamia, but the root is cognate with the Babylonian for sorcerer, a practitioner of black (harmful) magic, who would not be in the court of a ruler. We concluded that it is used at 2:2 in the pejorative sense, and was describing the experts as “those who practice sorcery”. כהה is the generic term for “experts”, not a term for a special group of skilled magicians and diviners. Its use in Dan was influenced by its general applicability to any expert, its use in Gen 41:8 and 7:11, where it occurs with other titles used in these lists, and also as an ironic contrast to the lack of expertise that these experts displayed. Finally, we concluded that כהה was descriptive of the extispex who “cut” open animals to read their entrails; this was the official means of divination in Babylon.

2. We concluded that, if the titles in Dan tells us anything, it is that the writers were from circles of administrators, which is hardly surprising given the practices of conquerors in the ancient Near East, and the evidence of material relating to that time period (e.g., Nehemiah as a cup bearer). The titles of administrators in chapters 3 and 6 are those that are found generally in Akkadian, Old Persian, and Aramaic. Their consistent derivation from Mesopotamian languages and administrative life form a stark contrast to the imprecision of the titles for religious experts.

3. We concluded through a text-critical analysis, and literary comparison of the lists in which the titles of religious experts occur, that the basic, full list of titles was חרטום, exorcist, chaldean, extispex”. According to the text these were “the sorcerers of the Chaldeans” (2:2). The examination of the occurrences of the titles throughout the stories also led to the insight that כהה does not occur until the Jews are introduced to the court story in chapter 2.
Also in “Chapter 3” we examined the portrayal of the court experts in the narratives. We concluded that the narratives provide a serious critique of the very foundations of the professions: they are portrayed as bogus. It is not simply a matter of the professionals in the court at that time being particularly incompetent.

1. Given our discovery that dates at the heads of the chapters are used with narrative significance elsewhere in Dan, we concluded that the date of chapter 2 was used to enhance the portrayal of the four: when they helped the king, they had not even finished their training. The professionals against whom the boys are tested after their three years of training, cannot match up to the novices (chapter 1). Also, significantly, where in chapter 2 “wise men” is used first it is as an ironic device to highlight their failure: the court “experts” failed, and it is the Jewish novice experts who prove to be truly wise.

2. We concluded that the professions, as well as the professionals were held up for ridicule. The king is portrayed in chapter 2 as not trusting the experts, suspecting them of playing him for a fool. It is also in this chapter where “wise men” is used first, and at that in an ironic usage: after their failure the king orders that all the so called “wise men” of the kingdom be killed. The portrayal does not improve, for in chapters 4 and 5, the task gets increasingly smaller and the revelation is not kept from them, yet the “experts” are still not able to interpret the revelations. Their portrayal as automatons, in contrast to the strong character of Daniel and the boys, can also be understood as a means of portraying the diviners in a humorous light. Even the kings take the brunt of humour, when they are portrayed as reacting inappropriately to bad news, and in Belshazzar’s case when he asks Daniel to make him react with terror, i.e., “to loosen his knots”.

3. We concluded that the professions of the diviners were negatively assessed. They offer a self-critique in chapter 2, explaining to the king that they did not have access to the gods. Daniel himself participates in this critique and explains that his bringing the dream and interpretation was not due to his ability, but to a revelation from his God. In chapter 4 this contrast is made by the king, who knows that Daniel can do what the others cannot because he had what they did not, the "spirit of the holy God in him". We also determined that it was significant that Daniel is portrayed as being among the numbers of such diviners. Those over whom he was leader fail when they are called upon to use their skills. And, as already noted, he does not attribute his ability to such human skills, but rather to his God.

We have concluded that nothing in Dan 1-6 should lead us to find a positive assessment of the "mantics" in the Daniel stories. They function in the stories as little more than pathetic, pagan charlatans who could not interpret a real revelation from God, no matter how simple it was.

"Chapter 4" brought us to the ultimate focus of the dissertation, the examination of the Daniel figure in the book: he and his three friends in Dan 1-5 [6]; and (in "Chapter 5") him alone in 7-12. In this chapter we examined the portrayal of Daniel in the narratives. The focus in this chapter was how Daniel functioned when he actually interpreted dreams and the writing on the wall. We took special note of the narrative and editorial commentaries provided on what he did. We concluded that Daniel, in contradistinction to the other professionals, is portrayed as a divinely aided interpreter.

1. As we already noted in the previous chapter, from the narrative the reader/hearer learns that Daniel was personally incapable of interpreting revelations, just like the others in the kings' courts. We concluded, however, that the story shows how his faithfulness to the God of Israel, proved him to
be worthy to be the means of God’s conveying interpretations of the
deliverances to the kings of Babylon. (Such faithfulness lasted through
Daniel’s and the three’s time in captivity, as chapters 3 and 6 make clear.)

