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ABSTRACT

The current study deals basically with the stories of Daniel and with two chapters in the history of Jewish interpretation, the Septuagint, and selected medieval exegesis. Before considering the Old Greek version and the rabbis' work it seemed necessary to investigate and review certain basic problems in the Massoretic Text of Daniel (Section I).

Section I was broken down into three chapters concerning philological (I), literary (II), and theological problems in the first part of Daniel (III). Little new ground was broken in the investigation of many of these areas such as the date of the Aramaic, the use of the verbal tenses, the unity and bilinguality of the work, but a review of the options taken in the past has been helpful to an overview of the Massoretic Text of Daniel I-VI. See the preface for further details. New ground was broken in certain smaller areas such as the use of the Kethibh and Qere in the Aramaic portion of the book, the uses of the preposition 첼, and the construct state and its circumlocution. The third chapter of Section I concerns the general theological affirmations of Daniel as a book as well as specific ones of the first six chapters.
The fourth chapter concerns the Septuagint. The procedure has been to investigate the three witnesses to the LXX text (967, 88, Syh) and to give a critical apparatus to these three including all the parts of 967 published to date. In chapters IV-VI of the Greek a minute comparison is made with the Massoretic Text.

The final chapter, quite simply, concerns the exegesis of selected passages in Daniel I-VI by three medieval rabbis. The three are Rashi and Ibn Ezra, perhaps the two most famous medieval rabbinic exegetes, and Ibn Yachya, an Italian rabbi of the sixteenth century. The Hebrew comments of these scholars are translated into English and commented on by the present author.

While this study makes few new departures in major critical issues it is hoped that the historical survey of problems is helpful, and that in certain areas a small contribution to Daniel studies has been provided.
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PREFACE

The current study grew out of an interest in the Aramaic portion of the Book of Daniel on the part of Mr. Peter W. Coxon who suggested to the author that some work needed to be done in the area of versional-exegetical studies. The original plan, somewhat boldly conceived, was to deal with all the versions and to illustrate the findings with selected passages for exegesis. It soon became apparent that this was a plan which would far exceed the scope of one thesis. It was decided to take the LXX—interesting because of its wide divergence from the MT—and to deal with it in detail. The last chapter (rabbinic exegesis of selected passages) grew out of my interest in Medieval and early Modern Hebrew as a language.

The thesis consists in three introductory chapters wherein many philological, literary, and theological matters of the MT are dealt with (Section I). This is followed by two rather long sections (numbers II and III) dealing with two chapters in the history of interpretation of Daniel I-VI; the LXX and medieval Jewish exegesis. These are simply two chapters about which little has been written recently. There is no necessary organic connection between them other than
both represent Jewish exegesis—one relatively early and the other relatively late.

The first chapter deals with the problem of the Kethibh/Qere in the Aramaic part of Daniel in order to classify the occurrences and to discover, if possible, a reason why such variations in the Aramaic text occur. One then turns to the perplexed problem of the date of Daniel's Aramaic. It was discovered that the language itself is an unsure dating criterion which leaves a date from somewhat later than 500 BC down to circa 165 BC as possible. There then follow studies of three philological problems; the use of the verbal tenses, the uses of the preposition ʾ, and the construct state and its circumlocution. All of these studies concern the Aramaic portion of Daniel only.

Chapter Two concerns itself with literary problems. Such issues as the unity, authorship, bilinguality, and date of the first six chapters (and the book as a whole) are discussed. The position of the present author has come to be that of Montgomery and others, that the book is bipartite both in time of origin and in authorship. The chief exponent of the unitary-authorship point-of-view was H. H. Rowley, and so time has been taken to examine carefully Rowley's argument for unity. Attention has also been turned to various explanations of the book's bilinguality. Again the position as set forth by Montgomery (following Dalman and Torrey) is the one
which has been followed here. After a discussion of the constituent genres found in Daniel I-VI a search for a genre for the whole six chapters has been instigated. It has been posited that while these chapters cannot technically qualify as haggadic midrash they certainly use techniques found in haggadah. Miscellaneous literary matters such as historical problems and the relation between I-VI and the Qumran literature are briefly dealt with.

The third chapter begins with a section on the general theological issues in Daniel as a whole. The theological concepts of the latter chapters are grounded in the first chapters and so, if unity is sought, it is to be found in the book's theology. Specific theological statements on God, man, and the world are also dealt with. Although chapter III is the briefest chapter it is very important. It is important if exegesis wishes to be anything more than antiquarian. If exegesis wishes to reach the point for which the book of Daniel was originally written—the edification of the saints—it must deal with theology. Theology is the "so-what" of exegesis. It is the theology of the biblical message that reaches out to modern man to help him live a better life.

The fourth and fifth chapters deal with the LXX text and with medieval Jewish exegesis in a detailed way. A
critical apparatus fully accounting for Chester Beatty Papyrus 967 (as published to date) is furnished, as is a line-by-line, often word-for-word, comparison between the LXX and the MT in those very puzzling chapters IV-VI. The last chapter deals with the exegesis of specific passages as found in the Hebrew commentaries of Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Ibn Yachya. The passages of these commentaries have been translated and exegeted.

The detailed nature of the treatment of the materials and, to an extent, the nature of the materials themselves make a grand synthesis of findings very difficult if not impossible to do. It has seemed best therefore to summarize findings as the thesis progresses in the chapters themselves.

The preface to a document is usually the last part to be written. As I look back over this work I realize that all problems have not been dealt with, much less solved. It is hoped, however, that a small contribution to Daniel studies has been made. It should be noted that American spellings and punctuation have been used throughout. It remains to me to thank in this way--since at present the miles forbid personal thanks--all the members of the Old Testament Department at St. Mary's College, Drs. Robin Salters and James D. Martin, Professor William McKane, and especially my advisor and friend Mr. Peter W. Coxon. I should also like to give thanks both for and to my wife Maxine, who has had the hardest task of
all--living with me throughout this whole experience.
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GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The concise purpose of this thesis is a study of the Aramaic Text of Daniel chapters I-VI in relation to the Septuagint (LXX) and medieval Jewish exegesis by means of a study of selected passages in the first six chapters of the book. The LXX will be considered both as an independent literary document and as a translation document of a Semitic original.

Of course not all critical questions arising from either the Massoretic Text (MT) or the LXX can be dealt with within the confines of one thesis. There is excellent commentary assistance at all critical points. Long the standard work in English, J. A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), is invaluable for its detailed philological notes and its lucid treatment of the versions. R. H. Charles' larger commentary (which appeared in 1929), although on the same scale as Montgomery's, has never been used to the extent of the latter's because of his insistence on adopting the readings of the LXX over those of the MT. Charles' preference for the LXX rests on very little factual information and detracts from the overall usefulness of his commentary.
On theological matters perhaps the best modern guide is Norman Porteous' volume (first published in Das Alte Testament Deutsch, 1962; then in English in The Old Testament Library, 1965). Of course many other works exist in English and other languages and for these the reader is directed to the bibliography. In German the most useful modern work overall is A. Bentzen's Daniel (Handbuch zum Alten Testament, volume 19, 2nd ed., 1952). This last commentary is not nearly as large as either Montgomery or Charles, but it offers good insights into the meaning of the text. It also has full references to Bauer-Leander's Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen. M. Delcor has the most recent major commentary, Le Livre de Daniel (1971). This last commentary is especially valuable for its insights concerning literary matters.

The plan of the thesis is as follows: a general introduction to the MT (Section I, chapters I-III), a general introduction to the LXX (Section II, chapter IV), and a final section concerning medieval Jewish exegesis of selected passages of Daniel's first six chapters (Section III, chapter V). Included in the first section are chapters dealing with matters philological and textual (chapter I), matters literary (chapter II), and matters theological (chapter III). The second section will deal most especially with the relation between the LXX and the MT. The third section will pay special attention to medieval Jewish exegesis. These
commentators are often omitted in discussion of the history of the exegesis of the Bible. One suspects that this is due to their relative difficulty and obscurity. It is both interesting and somewhat amusing to find so-called modern exegesis prefigured in writings of the 11th, 12th, and following centuries. A vast amount of the rabbinic material is irrelevant, but every so often—and tolerably often at that—a vital insight is gained into the text and the exegesis of a passage. Thus these often-ignored men can give valuable chapters to the history of exegesis of the Bible.