2. We concluded that in Dan 1 there was a contrast of the so-called
"wise" and the truly "wise". The former included Daniel’s compatriots who
acquiesced to the Babylonians, but not the faithful three, Hananiah, Mishael,
and Azariah. In keeping with the choice of "Daniel," because it was the name
of a priest, some of the attributes of the entrants into the king’s training
programme were relevant to priests. Mostly, however, the characteristics are
intellectual and indicate that the king was looking for the up-and-coming
cream of Jewish intellectual life. However, being Jewish was not enough.
All the entrants were maškilîm “learned ones, insightful ones, teachers” in a
secular sense of the word, but Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah all
were given enhanced insight, and Daniel was specially gifted with the
interpretation of dreams and visions; they were the truly insightful ones. Real
wisdom comes from God, and is not learned in the school of hard knocks, the
classroom, or the court.

3. We concluded that the poetic material in chapter 2, had been included to
provide the hermeneutical lens through which to understand how Daniel
functions in the stories. Again, there is a contrast: although the “wise” fail
and are sentenced to death, the truly “wise”, are successful, because their
wisdom comes from their God. Specifically, Daniel is given the “mystery”
that was revealed to the king, along with its interpretation, because his God
was the revealer of mysteries.

4. Chapters 4 and 5 seem to be older stories in which Daniel may have
been an intuitive diviner. We concluded, however, that through narrative
connections the stories were remapped so that Daniel’s abilities are again attributed to aid from his God. Rather than visions in the night, the assistance is described as God’s spirit being in him. This phrase we concluded was related to the description of Joseph, and probably dependent upon that, but also is in the tradition of the spirit of God enabling God’s servants to carry out their tasks. Within the narrative, it points back to chapters 1 and 2. The kings are thus portrayed as recognizing in Daniel the real source of his abilities. We concluded that in the narrative of chapter 4, this assistance comes at the point where Daniel is troubled by his thoughts, which includes both the content and a person’s thoughts about it. In other words, he has a moment of revelation.

We concluded that chapter 5 is reworked through the use of dates. Daniel has revelatory experiences in the first and third years of Belshazzar, according to the headings of chapters 7 and 8. These, obviously predate the last night of the king’s as related in chapter 5. This chronological technique, which we found used in chapters 1 and 2, as well, gives Daniel the necessary divine assistance to interpret the word-riddle on the wall.

Such, then, are the things the writers of the visions wanted to portray to the reader about a maškil, in preparation for the visions that follow. This is the image that they had of themselves as maškilim, i.e., divinely aided interpreters for their day. The contrast of the inability of the pagan “mantes”, and the divine assistance for the faithful Jew is an extension of our discoveries in the previous chapter. Rather than choosing a diviner as the source of the name for the character, the redactors of the stories chose the name of a priest who was among the faithful who returned to Palestine, and the name of a character who had already been declared as wiser than a foreign king. The namesakes of the four were among those who participated in the covenant renewal and reading and teaching of the law after the return from the exile.
The authors/redactors of *Dan* did not want to portray Daniel as merely better than the other diviners in the court. They consistently portray him as doing something qualitatively different. Only interpreters such as Daniel, faithful Jews chosen by God, could reveal the mysteries of God to the world. It is not Daniel as a court expert that they were attempting to emulate, it was Daniel as the spirit endowed interpreter, which was a role independent of what he was forced to be in the courts of the kings of Babylon and Persia.

Having considered the background of the Daniel character, the professions of which he is a part, and the role that he plays in the stories, we were in a better position to determine whether there was a relationship with the visions and visionaries from the Maccabean era, and if so what those relationships might be. One of the features of the visions that had been noted by scholars was the reuse of older prophecies in the visions of 7-12. Given the emphasis upon the role of Daniel as a divinely aided interpreter in the stories of 1-6, and given the prominent role of interpretation of dreams and visions, and of the Jeremian prophecy in chapter 9, in “Chapter 5” we examined select prophetic passages used in the visions by the interpreters to make sense of their day.

1. *Dan* is clearly dependent upon *Jer* in chapter 9. The Jeremian prophecy of a 70-year exile is, after all the passage cited as that which the angel interprets for Daniel. *Dan* 9 was shown in “Chapter 2” to be dependent on *Chr-Ezra-Neh* for some of its historical framework. As well, we showed in this chapter that the prayer in 9 made significant use of material from that body of literature.

2. We concluded that the context in *Jer* from which the prophecy of 70 years comes provided information on some beliefs of the visionaries. *Jer* 25:13-14 could be interpreted to mean that any prophecy against a foreign nation in that book could be applied to Babylon. By a similar process, then
Babylon could be understood as Syria, and thus all the prophecies could apply to the writers’ day.

3. We concluded that the letter of Jeremiah to the Babylonian exiles, which contains the second reference to the 70-year period (29:10), provided the key to understanding why Daniel was not called a prophet or diviner in *Dan*. In that letter, it is conveyed that there would be no prophetic revelations for the exiles; all who claimed to receive dreams or prophecies were to be considered liars. Interpreters who knew of this passage could not have called Daniel a prophet, and doubtless would not have called him a diviner. Daniel, however, could receive visions for a future day, and could “seal them up” so that they were available when needed, which they were in the second century BCE.

4. Chapters 10-12 proved to be the most fruitful source of information. This account of a vision makes use of several old prophecies against the Assyrians. The use of *Hab* 2:2-4 had been noted by many scholars before our investigation. However, we were able to show other traces of its influence on the vision. We also examined the use of themes from *Hab* 1:8-11. Two significant conclusions were reached. First the use of the material from *Hab* was relevant to the writers of the visions, because in that book they found a paradigm for what they were experiencing and for what would happen to Antiochus Epiphanes. Just as the aggressor in *Hab* would be punished by God, so would Antiochus. The theme of the *Hab* material was repeated with the use of *Num* 24:24, and *Is* 10.

5. We reached another conclusion: the writers of the visions believed their opponents to be divine instruments of God. Just as the Assyrians and Babylonians had done God’s bidding to punish wicked Israel in the past, so the superpowers of their era were acting on God’s behalf. Also, just as the
Assyrians overstepped the bounds in Habakkuk’s day, just as the Babylonians did sometime after the era of Nebuchadnezzar (the “servant” of God), so the Syrians had overstepped the bounds in the actions of Antiochus.

6. We also concluded that the *maškilîm* of the second century found themselves in old prophecies. They were the ones for whom the visions had been sealed. They were the ones who were waiting. They were the ones who were righteous (*Hab* 2:2-4). The pride of place, however, was reserved for their role as the suffering servants of *Isa* 52-53. They found in this prophecy a description of themselves as the ones who would teach the people of God, the Many. They found the persecution that they were experiencing as they tried to teach the people what they needed to know to be right with God. But mostly, they found the reference to the title that they held, the *maškilîm*. Again it was at this point that we found connections with the teachers of Israel, as portrayed by the *Chr-Ezra-Neh* material. Like David giving insight into the plan of God for the temple to Solomon, and the Levites giving insight into the Law to the returned exiles, they were *maškilîm*, learned teachers who could give insight into the mysteries of God in the prophecies of old. They were latter day Daniels and like him were not prophets, for those had ceased, and not mere diviners, but divinely assisted interpreters with special insight into prophecies. This insight was available to any *maškil* such as them or Daniel, and so putting the prophecies into his mouth was not an act of deception, so much as a means to get a hearing for the unchanging mysteries of God.

7. We concluded that, although chapter 7 and 8 do not contain the same amount of interpreted material, nonetheless, they do follow the same pattern. Chapter 7 relied upon the dream given to Nebuchadnezzar in chapter 2, and
just as the prophecy of the 70 year exile was modified by meshing it with the jubilee theology of *Lev*, that dream was meshed with the prophecy of *Hos* 13:7-8 and *Jer* 5:6, so that the perspective was that of a Jew, not a Babylonian king. The nations that arose were aggressors, and the worst was the fourth, as it sunk to its lowest in Antiochus. Again, just as with *Jer* and *Lev*, chapter 8 meshed the animal vision in chapter 7 and the sacrifice of continual burnt offering, which Antiochus had stopped. The goat and ram, which are associated with that ritual, had as their end death through slaughter at the hands of a Jewish cultic official. As well, the description of Antiochus in that apocalypse was determined to be based upon the prophecy of the fall of Helal ben Shaḥar in *Is* 14:12-15. Just as that one was brought low because of his hubris, so would Antiochus.

8. We concluded that the visionaries of *Dan* were not alone in their beliefs about being divinely aided in their interpretations. The review of passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls relating to the Teacher of Righteousness, and the *maškil* and other writers of the *Hodayot*, revealed that there were others who conceived of themselves or their teachers as being divinely aided in their teaching. Josephus provided pictures of such individuals in action, and a description of how they went about their predictions based upon what the prophets had said and written, and due to their piety.

9. In conjunction with what we discovered in other chapters, we were able to conclude that the “scriptures” of the second century BCE *maškilim* included *Gen*, *Exod*, *Lev*, *Num*, *Isa* and *Deutero-Isa*, *Jer*, *Ezek*, *Hos*, *Hab*, *Dan 2*, *Chr-Ezra-Neh*.

From our consideration of the background of the Daniel figure, the portrayal of the Babylonian professional diviners, the portrayal and explanation of the abilities of
Daniel, the use of old prophecies, and the comparative material provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls and Josephus, we can, with a bit of creative license, present a portrait of one of these maškilim. He would have been a respected member of the religious community with which he was connected. He was not alone among his circles, and doubtless together they were the heart of the intellectual and spiritual life of the community. Among the rival factions of Judaism there were others who called themselves maškilim, but he and his associates knew that the others were not living the life that God expected of a holy man like a maškil, and so they were only playing at this, deceiving the people. These “others” may have been among those who were in favour of, or at least did not oppose, the changes that he and his associates knew to be contrary to the will of God, such changes as hellenisation brought, and as Antiochus attempted to foist on his people.