Modern, critical exegesis of the Book of Daniel may be said to have begun in 1806 with the publication of L. Bertholdt's *Daniel Neu Übersetzt und Erklärt*, but due to the difficulty in obtaining this commentary, I have begun a study of the modern exegesis of Daniel I-VI with Hitzig's *Das Buch Daniel Erklärt* (1850). Where notation has been made in others' works of Bertholdt's views I have taken these into consideration. No one thesis can contain an account of all the literature that has been written on the book, and so I have tried to deal with the more important commentaries and studies. The reason for a concentration on the modern-critical exegesis of the book should be clear. While not wishing to diminish the importance of earlier exegesis for Daniel study, the real critical advances in exegesis have come in approximately the last 175 years.
There are several critical problems in the Book of Daniel which can be debated, but never actually solved. What appeals to one exegete may be taken as an unconvincing argument by another. A typical example of this is the problem of the date of the Aramaic of Daniel. It has been asserted in the past (and still is by some) that the Aramaic of Daniel dates from the sixth century BC. With the advent of higher criticism the date was shifted to the second century BC. The argument raged on. Linguistic arguments were adduced on both sides, and these arguments were considered by their proponents to be conclusive proof. Today many scholars are not at all sure that a judgment can be made on the basis of the Aramaic itself. Of course there are those who, on linguistic and other grounds, hold fast to a sixth century date. There are others who hold to a second century date, and there are many positions in between. In cases such as the date of the Aramaic it is better to admit ignorance, or deficit of surety, than to assume knowledge on the basis of faulty or insufficient data. The methodology assumed here therefore will be to set out the theories and options and then to make a choice from among them where it seems that such a choice can be made. When no such choice is possible or prudent on the available evidence, then judgment must be suspended or a judgment held as tentative. This is held as a cardinal principle of the present study.
Another vital principle adopted here will be to remember to text. Often when words and passages do not fit one's theory, they are excised as secondary additions. The secondary nature of portions of Daniel I-VI is highly probable, but it must be remembered that these portions exist in the text which has come down to modern times. It must be seen how these bits came to be where they are, and there should be good internal reasons for assuming their secondary nature. Exegesis should deal with the text in front of the exegete, secondary bits and all. Thus when discussing a secondary piece of narrative, one must show a better reason for assuming a secondary character than an exegete's theory.

Since the greater bulk of chapters I-VI are written in Aramaic, the grammatical points discussed will have as their subject the Biblical Aramaic (BA) portion of the book. The first chapter, written in Hebrew, forms an introduction to the tales found in the next five chapters, and in itself be a translation from Aramaic. In this last topic attention will be turned in due course.

The current section will survey certain philological, literary, and theological points important for the explication of Daniel I-VI in its Hebrew/Aramaic dress before proceeding to the LXX. It is obvious that one must understand the original text before one can go on to understand a
SECTION I

A PHILOLOGICAL, LITERARY, THEOLOGICAL INTRODUCTION TO

THE MASSORETIC TEXT OF DANIEL I-VI

The purpose of the first section of the present study is to introduce the MT of Daniel I-VI in a general way. It is, of course, beyond the scope of the present writing to give any complete account of the grammar of the book (either Hebrew or Aramaic). Excellent standard works exist which accomplish these tasks. Nonetheless, certain less frequently discussed grammatical points must be presented, and since the greatest bulk of chapters I-VI are written in Aramaic the grammatical points discussed will have as their subject the Biblical Aramaic (BA) portion of the book. The first chapter, written in Hebrew, forms an introduction to the tales found in the next five chapters, and may itself be a translation from Aramaic. To this last topic attention will be turned in due course.

The current section will survey certain philological, literary, and theological points important for the explication of Daniel I-VI in its Hebrew/Aramaic dress before proceeding to the LXX. It is obvious that one must understand the original work before one can go on to understand a
translation. The LXX is a philological-literary-theological product in its own right, but it is, in the last result, a translation of a Semitic original.

The question of literary-type should be ascertained at the beginning along with other possible relationships to biblical as well as extra-biblical literature. The reading of both the MT and the LXX will be clarified by this process. It is most unlikely that a translation of a work, if that translation is faithful to the thought of the original, would change the literary-type of that original. If the literary-type is changed it is doubtful whether the secondary product can be called a translation at all.

The theological thought of Daniel I-VI is dependent upon both the philological structures and the Gattung of the work. That theology is, however, not simply the sum (or even the product) of the two, but something greater than these. It is nevertheless to a great extent determined by the philological forms and literary content. The third chapter of this section will attempt to set out the basic theological tenets seen in chapters I-VI. In the end, the result of this section should be an overview of Daniel I-VI in Hebrew/Aramaic.
CHAPTER I

PHILOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE MASSORETIC
TEXT OF DANIEL I-VI

THE TEXT

The Hebrew/Aramaic text used in this study is mainly
the seventh edition of Rudolf Kittel's Biblia Hebraica
(BHK.7). BHK.7 rests primarily on an eleventh century
(AD) Hebrew/Aramaic manuscript, codex Leningradensis, which
is of the massoretic school of ben Asher. Previous editions
of BHK had been based on manuscripts of the ben Hayyim
school. Occasional reference has been made to this ben
Hayyim tradition, found in what is commonly called the Bom-
berg Bible. In addition to this, variants in Strack's
Grammatik des biblisch-Aramäischen are mentioned here and
there. The differences between the ben Asher and the ben
Hayyim traditions are usually very minimal from the point of
view of the text's meaning. More to this, as has been pre-
viously pointed out, a primary duty of exegesis is to deal
with the present text. This is to say that although one may
be presented with a panoply of variants, nonetheless, it is
incumbent upon the exegete as a primary duty to explain the
present text, not the Vorlage, nor the variants, nor the history of traditions behind the text, but the current text. This is not meant to say that the text has sprung up without any history, but rather that once the traditions have been explained, the variants noted, the Vorlage fixed, the exegete's task goes on until he has explained the current form of the text.

The preservation of a standard text in the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament seems to be less exact than that of the Hebrew portions. For this reason, as well as for the reason that the drawbacks of the apparatus of BHK are well-known, most variants have been checked against the sources given in the apparatus of BHK. The less exact preservation of the text may be seen primarily reflected in the fact that cases of Kethibh and Qere are limited to twelve in the six Hebrew chapters of Daniel, whereas the count in the six Aramaic chapters numbers 106. The only occurrence in the Hebrew of Daniel is in I.3, where the Kethibh י"ש is simplified to ינ in the Qere. The case of the variants found in the Aramaic chapters is more complex. To this subject attention must now be turned in some detail.

Kethibh and Qere (K. and Q.)

As has been stated above, the sheer number of instances of K. and Q. in the Aramaic portion of Daniel leads
one to a question of origin and meaning. Can some rationale behind this fairly common occurrence be found? Although the general topic of discussion in this thesis is Daniel I-VI, the seventh chapter is included in the figures for the Aramaic simply for the sake of completeness. The K./Q. breaks down into ten use-categories. A discussion of these ten categories will take us into a preliminary discussion of many points of Aramaic grammar. At this point a cautionary word delivered by F. Rosenthal in his Grammar of Biblical Aramaic is in order.

The often expressed a priori assumption that the consonant text (kêêtêb) represents the more original form of the text is, as far as BA is concerned, a dangerous oversimplification. 6

1. Suffixes attached to a seemingly plural noun in K., to a seemingly singular noun in Q. The occurrences of this type of variation are as follows: II.4,26; III.12,12, 18; IV.14,16,16,22,24,24,29; V.14,16,21,23; VI.14,23; VII.5, 6,7,8,19,19,20. An example of this kind of K./Q. is יִשְׁמֹא (K.), יִשְׁמֹע (Q., found in III.12; IV.22,24,29; V.14,16; VI.14). The Massoretes have uniformly substituted יִשְׁמֹע for יִשָּׁמֹע. According to Kautzsch, suffixes on masculine plural nouns were attached to a form with the connecting link י. The yodh of the suffix and the י of the link eventually flowed together. The second masculine singular, third feminine singular, and the first common plural pronominal
suffixes are based on the addition of the suffix to the form with the ' _ link. This forms the K. Bauer-Leander go a bit further in probing the origin of this link. The nouns and prepositions which have the current K./Q. problem, according to Bauer-Leander, originally ended in ay so that when a singular suffix was added to them the resultant form resembled a plural noun with a suffix. The Massoretes took these singular suffixes to be suffixes attached to the form of the plural and so arose the current K./Q. 8

Both Kautzsch and Bauer-Leander are probably right concerning the origin of the form itself (i.e. 7'). What is questionable is whether the Massoretes who were conversant in Aramaic merely mistook the forms for singulars with plural suffixes, or changed a historical spelling to conform with current pronunciation. It might be objected here that the Massoretes would never modernize, but rather tend to conserve what had been handed down. It must be remembered that the text was not really changed. A note was simply added to the margin. Thus the ancient text, historical spelling and all (if 7' actually is to be considered a historical spelling), would be preserved intact, but with a footnote added to aid in the pronunciation of the text.

In the papyri the form of the word is 7' in those examples which have come down to modern times. 9 Syriac, likewise, always has 7'(i.e. a form which orthographically
looks like a suffix attached to a plural noun). In Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (JPA) either יֵּשׁ or יֵּשׁ may be found although the preponderance of cases seems to read the former. This latter fact would lead one to believe that, if anything, the Massoretes were reconciling pronunciation to spelling; they were doing away with a yodh which had long since dropped out of pronunciation. This kind of change causes the modern reader little confusion when dealing with a preposition, but when dealing with a noun the case is far less clear. An illustration of this confusion is seen in the forms יֵּשׁ (K.), יֵּשׁ (Q., II.4). The noun here is clearly plural with a second masculine singular pronominal suffix. Since there was no orthographic difference in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic between a singular or a plural noun with a second masculine suffix, someone not familiar with this dialect could be confused. This confusion would not, of course, be felt by the Massoretes themselves, and it is highly unlikely that they could have foreseen it arising within their primary readership.

Other forms which fall into this category are: יֵּשׁ (II.26); יֵּשׁ (III.12); יֵּשׁ (III.18); יֵּשׁ (IV.14, V.21); יֵּשׁ (IV.16); יֵּשׁ (V.23, VI.23); יֵּשׁ (VII.5,19); יֵּשׁ (VII.6); יֵּשׁ (VII.7); יֵּשׁ (VII.8,20); יֵּשׁ (VII.19).
2. Variation between $\varkappa$ (K.) and $\varkappa$ (Q.). This kind of K./Q. is found in II.5,39,40; III.24,26,32; IV.4,14,21,22,29,31; V.7,18,21,30; VI.2,19; VII.23,25. An example can be seen in $\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa(K.)$, $\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa(Q.)$, III.26,32; IV.14,21,22,29,31; V.18,21; VII.25). The base form from which the word is taken is $\varkappa$.

According to Bauer-Leander when an ay is followed by a vowel it goes to $\nu$. The clearest example of this process is in the gentilic noun $\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa$ "Chaldean." The singular absolute is not found in Biblical Aramaic, but its form can be reconstructed on the analogy of other like forms. In the plural absolute instead of the expected $\kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa$, the yodh goes to aleph yielding $\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa$. Again according to Bauer-Leander, other forms partook of this same yodh to aleph shift on analogy of this process. This gives an emphatic plural form of $\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa$, and an emphatic singular form of $\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa$.

These forms are, in each case, the Q., while the K. retains the original yodh.

Investigation of the papyri has led to the discovery that the emphatic singular there agrees with the K. ($\varkappa$). There appear to be no gentilic plurals in the papyri. The one form in the Genesis Apocryphon is $\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa\varkappa(21.21)$ which Fitzmyer designates as a plural determined (emphatic) adjective to be vocalized $\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$. This kind of pronunciation would agree in its use of the glottal stop with the Q. of Biblical Aramaic.
In Jewish Palestinian Aramaic the vocalization of gentilics agrees orthographically with that of the Q. of Daniel. One finds an emphatic singular ḫוֹדָּה and an emphatic plural ḫוֹדוֹת. These are precisely the same forms as יְדֵהַ and יְדוֹת, for which Daniel's K. reads יְדָּה and יְדֹת.

The form of the Jewish Palestinian Aramaic equivalent to the word אֲנָא, showing the same yodh to aleph shift. This type of K./Q. variation is to be explained either as a dialectical change in form between the language of Daniel and that of the Massoretes, or it could be a later adaptation of Daniel's forms. Other forms of this type are: רֶפֶעָא, רֶפֶעֲא (II.5, IV.14, V.7,30); כֶּשְׂדָּא, כֶּשְׂדַּא (II.40, III.25, VII.7 with ה, 23); מֶלֶאָא, מֶלֶאֵי (VI.1); מֶלֶאָא מֶלֶא (VI.29); תֶּלֶתיָא, תֶּלֶתיָא (II.39).

3. Variations in the second person masculine singular personal pronoun. The variation between אֲנִי (K.) and אֲנָא (Q.) occurs in II.29,31,37,38; III.10; IV.15,15,19; V.13,18,22,23; VI.17,21. The Q. agrees in form with the papyri, later Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, and orthographically with Syriac. It is somewhat strange that the same form אֲנָא is found in both East and West. In the interest of accuracy it should be noted that while Jewish Palestinian Aramaic does have forms which agree with the Q. of Daniel the more widely-used form agrees orthographically with the most ancient inscriptions, that
The only place where the second masculine singular personal pronoun agrees with the K. of Daniel is in the Genesis Apocryphon, which, according to both Kutscher and Fitzmyer is best dated as first century BC. It is not surprising to find that the Q. agrees with Jewish Palestinian Aramaic. The Massoretes spoke and wrote in a dialect closer to Jewish Palestinian than to Biblical Aramaic. According to Bauer-Leander the alternation between K. and Q. here is to be explained on the basis of different dialects. There is, of course, no correct reading here. Both readings are correct; they merely differ in dialect. The K. is the original form of the second person masculine singular personal pronoun in Biblical Aramaic.

4. The plural participles of verbs. This K./Q. variation is found in II.38; III.3,31; IV.32,32; V.19; VI.26,27. An example of it is the form (V.19; VI.27). This form is notable because of the shift from yodh to aleph which takes place in the K., and the retention of the yodh in the Q. This yodh to aleph shift is also found in the hollow verbs in Akkadian. The Q. requires yodh as do verbs in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic. It would seem that the medial consonant was spoken so lightly that in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic yodh was first pronounced and later written. This is also the case in Syriac. The evidence of the fifth century papyri is inconclusive, but that supplied by
Akkadian, alluded to above, may point to the fact that a medial aleph in the participles of יָנַב verbs is an old construction. In any case the Q. agrees with the usage of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic. Other words noted by the Mas-soretes for this type of Q. are: נְרֵיָא (II.38; III.31; VI.26); נְרֵיָא (IV.32,32); נְרֵיָא (III.3).