This maškil believed himself and the other maškilim to be gifted and directly aided by God when they interpreted. He would pore over the writings that he had of the prophets of old, beginning with Moses. He knew them well, and as events unfolded around him, he was able to see how prophecies fitted together, and how figures and events of his day had been foretold by God through the prophets. Sometimes the hidden meaning of the prophecies and how they were interconnected were “unsealed” as he studied them, sometimes they came as he experienced his own visions and dreams.¹

¹ Altered states of consciousness have been scientifically verified, although they are induced through a variety of means from self inducement to drugs. People such as our example might have truly experienced some form of altered state of consciousness and thus this statement about personal visions. On this phenomenon and the types of religious figures that are associated with, see Michael James Winkelman, “A cross-cultural study of shamanistic healers,” Journal of Psychoactive Drugs 21 (1989): 17-24; and Michael James Winkelman, Shamans, Priests and Witches: A Cross-Cultural Study of Magico-Religious Practitioners, Anthropological State Papers, ed. C. A. Clark, 44 (Tempe, AR: Arizona State University, 1992). I am grateful to Dr. James Davila for drawing this research to my attention.
This *maškil* believed that he was part of a long line of *maškilîm* and that he would continue this line as he instructed his students, those from among the younger members of the community who had “the gift”. Any of the *maškilîm* of the past could have done as he had, interpreting the events of his day through the prophetic writings. Had God chosen, he could have revealed to one like Daniel how the events of the second century BCE were laid out in prophecies, for the God of Daniel was his God too. Daniel, he could point out, had interpreted a dream that foretold the future course of history; he even had the dream and was given its interpretation in a dream. Whether their God opened the meaning in the sixth century BCE or the second, before the event, in the midst of it, or after, the result would have been the same, for their God had not changed.

*Proposals for future research*

In order to further the research that is here presented, the following could be investigated.

1. A study of the interpretative techniques used in the employment of, and meshing of the various scriptures to make the visions. These techniques could be compared to those known from the pesherim of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and from later Jewish literature.

2. A detailed search for other scriptures that were employed in the writing of the visions of 7-12. This would probably require the development of a sophisticated database that took into account the kinds of techniques discovered in the previous research.

3. The relationship between the literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls and *Dan*.
4. A comparative study of similar religious teachers both in Judaism and in other cultures.

5. A full examination of the priestly and levitical connections of the book in order to determine whether Daniel is being portrayed as such a cultic official.

Towards the end of “Chapter 3” we cited Isa 44:25-26a. It seems appropriate to use it as the concluding remarks of this dissertation, for it sums up what we have found the stories and the visions to be illustrating.

I frustrate false prophets and their omens, and make fools of diviners; I reverse what wise men say and make nonsense of their wisdom. I confirm my servants’ prophecies and bring about my messengers’ plans.
Appendix A:
Lists of Religious Experts in Dan

The lists of religious experts in Dan are varied, as Table 2 (page 126) and Table 4 (page 161) show. There are also some text-critical questions that relate to them. Given the importance of the titles, I undertook a study of the lists to determine whether there was an underlying pattern, or whether they were randomly composed. This Appendix is the fruit of that investigation, and gives the rationale for how some of the lists are cited and translated in the body of the dissertation. It consists in an examination of each list as it occurs in the Masoretic Text, the Qumran Text, the Old Greek, and the Vulgate.

Dan 1:20

Table 10. List of experts at Dan 1:20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>4QDan(^a)</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>מְהַרְמִימָה</td>
<td>[ ... ]</td>
<td>φιλοσόφους / φιλολόγους (^1)</td>
<td>μάγους</td>
<td>magos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>מְהַרְמִימָה</td>
<td>מַגָּס</td>
<td>σοφιστάς</td>
<td>ἐπισκεπτός</td>
<td>ariolos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see immediately from this comparison that Masoretic Text (= 4QDan\(^a\) ?), Theodotion, and Vulgate seem to represent the same text. Given the evidence of 4QDan\(^a\), Theodotion, and Vulgate, it is probable that the original text was what we find

\(^1\) 88-Syh read φιλοσόφους and 967 φιλολόγους. Given that both are hapax legomena, it is not possible to suggest what that text might have been if it was not that of Masoretic Text.
in the Masoretic Text.² Old Greek, however, is quite different. It is possible that was mistaken for בָּֽדָּה, which in Old Greek would be the usual word rendered by σοφίστής, but that does not explain the rendering of δεινός, which should be μάγος or possibly even φαρμακός.

Other clues in chapter 1 may hold the answer to why Old Greek is different here. Old Greek has an added emphasis on learning from written materials in vv. 4 and 17-20.³ In v. 4, Masoretic Text says that the candidates for inclusion in the training programme were to be

Theodotion renders this quite faithfully. Old Greek, however, has:

επιστήμονας ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ γραμματικοῖς καὶ συνετοῖς καὶ σοφοῖς ... καὶ διδάξαι αὐτοῖς γράμματα καὶ διάλεκτον Ἀλδαϊκὴν

A connection was made by Old Greek between דTürkiye and סֵפֶּר, resulting in cognates being used and giving the passage a literary focus. In v. 17 the four are also (compared to Masoretic Text) given φρόνησιν;⁵ not only is Daniel given σύνεσιν ἐν

² A. B. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908-1914), VII, 128, suggests that בְּדָה is a gloss on בַּדָּה, but there is no evidence for this.

³ Whether this emphasis was original or added cannot be determined, but if the following argument has merit, it would appear that Old Greek added this emphasis.

⁴ 967 lacks this word. It may be a doublet, as proposed by R. T. McLay, “A collation of variants from 967 to Ziegler’s critical edition of Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco,” Textus: Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project 18 (1995): 125. If this is the case, then the two bound constructions would each be rendered by individual words. The translation equivalents of the words provide little help in determining what Old Greek read if the Vorlage was followed relatively closely. The cognates γραμματικός and γράμμα usually render forms of הָדָּה cognates. Συνετός does render forms of דָּה in Deuteronomy, but renders forms of דָּה more often. Σοφός and cognates usually renders forms of בָּדָּה.

⁵ See also Old Greek at 2:23.
παντὶ ὁράματι καὶ ἐνυπνίους, but also ῥήματι; and to those attributes is added [σύνεσιν...] ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ. In v. 19 ἐν τοῖς σοφοῖς may be an elaboration on those to whom ἔδειξεν refers. Verse 20 makes it explicit that the four are ten times σοφωτέρους than the others, the Hebrew being unspecific.

This context of learning seems to have led Old Greek to render ἡράμενα and ἔπαινα with wisdom terms as well. Thus, instead of the youths competing against religious experts in chapter 1, they compete with philosophers and sophists, who correspond better as the opponents of those who have studied texts.

6 Old Greek could have read ἡράμενα, because ἔδειξεν is not rendered at all, but it is also missing in v. 20 in the rendering of ἡράμενα and so may be characteristic of a translation style in which ἔδειξεν is sometimes rendered by the article used to designate a class.

7 The second half of v. 20 is longer in both Greek versions with an addition that brings this chapter into line with others by concluding it with the elevation of the Jewish youths (their God in other chapters). The Old Greek, however, is divided on what was added:

88-Syriac have: καὶ ἔδεξασεν αὐτοὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτοὺς ἐφοίτητο καὶ ἀνέδειξεν αὐτοὺς σοφοὺς παρὰ πάντας τοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν πράγμασιν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ “the king glorified them and made them rulers and proclaimed them wise beyond all his people in affairs of his whole land and of his kingdom”.

967 has: καὶ ἔδεξασεν αὐτοὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀνέδειξεν ἐν πράγμασιν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ βασιλείᾳ “the king glorified them and proclaimed them over all the affairs in his kingdom”.

Collins, Daniel, 129 adopts the reading of 967 because of the amount of space left in the lacuna in 4QDan. It appears likely that this is correct and thus this addition would have been the shorter of the two and so would not have included σοφοὺς. For that reason, this adds nothing relevant to our discussion of the context.

8 The letters in ἡράμενα may have guided Old Greek in this move. The same sounds, s and ph, are found in the stem σοφ-. Such similarities of sounds were sometimes used in the selection of translation equivalents. Bludau, Alexandrinische Übersetzung, 70, 92-93, 137-38, indicates places in Old Greek Dan where various renderings into Greek were based upon phonological similarities (Gleichklang, Wortklang, Ton zusammenklingen). This is one that he notes (p. 137). Cf. C. T. Fritsch, “Homophony in the Septuagint,” Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1973 (Jerusalem: World
Dan 2:2

Table 11. List of experts at Dan 2:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>IQDan⁴</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>לֶבֶרֶשֵׁי</td>
<td>כֵּֽרִים</td>
<td>Χαλδαίων</td>
<td>Χαλδαῖος</td>
<td>Chaldei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>לֶבֶרֶשֵׁי</td>
<td>לֶבֶרֶשֵׁי</td>
<td>φαρμακοῦς</td>
<td>φαρμακοῦς</td>
<td>malefici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>לֶבֶרֶשֵׁי</td>
<td>לֶבֶרֶשֵׁי</td>
<td>μάγους</td>
<td>μάγους</td>
<td>magi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>לֶבֶרֶשֵׁי</td>
<td>לֶבֶרֶשֵׁי</td>
<td>ἐπαυκοῦς</td>
<td>ἐπαυκοῦς</td>
<td>arioli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list begins with the same lexemes as the previous list. In a comparison with the other lists, it stands out for two reasons. First, the consistency among the Masoretic Text and the versions is not repeated in any of the other lists of religious experts. This raises the suspicion that Old Greek may have been harmonised with Theodotion.⁹ Old Greek, therefore, may have been different, especially in light of the rendering of 1:20, and that difference may have led to a later harmonization with Theodotion.¹⁰ As IQDan⁴ shows, however, it and OG are different in having the final element as a modifier.

Secondly, the list is significant because it has the lone occurrence of מִלְכָּשִׁים in Dan. It could be a gloss on מִלְכָּשִׁים based upon similarity of letters in the root,¹¹ which arose within the history of the transmission of the story either independently or as part of Dan. That the gloss does not appear at 1:20 where the word first appears could

Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 119, who also cites this word. This assumes that 88-Syh preserves the original, however.