5. Possible Hebraisms in the K. corrected by the Q. This type is found in IV.13,14; V.16,16; VII.10. An example is found twice in V.16 in נְרֵיָא (K.), נְרֵיָא (Q.). These forms are somewhat of a mystery. They are either scribal errors, Hebraisms, or true Aramaic forms. In both instances in chapter V the Q. reads נְרֵיָא. What causes the difficulty is the fact that a similar form (נְרֵיָא) occurs in II.10 without being noted in a Q. Why would the Massoretes allow the form in II.10 to stand and not the forms in V.16? Bevan, Prince, Marti, Kautzsch, Bauer-Leander, and with less enthusiasm Montgomery and Torrey all think the form to be a Hebraism and as such should be changed to נְרֵיָא as in III.29. If indeed it is a Hebraism one must again ask why the Massoretes would allow the form in chapter II and not here in chapter V. Powell thinks it is more likely that the forms are scribal errors for נְרֵיָא in II.10 and for נְרֵיָא in V.16. In an earlier section of his work Powell posits that the forms in V.16 may be true Aramaic forms which have arisen (as in Hebrew) by the contraction of an aw diphthong
to ¹. Due to the lack of massoretic correction in II.10 Rosenthal cautiously posits that the forms in chapter V (and the one in chapter II) are remnants of an ancient Huphal formation, common in Biblical Hebrew, and preserved in these three examples in Biblical Aramaic. Indeed, the discussion has gone on for some time in Hebrew-studies whether or not the imperfect Qal of ¹² ¹³ is really not a Qal at all, but rather a Hophal. By implication what Rosenthal is saying above is that the forms in Biblical Aramaic are not Hebraisms, but an ancient phenomenon common to both Hebrew and Aramaic. The fact is, however, that if the forms under discussion here are remnants of "an ancient Huphal," they are the only remnant preserved in Aramaic to the present author's knowledge.

The papyri alternate, as does Biblical Aramaic, between the roots ¹² and ¹³ (with a slight preference for the former in the papyri). The imperfect is ¹² ¹³ or ¹. In Jewish Palestinian Aramaic the Targum Onkelos to Genesis 15.5 has the imperfect form ¹², while the Targum Jerushalmi I has ¹² (corresponding exactly to the Q. in the first occurrence in V.16). Syriac and Mandaic use neither root to mean "to be able." Examples from other dialects could be multiplied, but it is unnecessary to do so. Biblical Aramaic (as over against the papyri) shows a preference for ¹³, and has an imperfect ¹ in III.29 along
with the other three forms previously mentioned. It should be pointed out that the relative ambiguity of knowledge as to the actual pronunciation of Egyptian Aramaic should caution against dogmatism in any statement that no "Hûphal" forms exist there. The occasional lack of vowel letters to represent long ü should add to this caution. Apparently, however, there are none in Egyptian Aramaic. In consequence the mystery remains and will probably always remain as to why the forms are as they are and as to why the form in II.10 is left without a Q.

In the case of בָּשָׁר (K.), בָּשָׁר (Q., IV.13,14), most older commentators felt this to be a Hebraism.39 Rosenthal fairly well sums up modern opinion, however, when he states:

..."mankind" is not a Hebraism, but originated through vowel assimilation from *'unas (cf. *tuhat "underneath").40

The form, if it were a Hebraism, would not be a pure Hebraism, but a Hebrew Aramaic hybrid in any case. The long ü is the Hebrew part of the form, the final aleph (the sign of the emphatic state) being Aramaic. In VII.10 there is absolutely no reason to substitute the Q. י'צ for the form of the K. י'צ which is a perfectly good Aramaic form.41

The remaining case of a possible Hebraism is דכ'א (K.), יכ'א (Q., VII.10). Most commentators agree that the final m should be read as an n.42 Rosenthal again summarizes well and concisely: "D' instead of י, as the ending of the
abs. st. of the pl. masc. ... is a Hebraism. A similar difficulty to the case of V.16 exists here in that \( יִשְׁכַּר \) in IV.14 (as well as \( יִשָּׁר \) in Ezra 4.13) are not noted in Qeres. The reason why one should be noted and two should not is as great a mystery here as it is in V.16. A possibility is that both final \( מ \) and final \( נ \) were acceptable to the Massoretes. Both \( מ \) and \( נ \) are acceptable endings for masculine plural nouns in Mishnaic Hebrew.

6. Variation in the termination of the third person feminine plural perfect. This type of K./Q. occurs in V.5 and VII.8,20. It is intimately connected with the next category and so final decisions must await the full discussion of both types. It is difficult to choose one example for discussion. In V.5 the K. is \( יִשָּׁר \) and the Q. is \( יִשְׁקַר \). On the basis of later Aramaic dialects most grammarians assume that there was a separate form of the third person feminine plural perfect in Biblical Aramaic. A problem with this theory is that there occurs a Q. for every K. of a third feminine plural perfect in Daniel's Aramaic. If a distinguishable feminine form existed why has the text in every case a masculine form (or a form identical to it)? Scholars have given several answers to this problem all of which should be considered. These answers include the following: (1) The Q. was added to conform to strict grammatical rules, (2) there is a discord between subject and
verb in the text, (3) the K. is a misreading of another form.

(1) This means that the Q. was added early on in the history of the transmission of the text. Montgomery notes that Theodotion's translation of וְהוּא by a participle in VII.20 is proof that the Q. was read by him as correct.44 This does not really prove anything except that the grammatical conventions of Aramaic at Theodotion's time (if he knew them) required a separate form for the third feminine plural perfect.45 Even if it could be proved that Ur-Theodotion read וְהוּא it would not prove that the form was correct.46 It would merely witness an early variant reading.

(2) Prince in his commentary makes the bald statement that "the Semitic construction does not require that the verb and the subject should agree."47 On the face of it this is a shocking statement, for it is common knowledge that in the vast majority of cases in all Semitic languages that subject and verb do agree. If Prince was referring to an anomaly in Aramaic then his statement is more comprehensible. The same kind of solecism occurs in Hebrew.48 What Prince may have been referring to was a so-called constructio ad sensum in which attention is paid to the meaning of the sentence in general rather than to the exact grammatical concord of subject with verb. The case in V.5 could conform to this type of construction. The subject of discussion is
not simply "fingers," but "the fingers of a man's hand," so that the construction places the emphasis on the word man, or upon the whole phrase as a compound subject rather than simply looking to the word "fingers" as the grammatical subject. The case is rather clear in chapter V, but the cases in chapter VII are not quite as straightforward. It is possible to read both of the occurrences in chapter VII as examples of this constructio ad sensum, but to read so involves a forced interpretation of the text. Another weakness of this theory is that the K./Q. occurs at each instance of the third person feminine plural perfect in Biblical Aramaic. It is unfortunate that one has only three examples of this construction in the Aramaic parts of the Old Testament.

Another possibility, related to this theory, would be that Biblical Aramaic, like Biblical Hebrew, did not differentiate orthographically between masculine and feminine in the third plural perfect. Jewish Palestinian Aramaic has a distinction as to gender both in Targum Onkelos and in Galilean Aramaic.\textsuperscript{49} Syriac\textsuperscript{50} and most probably Egyptian Aramaic also make this distinction.\textsuperscript{51} The Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon also has a separate form.\textsuperscript{52} Of these Aramaic dialects the forms are as follows: Targum Onkelos, מומגנ, Galilean, חנמג, Syriac, סמג, Egyptian Aramaic, תומג (only attested form), Genesis Apocryphon, שומג.
(only attested form). If one assumes an equivalency between the final he and final aleph as mere indicators of final pure-long vowels, then the Q. in Daniel is the same as Targum Onkelos, Egyptian Aramaic (which also has a final he), and the Genesis Apocryphon. With Aramaic forms attested from the fifth century BC which do possess a separate form for the third feminine plural perfect it would be passing strange if Biblical Aramaic did not. This opinion is strengthened if the slender evidence of Egyptian Aramaic be accepted and if it be remembered that both Egyptian Aramaic and Daniel's are included in the general category of Imperial Aramaic. One must, however, set conclusions aside until other alternatives are considered.