⁹ See McLay, “Translation technique and textual studies”, 226-27 et passim. He argues that the Theodotion tradition has influenced the transmission of the Old Greek tradition. Although he does not discuss this list in his dissertation, in private discussions he has indicated that he would draw the same conclusion here.

¹⁰ Note, however, that it does not happen at 2:10 where we also find מִלְכָּשִׁים translated with μάγος, but מִלְכָּשִׁים translated with σοφός.

¹¹ Cf. on p. 362 on the possible translation of מִלְכָּשִׁים by association of letters (מִלְכָּש-ו) with the מִלְכָּש cognates.
indicate that it was added before chapter 1 was appended. As we argued above, however, based upon Old Greek and \textit{IQDan} it seems more likely that it goes with the following word and clarifies that the “sorcerers of the Chaldeans”. Thus, the list is the same as in 1:20, but with an explanatory phrase added: “the \textit{hartoms}, and exorcists, \textit{i.e.}, the sorcerers of the Chaldeans”.

\textbf{Dan 2:10}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & \textbf{4} & \textbf{3} & \textbf{2} & \textbf{1} \\
\hline
MT & לְכָל-חֲרָמִים & וּבְשָׂרִים & ... & כְּלָיָה \textit{MT} \\
OG & Χαλδαὶον & μάγον & σοφόν & ... & Χαλδαὶον \textit{OG} \\
TH & Χαλδαὶον & μάγον & ἐπαυσίνον & ... & Χαλδαὶοι \textit{TH} \\
VG & Chaldeus & mago & ariolo & ... & Chaldei \textit{VG} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{List of experts at \textit{Dan} 2:10}
\end{table}

This list comes close to being consistent among the Masoretic Text and versions. The only difference is the use of σοφός for בְּרָמִים in Old Greek. We have already seen the use of a wisdom word (σοφιστακός) for בְּרָמִים in 1:20. Where it does not render בְּרָמִים, the other 9\textsuperscript{12} occurrences of σοφός in the Old Greek \textit{Dan} render מִלְּכֵי (1:4), and possibly בְּרָמִים (2:10), or are used only as an adjective or have no equivalent or relevant substantive,\textsuperscript{13} or has no counterpart.\textsuperscript{14} It is translated in Old Greek with σοφός twice, 6 times with σοφιστής,\textsuperscript{15} and 6 occurrences are not rendered.\textsuperscript{16} Why

\textsuperscript{12} 10 if 2:12 is included: 1:4, 19, 20; 2:10, 21, 25, 27; 5:11\textsuperscript{2x}.

\textsuperscript{13} 1:19, 20\textsuperscript{2x}, 2:25; 4:15 [18]; 5:7, 8 (a list of experts is found here), 11\textsuperscript{2x}.

\textsuperscript{14} 4:3 [6] and 5:15 are missing due to minuses in Old Greek.

\textsuperscript{15} σοφιστής (“master of one’s craft,” ‘adept,’ ‘expert’ of diviners,” \textit{LSJ}). 2:12 (on which see n. 94), 14, 18, 24\textsuperscript{2x}, 48. σοφιστής is found 9 times in the Greek, all but one in the Old Greek \textit{Dan}, \textit{i.e.}, \textit{Exod 7:11} where it renders בְּרָמִים. At \textit{Dan} Old Greek 1:20 it possibly translates בְּרָמִים (see discussion of 1:20 on p. 356) and at \textit{Dan} Old Greek 4:15 [18], 34c [37/3:31-33] there are no equivalent Aramaic forms. According to Hatch and Redpath it also occurs in a Theodotion reading at \textit{Gen} 41:24 (בְּרָמִים).
is not translated with ἐπανάλογος as it is in 2:2 and 27 is puzzling, as there is no need for variety here and there is no need here for a generic term, as there might have been in 1:20 or 4:6 [9]. It is possible that there was a different Vorlage or that Old Greek misread מָלִים for מָלִים, although one would expect σοφιστής as the rendering of מָלִים in Old Greek. It is obviously not a place where Theodotion has influenced Old Greek. 17 Given the problem of explaining it, it is best to account for it as an instance of variety in translation, which is a characteristic of Old Greek. 18

Dan 2:27

Table 13. List of experts at Dan 2:27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>יְרֵמֵי</td>
<td>יְסָסָא</td>
<td>חַלּוֹן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDAN</td>
<td>יְרֵמֵי</td>
<td>יְסָסָא</td>
<td>חַלּוֹן</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>γαζαρηνων</td>
<td>ἐπανάλογον</td>
<td>φαρμακών</td>
<td>σοφών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>γαζαρηνων</td>
<td>ἐπανάλογον</td>
<td>μάγον</td>
<td>σοφών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>aruspices</td>
<td>arioli</td>
<td>magi</td>
<td>sapientes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list presents three items worth noting. First, in Old Greek we have the second place where מָלִים is rendered with σοφός rather than σοφιστής. Although this may be a place where Theodotion has influenced Old Greek, we cannot be at all confident about it in light of 2:10.

Second, this list is one of only 2 out of 9 that begins with מָלִים, the other being at 5:15. In each list this lexeme is followed by אָרוּפִים, but, as we will show later, אָרוּפִים tends to be second in the lists in any case. Here, the list continues, but at 5:15 the list is

16 מָלִים: 2:13; 4:3 [6], 15[18]; 5:7, 8 (a list of experts is found here), 15.
17 McLay, "Translation technique and textual studies", 226-27.
18 McLay, "Translation technique and textual studies".
truncated, having only the two lexemes. Above we argued that in these two lists מַשָּׁה is used in a general sense (‘expert’), not a specific sense (‘sage’).

Third, we have the rendering of מַשָּׁה with פַּרְשִׁים. This happens in one other location, 5:7, and the two will be considered together. In both cases, מַשָּׁה is represented by פַּרְשִׁים in Old Greek, by μάγος in Theodotion and by magus in Vulgate. In the Greek versions, however, פַּרְשִׁים usually represents the מַשָּׁה cognates, not מַשָּׁה, while μάγος and magus do represent מַשָּׁה. Whereas there is only one letter difference between מַשָּׁה and מַשָּׁה it is possible that an original מַשָּׁה was mistaken at some point for מַשָּׁה or vice versa.

There are two points that do not favour the proposal just made, however. First, in Dan only מַשָּׁה is used, so that requires that the mistake involve both the haplography of the כ and the כ and the confusion of the remaining letter with כ. Second, Masoretic Text, 4QDan⁹, Theodotion, and Vulgate all witness to מַשָּׁה. Given these points and the occurrence of פַּרְשִׁים for מַשָּׁה twice, the probability is that מַשָּׁה was the original word here. In his dissertation on the translation technique of the Greek versions of Dan, McLay notes that Old Greek seems to have had a limited knowledge of Aramaic and Hebrew vocabulary and for that reason, made guesses based on the context and similar words.¹⁹ Given the loose resemblance of form (מַשָּׁה) and the similarity of contexts, it is reasonable to conclude that מַשָּׁה is one word that Old Greek did not know, and that he used the מַשָּׁה cognates to translate it in these two instances.²⁰ Another factor that could have helped Old Greek to make such a link is the


occurrence of שֵׁל שָׁנָה in Exod 7:11. In that context it is linked with וַיְרַמֵּס וַיְרַמִּים and וַיְרַמֵּס וַיְרַמִּים. The occurrence of וַיְרַמֵּס in the list under consideration could well have sent Old Greek to look at its occurrences elsewhere for clues to how to translate וַיְרַמֵּס. It may also be that Old Greek was merely providing variety in his translation.

**Dan 4:4 [7]**

Table 14. List of experts at Dan 4:4 [7]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>אָרֶש</td>
<td>כֹּשֶׁר</td>
<td>קִשֹּׁת</td>
<td><strong>867</strong> עֲשַׂפְתָּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Χαλδαῖοι</td>
<td>γαζαρηνοὶ</td>
<td>μάγοι</td>
<td>ἥπατοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>aruspices</td>
<td>Chaldei</td>
<td>magi</td>
<td>arioli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this list, there has been an obvious inversion of the final terms, as the list from Theodotion shows. This is not significant, in that there are other such inversions among the lists. The major point to be noted is that this list is part of a minus in Old Greek which has no matching text for Masoretic Text 4:2b [5b]–6 [9]. As Lust points out, the difference this material makes is between whether the story is a court contest (Masoretic–Theodotion–Vulgate), as in chapters 2 and 5, or simply a legend about a wise Jew with no hint of a contest.

---


21 Collins, *Daniel*, 208 n. 11, incorrectly says Vulgate has the inversion.


Dan 5:7

Table 15. List of experts at Dan 5:7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>כלחמים</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>גנור</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDan</td>
<td>כלחמים</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>גנור</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>sapientibus</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>aruspices</td>
<td>Chaldeos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this list we first should note that בבלית appears in 4QDan* and not in Masoretic–Theodotion–Vulgate, but the material from [גנור] to [בבלית] is missing due to the poor state of the scroll. However, given the probable presence of בבלית, it is likely that בבלית was in the text. Whether בבלית was there or not is uncertain.

Given what we know about the usual translation of the words into Greek, we could expect the following for Masoretic and 4QDan*:

Table 16. Hypothetical Greek list at Dan 5:7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>כלחמים</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>גנור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG*</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>magus</td>
<td>Chaldeus</td>
<td>aruspex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDan*</td>
<td>כלחמים</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>גנור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG*</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH*</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG*</td>
<td>magus</td>
<td>ariolus</td>
<td>Chaldeos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theodotion and Vulgate follow Masoretic Text exactly. Old Greek, however, seems not to follow either Masoretic Text or 4QDan*, rather we find επαριδος, φαρμακους, Χαλδαιος, and γαζαρηνος. The Vorlage underlying these would have...