(3) A final theory is that the K. in Daniel is a miswriting for another form. It might first be suggested that the final waw is a miswriting (a copyist's error) for final nun. This would be possible even in the old orthography. One Kennicott manuscript actually reads ![Dj\[V.5. This reading could either be a feminine participle, or, assuming for a moment a form similar to Galilean Aramaic, a third person feminine plural perfect. The problem with the theory is that, again, this Q. occurs for each one of the forms in the text. It would seem that a copyist could get one out of three forms copied correctly.

H. L. Ginsberg observed that all Aramaic dialects
possess the separate third feminine plural perfect endings. Examples of this have been shown above for at least some dialects and sub-groups. Only the Aramaic of Daniel seems to be an exception. It is not, according to Ginsberg, a miswriting of forms since even in the older scripts the 77, the 7, and the do not resemble one another. Ginsberg's solution is to posit that was miswritten for yodh. This would agree with the form of the third feminine plural perfect in Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac (at least orthographically), and Samaritan Aramaic. His argument that the Aramaic of Daniel elsewhere "swarms with waws that are miswritten for yodhs" is a bit overstated (there are actually about eight such cases, see below), but his point is well-taken. Even Rosenthal admits that this may be the correct solution.

Can some choice between these theories be made? It was seen that a constructio ad sensum is possible in V.5, but in chapter VII a strained interpretation is necessary to claim this. This leaves one with the options that either the form of the K. was miswritten for something else or no separate form for the third feminine plural perfect existed in Biblical Aramaic. It is better to leave both possibilities open at this point. Below further data will be considered. All that can be said surely is that the Massoretes felt that a superior text was achieved by reading a form with
a final he, most likely because this was the more familiar form to them and to their immediate readers.

7. Confusion and alternation of vowel letters (א, ה, י, ע) in the K./Q. This is a composite category. There are different types of phenomena categorized together at this point for convenience. The occurrences are II.22,33,33,41,41,42,42; III.10,19,29; IV.9; V.7,8,16,29; VII.8,19. The first subtype in this category is the alternation between לוהי (K.), and לוהי (Q., II.33,33,41,41,42,42); לוהי (K.), and לוהי (Q., VII.8); and לוהי (K.), and לוהי (Q., VII.19). In other words the question is one of the variation of the third person plural pronominal suffix between the masculine form and its feminine counterpart. The subjects of the various clauses in which the above forms are found are all feminine (אלע, ראיע, נוי). Therefore, by strict grammatical convention, one would expect the feminine suffix. The question is, however, whether Biblical Aramaic possessed a separate suffix for the third feminine plural. This is the same problem as was discussed in number six immediately above, and the evidence developed there may prove helpful. It is not important to discuss the morphology of the different Aramaic dialects here. One only needs to see if a different suffix exists for masculine and feminine in the third person plural. Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Galilean Aramaic, Genesis Apocryphon Aramaic, Syriac, Palmyrene, and Nabatean all have this
separate form. The case in Egyptian Aramaic is not clear. Leander states that the feminine forms do not occur. Montgomery states that the form in the papyri is , which would not vary according to gender if such feminine forms did occur. It is not clear where Montgomery gets his information (the suffix of the third masculine plural in the papyri is ), and upon what knowledge he bases his judgment that the forms would not vary according to gender; but if he is right then Egyptian Aramaic is similar to Biblical Aramaic in the fact that there is apparently but one form for both masculine and feminine genders of the third person plural pronoun. With the exception of Egyptian Aramaic Biblical Aramaic’s sister dialects all possess a separate form. This may make it more likely that Biblical Aramaic also possesses such a form. Assuming this assumption to be valid for the moment, how does one explain the K.Q.? The easiest answer is to assume with Ginsberg that the waws are miswritten yodhs. In addition to the eight references of the suffix to things feminine there are two references to things masculine (VI.2,2). It is somewhat strange to posit mistakes in all eight cases where the suffix refers to the feminine. Is it not likely that a copyist would recognize one yodh in eight? On this ground it is probably best to say that, as far as present knowledge is concerned, Biblical Aramaic did not differentiate between
masculine and feminine in the third person plural pronominal suffix. What then can be said of the suggestions concerning the third feminine plural perfect which were made in number six above? If, as has been posited, Biblical Aramaic did not originally distinguish (orthographically) between genders in the third person plural pronominal suffix, and since the perfect is the suffix conjugation of the verb (that is the conjugation produced by the addition of modified forms of the pronominal suffixes to the stem), it is at least reasonable to assume that Biblical Aramaic made no orthographical distinction between the different genders of the third person plural perfect either.

A second sub-type of the present category is a group of foreign words which occur in Daniel. These words are as follows: יָדִּי (K.), וַעֲקֵדָּה (Q., III.5,10), יָמִּי (K.), יָמִּי (Q., III.10); מַעֲרָה (K.), מַעֲרָה (Q., V.7,16,29). The variation between K. and Q. merely shows two different ways of writing a non-native word. Since pronunciation is unsure in any case, further comment seems unnecessary. The unsurety of orthography, not to mention actual pronunciation, of these loan-words is shown by the multiple possibilities for the K. given in the apparatus of BHK.7 ( אִיזָּאָן, אִיזָּאָן, אִיזָּאָן, אִיזָּאָן; or for the Q. ( אִיזָּאָן, אִיזָּאָן, אִיזָּאָן). 60

In yet another sub-group the Massoretes modified in the margin verb forms so as to make them agree in number
and gender (K. קְנִי, Q. קְנִי, IV.9). Two occurrences of the same word in IV.16,21 (יִֽרָכָּן) are simplified in the spelling of the Q. (יִֽרָכָּן) by the elimination of the quiescent aleph. The usage of the Q. agrees generally speaking with that of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic.

In II.39 אֶבוּא (K.) is simplified by the removal of an unaccented adverbial final a (עֶבָא). This unaccented final a may be the remnant of an accusative case ending. By the time of the Massoretes it was evidently no longer considered necessary.

There is no reason for assuming that the K. is not original to Biblical Aramaic. The abstract noun יִֽרָכָּן (V.11,14) which is without a Q. shows that this spelling is probably original. By the time of the Massoretes the spelling had gone over from yodh to waw, most probably preceded by a shift in pronunciation from ֵ to ֽ. An alternative solution would be to suggest that this is a waw mistaken for a yodh. This is just the reverse of Ginsberg's suggestion that yodhs have been mistaken for waws. The only K./Q. in chapter I is דִּמְרוּ (K.), דִּמְרוּ (Q., I.3). It is probably best to follow Torrey here and consider that the form is a conflation of the words דִּמְרוּ "blemish," and נָֽעֲדָה "anything." The form יִֽרָכָּן (K., III.29) is most likely the concrete form of the abstract יִֽרָכָּן (Q., also found in VI.5; Ezra 4.22; 6.9). As such it is comparable to יִֽרָכָּן (II.22) and to יִֽרָכָּן (V.11,14). The
Massoretes provided the more common abstract form in the margin. The final K./Q. in this category is נַעֲשֶׂה (K.), חָלִיךְ (Q., V.8). It is most likely that the Massoretes were merely reading a variant tradition of the text. They felt that the form with the pronominal suffix made the reading of the text clearer.

8. **Shift in both stem and number of the verb in the**

Q. This type occurs only one time (V.21). The K. is נִשְׂפָּה (נִשְׂפָּה), and the Q. is נִשְׂפָּה. The K. is to be parsed as a third person masculine singular perfect Pef'il; the Q. is a third person masculine plural perfect Pafel. If the Q. is read the construction is to be seen as an impersonal plural used as a circumlocutory passive. The major difficulty in reading the Q. comes in obtaining it from the present text. One must either assume haplography of the letter waw, or faulty word division. Either of these errors must generally be allowed as a possibility, but here the K. makes perfect sense, although it might be objected that the translation "became equal to (with)" does not reflect the passive which is the function of the Pef'il. What is required is a meaning "was made equal to (with)." This would be a factitive use of a stative verb, i.e. a Pafel (נִשְׂפָּה), made into the necessary passive by means of the impersonal third person plural (this is the Q.). A possible suggestion, which, to
the current author's knowledge has not been previously made, is that the K. form is not a passive at all, but rather a simple Pe'al stative, or what Rosenthal calls a pe'iel.\(^67\)

The only forms of a third-radical-weak verb of this nature in Biblical Aramaic are יָפֶשׁ in V.3 and יַנְּנֵי in VII.19. On the analogy of these forms it is possible to reconstruct a form which would be a third masculine singular. This form is *יָפֶשׁ, identical to the K. Syriac has a similar form in the p'el of stative verbs (סְפֶּל).\(^68\) The stative form suggested would not need to be passive, thus avoiding the disadvantage of the pe'iel. The translation would then be:

"and his heart was (or became) equal with the beast." In the English translation one must insert a "that of," "his heart was (or became) equal with (that of) the beast." This ellipsis is precisely equivalent to the one in IV.13: "his heart was changed from (that of) a man."

9. Different vocalizations of יָפֶשׁ verbs. These verbs are found in IV.4; V.8,10; VI.4. This K./Q. occurs only with the p'el stem, and then only in the masculine plural participle יָפֶשׁ(Q. יָפֶשׁ), and the third feminine singular perfect יָפֶשׂ(Q. יָפֶשׂ). It should be noted that, in the latter instance, it does not always occur (יָפֶשׂ, VI.19). From later Jewish Palestinian Aramaic it appears that there is no regularity in forming the paradigm of verbs of this
type. It is likely that the Massoretes were merely noting variants here. The evidence from the Papyri is very slim, but it appears that a form such as the Q. was used there. In the Genesis Apocryphon Fitzmyer vocalizes a petal masculine plural participle as ḥazzīn. This would be equivalent to the Q. in Daniel. In Jewish Palestinian Aramaic both רַגָּל and רַגָּל are found. It therefore appears that there were forms which were both contracted and uncontracted.

10. The addition of a letter in the Q. This is found in the forms יֶהָּלֶנֶת (K.), יֶהָּלֶנֶת (Q., II.9); and יְָל (K.), יְָל (Q., II.43). The first instance may be either a hophel or a hithpael with assimilation of י to א as in Biblical Hebrew. The forms of the K. and Q. appear to be alternatives, although Syriac would use the form without assimilation. The second instance merely makes reading easier in the Massoretes' opinion. There is little to be said for the choice of one over the other, except that reading the Q. makes the narrative flow in a smoother manner.

In summary, it has been seen that the purpose of the K./Q. is greatly varied. The Massoretes may have corrected a form which they considered to be grammatically incorrect or inferior (numbers 1-6, part of 7, and 8 above), giving alternative pronunciations or spellings of words (part of 7,
and 9). The Massoretes also simply supplied variant readings (part of 7, and 10). It cannot be stressed too strongly that whichever reading is taken in a particular case, neither is the wrong reading. The Massoretes entered into the margin from a goodly number of variant readings only those which were attested and those which, in their opinion, improved the text grammatically or literarily.

THE DATE OF THE ARAMAIC

As has been stated elsewhere, this is a problem the solution of which will probably always evade scholarship. Complete evidence cannot be cited here because there are already excellent resources which accomplish the task clearly and completely;⁷⁴ thus any thorough-going exposition of the various arguments would merely constitute repetition. It must suffice to give a concise summary of the present state of the quest.

No serious question was raised about the date of the book in general (or the Aramaic in particular) until the last century. Before this time the objectors were few. The first man to question the sixth century date for the book was the neo-Platonist Porphyry (232–c. 303AD) who called the words of the book vaticinium ex eventu, or prophecies after the fact. The traditional position of the church was to reject this and maintain a sixth century date for the whole of
Daniel. With the rise of modern biblical criticism, which applying to Daniel began in 1806, the date of the book (or at least parts of it) were fixed at about 164 BC. It is not the current purpose to advocate either early or late date nor any in between, but rather to investigate the Aramaic to deduce what date is allowed by it.

Perhaps no statement concerning the date of a biblical document has roused such emotion, both pro and con, as the words of S. R. Driver:

The verdict of the language of Daniel is thus clear. The Persian words presuppose a period after the Persian empire had been well established: the Greek words demand, the Hebrew supports, and the Aramaic permits, a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (B.C. 332).*5

Driver's statement was the immediate cause of R. D. Wilson's essay (1912) which sought to refute it. The ninth edition of Driver's Introduction (1913) contained an additional four pages for the purpose of answering Wilson.76 Ten years later Charles Boutflower wrote In and Around the Book of Daniel, and although the work was independent, largely agreed with Wilson. These two articles, along with two by W. St. Clair Tisdall,77 occasioned the book The Aramaic of the Old Testament by H. H. Rowley. Rowley carefully assembled a massive amount of information and has been for many years the classic statement of the linguistic argument for a second century date for Daniel's Aramaic. Some two years earlier Walter
Baumgartner had come to similar conclusions in a long article in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. H. H. Schaeder answered Baumgartner's article in his *Iranische Beiträge I* in 1930 (he does not seem to be aware of Rowley's work). Schaeder makes the point that one could expect the language to be modernized in the development of the text of Daniel as tradition handed it on. This is to say that the spelling was modernized in passage of time. Kitchen who has written the latest discussion of Daniel's Aramaic, has taken up Schaeder's position on this and other matters.

The two major philological arguments adduced for a second century date have in the past been the presence of certain Akkadian, Persian, and Greek loan words in the Aramaic of Daniel along with the orthography of certain consonants. According to Kitchen, and there is no reason to doubt his conclusion, the inference from these data is ambiguous as to date. The first of the above-named factors is the occurrence of loan words in the Aramaic of the book.

To this topic attention will now be turned.

**Loan Words in the Aramaic of Daniel**

About 90% of the vocabulary of Daniel's Aramaic is found in Aramaic documents of the fifth century BC and earlier. This points to a fact long recognized by scholars, that is, the Aramaic of Daniel stands as a sub-division of
Imperial Aramaic. This means that the actual amount of loan words in Biblical Aramaic is relatively small. It is best to break these loan words down into their constituent languages.

Hebrew loan words. These are relatively worthless for purposes of dating. The author was most probably a Hebrew and consequently Hebrew words could be expected to creep into his vocabulary. Rosenthal lists some of the more important words in Biblical Aramaic which have come from Hebrew.

Akkadian loan words. These too, do not add a great deal of evidence to fixing the date of Daniel's Aramaic. The fact that the Arameans penetrated into Babylonia and Assyria from the late second millenium BC coupled with the fact that from the eighth century BC Aramaic was recognized as an official language in Mesopotamia means that there is little chance to be exact in ascertaining when these words came into Aramaic. If one adds the words _gem (from e/adānu, adannu, ḫadānum) and _gē (from paḫḫaru), to the eighteen Akkadian words listed in Rosenthal's Grammar one sees that twelve of the terms are attested in both early and late sources, seven of the terms are listed in late sources only, and one of the terms is listed in early sources only. Accordingly,
the seven terms not attested until the late sources could as well be survivals as elements which did not come into the language until late, especially since many of the late sources are post-Christian and it must be assumed that any Akkadian words would have come into another language long before the Christian era. The net effect of the Akkadian loan words is to allow a date from the time of the papyri (and before) until the date of 164 BC assumed by some scholars as the date of Daniel's Aramaic.