---

24 967 has only επαριδος γαζαρηνος (See above, n. 110, on -ραδ- for -ζαρ-). Angelo Geissen, Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel: Kap. 5-12, Zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco sowie Esther Kap. 1,1a-2,15 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1968), 147 suggests that homoioteleuton has taken place here. It could also represent an even shorter Vorlage: בבלית, but on the strength of the other traditions, this seems unlikely.
been something such as הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ. Given this we are confident that הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ were in the original. In addition to those two, הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ הָרֹאשׁ from אָרֳדַם is also accounted for in Old Greek where we find επαναλήπτος. However, in Old Greek επαναλήπτος stands in first place and in אָרֳדַם stands second. An inversion has occurred here at some time, just as in other places in the lists (see note 22). Here, however, the inversion is probably influenced by the usual prominence given to וְרֶשֶׁם, which, as we noted above (page 161), comes first in 4/7 of the other lists. Given that Masoretic Text, אָרֳדַם, Theodotion, and Vulgate all begin with שֵׁם/μαγος/magus, this makes it the more difficult reading and thus the more likely word to have begun the original list. A fourth word that we can now be confident about is שֵׁם, which can be represented by φαρμακως in Old Greek, as we have concluded above (page 362), and which is represented by μαγος in Theodotion and by magus in Vulgate.

We are now left with the question of whether we have a long or a short list. The Masoretic–Theodotion–Vulgate tradition represents לָאָשֶׁפֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת and אָרֳדַם–Old Greek represent לָאָשֶׁפֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת. Given the similarity of endings, we propose that לָאָשֶׁפֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת קֶסֶרֶת dropped out of the longer list due to homoioteleuton. The original list was therefore probably that represented by the אָרֳדַם–Old Greek tradition with the אָרֳדַם order for the first 2 words.

Old Greek Dan 5:8

Table 17. List of experts at Old Greek Dan 5:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>הָרֹאשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>γαροζηνοι</td>
<td>φαρμακως</td>
<td>επαναλήπτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>סופו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sapientes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Old Greek obviously stands out here. Whether it is a harmonisation with the previous verse (less ἡμῶν) or evidence of a different Vorlage cannot now be determined. We will assume the former on the basis of similar clarifying expansions in other chapters, e.g., 1:5, 25 and 10. 26

Dan 5:11

Table 18. List of experts at Dan 5:11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>ἁγάμην</td>
<td>έκκλησίας</td>
<td>θεομόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>γαζαρηνων</td>
<td>χαλδαίων</td>
<td>μάγων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>auraspicum</td>
<td>Chaldeorum</td>
<td>incantatorum magorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is not found in Old Greek which reads ὑπερέχων πάντας τοὺς σοφοὺς Βαβυλώνος. We should note that Vulgate has an inversion of the first two items (see note 22). As well, this is the only place outside of Exod 7:11 where מטטר is rendered with an incant- form, which usually represents a form of the root בְּרָד.

Dan 5:15

Table 19. List of experts at Dan 5:15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>תַחַם</td>
<td>Ἀθέα</td>
<td>Ἀθέα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>γαζαρηνωι</td>
<td>μάγωι</td>
<td>σοφοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>magi</td>
<td>sapientes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list is the second one that begins with בְּרָד, the other being at 2:27. In the light of our comparison of the lists on page 161, it is tempting to suggest that there has been a confusion of מĪ for מטטר, especially in light of the first list in 1:20, which consists of these two terms (see the lists at 2:10, 4:4 [7] and 5:11 as well), and which

25 On which see McLay. "Translation technique and textual studies", 42 on l 49.

26 On which see McLay. "Translation technique and textual studies", 43 on l 104.
would serve as an *inclusio* for the lists. However, Theodotion and Vulgate support the Masoretic Text. The list at 2:27 also includes הָאוֹדָה, thus making it unlikely that it stood first, so it is possible that both lists began as they do now.

In this list we have an anomaly not encountered to this point: Theodotion has a longer reading than Masoretic Text and Vulgate. As well, Ziegler notes that in MS Q and in the Ethiopic translation, Ḡαλδαῖοι occurs before γαζαρηνοί, and that it was also included by Chrysostom, but after γαζαρηνοί.²⁷ Also, MS 62 lacks γαζαρηνοί, but that is probably a harmonisation with Masoretic Text. As Ziegler notes, the Theodotion addition(s) are probably a harmonisation with 5:11 and, we would add, with 2:27, 4:4[7] and 5:7.

It is possible that this list is meant to be a truncated reference back to the lists at 5:7 and 11. The material in 5:7 consists of a list that begins with שֶׁבֶל הַחִזְקָה and that list is then summarized as שֶׁבֶל הַחִזְקָה. This list in 5:15 could be inclusive of both elements: "The wise men, the enchanters, etc., were brought before me".²⁸

---


²⁸ *Cf.* Delcor, *Daniel*, 128, who suggests that it moves from the general to the specific.
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