Persian loan words. The Aramaic of Daniel contains some nineteen Persian loan words. Of these, according to Kitchen, thirteen are found in later literature, especially in the Targums. In the papyri, according to Rowley, there are (in Cowley's collection) twenty-six Persian loan words, only two of which have survived to the age of the Targums. What Rowley does not say is that some eight or nine of the words of Persian origin in Daniel's Aramaic are also found in the fifth century BC. Of these, four or five also occur in the Targums. Kitchen brings out another important consideration. New collections have come to light since 1929 when Rowley wrote. For example, the collection edited by G. R. Driver contains twenty-six Persian words nineteen of which are new. Two words occur in both Cowley and Kraeling, three in Cowley only, two in other sources. Five of these
words occur in the Talmud. Therefore, on Rowley's own crit-

erion, the Driver collection shows as much affinity with the
Talmud as it does with other documents of the fifth century
BC. 91

Several conclusions emerge from the above statements.
First, twenty words are virtually useless in a statistical
argument. Second, the examples cited from the Driver col-
lection show that our knowledge of the impact of Persian on
Aramaic is very incompletely understood. This is clearly
shown when the Persian loan words in a language are increased
by nearly half in a small collection of documents. Third,
several words which were not thought to be common to the
papyri and Biblical Aramaic in 1929 are, with the publica-
tion of the Kraeling and Driver documents, now known to be
so. 92

Another valuable point to remember is that the Per-
sian words in the Aramaic of Daniel are Old Persian loan
words. 93 This means that the words must have entered Aramaic
generally before circa 300 BC. This, however, merely states
when the words entered Aramaic, it has nothing to do with
the date of Daniel's Aramaic. In other words, the words
could have been taken up into the Aramaic language before
300 BC but still be found in a document of the second century.
Persian loan words leave the question open as to the Ara-
maic's date. They would most likely, of course, speak for a
date after the foundation of the Persian empire in 539 BC, but just how far down the date must move in order to accommodate the incorporation of these words into Aramaic is a matter of question. In spite of the evidence adduced by Kitchen to show Persian words in Aramaic as early as 519, it seems altogether more likely that some date later than the third year of Cyrus (535, Daniel X.1) is necessary for the number of Persian loan words in the Aramaic of Daniel. Although the point could be debated, the net effect of the Persian loan words might possibly be to draw the upper limit down from the traditional date (about 535) to somewhere in the vicinity of 500 BC, but no surety is possible here.

Greek loan words. This is a very difficult problem for those who would maintain the traditional date for the composition of Daniel, and thus for its Aramaic. Kitchen, who in spite of his attempt to be fair shows his preference for a sixth century date here, is reduced to arguing that there was much Greek commercial intercourse as early as the eighth century BC in Palestine. There is archaeological evidence for this exchange of traders. There were Greek artisans in Nebuchadrezzar's Babylon. There are Greek papyri at Elephantine dating from as early as the fourth century BC. The preservation of the terms here and in late sources only could be accidental and could only prove the inadequacy
of source material. 96

There are only three words of proven Greek origin in Daniel's Aramaic. These are אֲדוֹן/קִדְמֵא, לֵזַעְרָא/זָיוֹלְחוּוֹנ, לִבּוֹאֵש/סְמָעָוָיו. The first of these words is found in Homer, 97 the second is found in Aristotle (fourth century BC), 98 and the third is found in Plato (fifth-fourth centuries BC). 99 This last term may be found as the name of a specific musical instrument for the first time in Polybius (second century BC). 100 More to this, S. R. Driver states that Polybius was describing musical instruments enjoyed by Antiochus Epiphanes. 101

It is not, however, wholly clear from the passages cited by Driver that Polybius was really referring to a specific musical instrument. The term συμφωνία had a well-attested meaning of "concord (of sounds or instruments)," as early as the fifth century BC. 102 Liddell and Scott allow the possibility that Polybius meant something like "band, orchestra," but not a specific musical instrument. If Polybius simply refers to a harmony, then the first noted usage of συμφωνία as "orchestra" dates from the first Christian century. Noted musicologists have taken Polybius' references to be to the "full consort" of instruments. 103 Curt Sachs has taken the reference in Daniel to be the same sort of thing. A rather extended citation from Sachs will suffice to put the case of these scholars:
...It would be unusual to enumerate separately the instruments of an orchestra and then add the orchestra itself; we would not describe a military band, for example, as flutes, saxophones, trombones, tubas, drums, and their ensemble. Though meaningless from an occidental point of view, such a description is significant when we know the practice of oriental music. If we accept the Aramaic text word for word, the king's subjects heard the various instruments first singly and then all together. And this is exactly the manner of orchestra playing in the Near East. A flourish on a horn or trumpet may attract attention. Then the performance begins. Several leading instruments out of the band display, in an improvised solo performance called *tagsim* in Arabic, the *magam* or melodic pattern of the piece, each one according to the nature and technique of his instrument. After them the full ensemble joins in with either a short ritornello or a longer symphony. In addition to the melodic solo instruments which are admitted to a *tagsim*, this ensemble comprises drums and other instruments of a merely rhythmical character. It would be appropriate to call them "all kinds of *zmara*" or instruments, in the words of the Book of Daniel.

Thus, a literal translation of the Aramaic text suggests the picture of a horn signal, followed by solos of oboe, lyre and harp, and a full ensemble of these and some rhythmical instruments. It does not describe an orchestra, but an orchestral performance in the Ancient Near East.104

If, however, Driver and others are right in assuming that both Polybius and Daniel refer to a specific musical instrument, those who would maintain a sixth century date for Daniel would have to do so in spite of the information the Polybius refers his comments to Antiochus Ephiphanes, the very tyrant in whose reign many scholars have dated the book of Daniel. It is interesting that Kitchen nowhere uses the above outlined argument, but rather assumes that scholars
such as Driver and Bevan are right. Kitchen argues that the fact that σοτομησία in the required meaning is only preserved in late sources is an accident of preservation and some future epigraphic find may show an early occurrence of this word (which it might well do). He seems to show an awareness of the difficulty into which Polybius puts the traditional date of Daniel by moving swiftly from the actual occurrence of the three words into the non-occurrence of more than three. Kitchen holds that if the book had been written as late as the mid-second century BC one could expect a great many more Greek words than three to be in the text. In answer to this it might be said that the three Greek words are found at a point in the text which describes a pagan monarch's orchestra. If the book of Daniel was a product of the Maccabean uprising, then it is not surprising that one finds a very few Greek words used, since it was against the Hellenization policy of the Seleucid monarch that the revolt was directed. The only three Greek words used are used in a pagan context. It is made very clear that these instruments are now Hebrew instruments; they are almost pejorative terms in their context by the very fact that they are Greek.

These three Greek words are not necessarily native to the text. If one could posit a Maccabean reworking of
earlier legends--written or oral--then these words could have been added at that time in order to contemporize the narrative. There are portions of chapters VII-XII which point to a Maccabean origin of these chapters. One might posit that three words were added to the text at that time. There is no definite proof for this hypothesis, but it is certainly a possibility. In light of the anti-Hellenistic tendency of the Maccabean period which would most probably show up in a refusal to use Greek terms, it is hard to see how Kitchen on the basis of the non-occurrence of more Greek terms thinks a sixth, fifth, or fourth century date is more likely than a third or a second century one. 106

As a result of a study of the Greek words in Daniel one is forced to one of four conclusions. (1) The fact that the word σουρωνις occurs as the name of a single musical instrument first in the second century and later is due to an accident of preservation. There is much evidence for cultural interchange between the Greek world and the Semitic world as early as the eighth century BC. There is, therefore, no reason to assume that the terms could not have existed with the correct meanings earlier in the parent language and in other languages as loan terms. There are two major weaknesses of this hypothesis. First, it must ascribe to coincidence the fact that the first reference to σουρωνις as a single musical instrument refers to Antiochus Epiphanes;
second, that the use of \( \text{συμφωνία} \) in the correct sense as a GREEK LOAN WORD antedates by some four centuries (on the traditional dating) the first recorded usage in such a sense in Greek itself. There are other usages of \( \text{συμφωνία} \) before the second century, but none until that time meaning a single musical instrument.

(2) The second conclusion questions the fact that \( \text{συμφωνία} \) does refer to a single musical instrument either in Polybius or in Daniel. The well-attested meaning of the word was "concord" and so it should be translated in Daniel. This theory, however, does not necessitate subscribing to either an early or a late date, but it makes an early date possible. One must still deal with Polybius' reference to \( \text{συμφωνία} \) in the context of Antiochus Epiphnes whatever the term meant.

(3) The Greek terms indicate that the Aramaic of Daniel is contemporary with Polybius, i.e. the second century BC. H. H. Rowley in 1932 used this criterion to deduce (although not dogmatically) that the Aramaic of the book is to be dated in the second century. (4) The Greek words came into use in a Maccabean revision of an existing legend to indicate a paganism which was foreign to Jewish faith. In any case the Greek words form a rather strong indicator that the date of the Aramaic should probably not be placed towards the upper limit of circa 500 BC, but towards the lower limit.
of circa 164. Just how far down the Greek points is not clear. If one accepts hypothesis (1), (2), or (4) above, it need not point down at all. It is perhaps best to follow Montgomery here:

The Gr(eek) words are, until more light comes, to be put on the scales with those from Persia, and both categories require a heavy counterweighting to resist their logical pressure.\(^{108}\)

**Orthography of Certain Consonants**

At the outset let it be said that what is under discussion is orthography and not pronunciation or phonetics (at least directly). H. H. Rowley seems to have the two confused in his study of 1929.\(^{109}\) In addition to the valuable section on this subject in Kitchen's article, the most relevant discussion is H. H. Schaedier's 1930 article "Sprachliche und orthographische Entwicklung im Reichsaramäischen" which Kitchen uses freely and everywhere assumes.\(^{110}\) Kitchen summarizes the phenomena as follows:

Old Aramaic (tenth to seventh centuries BC) and Imperial Aramaic (sixth to fourth centuries BC), one finds written:

\[ z \] where Daniel and Ezra have \( d \); Hebrew \( z \); Arabic \( \\text{古典}\)\( d \),

\[ s ' \] " " " " " t; " s; " t,

\[ q ' \] " " " " " c; " s; " d,

\[ \$ ' \] " " " " " \( t \); " s; " z,

\[ 's'(s?)'" " " " s or s; " s; " s.\(^{111}\)

It must be emphasized that the pronunciation did not shift...
from a proto-Semitic *d to z (papyri) to d (Daniel), but rather a pronounced d was first written as a z, then when the d shifted in pronunciation to d, slowly the orthography caught up changing the writing to a d. The same is true for the other consonants under discussion. The writing system, taken over from the Phoenicians, was inadequate to phonetically represent all the sounds of Aramaic. As a result, two sounds were represented by one consonant (e.g., the symbol for z represented both the sound of true z and the sound d). In time the sound d (represented by z) became pronounced as d. The shift in pronunciation led to a reconciliation of sound with symbol, i.e., since both were now pronounced as d, both came to be written as d. The evidence is that this shift in pronunciation had already taken place by the fifth century BC and the compensatory change in spelling was underway by this time as well. This can be seen in the occasional occurrence of for in the papyri. What these solecisms in the papyri amount to are phonetic modernizations of historical spellings with z of phonemes which were once pronounced d, but later came to be pronounced d. It is obvious that if Daniel was written at the traditional date in the sixth century then the orthography must have at one time agreed with that of the papyri in regards of the consonants tabulated above. This means that...
someone has systematically "updated" the spelling of Daniel to agree with later convention. This is the very point at which Rowley scorned Wilson for making Daniel a "spelling reformer." In scorning him so Rowley showed that he did not understand Wilson's argument. In general this is the same argument stated by Schaeder. A case can be built for this modernization having taken place in the text of Daniel. Already in 1930 Schaeder pointed to the variant spellings of מָצַא (III.2,3) and מָעִין (Ezra 7.21). The word מָעִין is a Persian loan word from ganzabara. When the spelling was undergoing its change period someone, perhaps a scribe, saw the word מָעִין and assumed it to be from *gdbr, not realizing that the z was a true z in this particular word. In the case of literature such as Daniel as over against a once-for-all-time legal document it is not far-fetched to assume that this modernization in spelling could take place. Kitchen abundantly illustrates that such changes took place in Egyptian literature. There is no reason to assume that changes did not occur in biblical literature as well.

On the basis of this summary, one is led to one of two hypotheses. (1) The Aramaic of Daniel was written early and the orthography has suffered modification and modernization. This is spoken for by the case of hyper-correction of בֶּן/בֶּן. (2) The Aramaic of Daniel was
composed after the sound/spelling shift took place and suffered no modification and modernization. It is difficult to say just when this sound/spelling reconciliation took place, or rather was completed in Aramaic generally. In the latest papyri in Cowley dating from circa 300 BC the spelling is still of the older type and so one must assume a date after this time for the modernization of Daniel's spelling, if such an event ever took place. Of course neither of the above hypotheses is capable of proof on the basis of current knowledge.

Conclusions on philology as a dating criterion. The sections on loan words and consonantal orthography have shown one thing and one thing only for certain. Philology in and of itself cannot date the Aramaic of Daniel. As far as the loan words are concerned it has been seen that the Persian words might limit the date to circa 500 BC, the Greek loan words point towards a later date, but there is no definite evidence as to exactly how much later. As to orthography, there can be no surety either way. Daniel may have been written early (before any sound/spelling shift) and modernized, or written wholly after this sound/spelling shift had taken place. On the information given above it is equally fair to say that Daniel was written early (perhaps even as early as the traditional date) or late; in the sixth
(or more likely the fifth) century or the second, or at any point in between. The language itself allows any date from the traditional to the critical date of the Aramaic. Any dating of Daniel's Aramaic portion must rest firmly on other criteria than language.

The fact that the language itself allows a date between approximately 500 (or before) and 164 means that any further investigation of Daniel's Aramaic can be carried out without reference to its date. Thus any apologetic for any date is avoided here. There are several more philological facets of the Aramaic of Daniel which require treatment.

THE USE OF VERBAL TENSES

Perhaps the single most important article on the subject of tense usage in Daniel's Aramaic has been written by H. B. Rosen. Unlike the syntax sections of Rosenthal (which are minimal) and Bauer-Leander, Rosen constructs a system which fits the usage of the vast majority of Biblical Aramaic verbs. Rosen analyzes about 124 verbs (about 83% of the total), leaving purposely out of the account the poetic passages of Daniel (II.20-23; III.33; IV.7-9,11-14,31-32; VI.27-28; VII.9-10,13-14,23-27). Those verbs which Rosen does not handle are as follows: יָבִי (II.5), נָבַי (III.19), רָבָא (IV.11), מְשַׁרְבָּה (VII.25), נָבַי (II.12), מַשַּׁרְבָּה (IV.11,20), מְשַׁרְבָּה (VII.9), מְשַׁרְבָּה (III.25; VII.5), מְשַׁרְבָּה (VII.23), מְשַׁרְבָּה (V.20), מְשַׁרְבָּה
The tenses of Daniel's Aramaic have always been a translation-problem. For example, the participle is widely used to indicate a variety of times. This can be confusing, at least on the surface. The common English progressive present or gerundive translation (be-ing, do-ing), is often very clumsy and sometimes misleading. For this reason Rosén's article is important; it attempts to codify the various verb-tenses into use-categories. There is no reason to disagree with Rosén's conclusions, and no reason to give more than a summary of his findings here.

Verbs break into one of two classes, point and linear. The point class includes verbs whose perfect (Rosén calls it a stative) is used as a subordinative or perfective tense, whose imperfect is used as a future/volitive, whose participle is used as the regular narrative tense, and whose participle plus יִשָּׁלֶג is a present progressive tense. This is by far the larger class, including 113 verbs. Linear verbs have the participle as a present, the imperfect as a narrative, the participle plus imperfect copula as future/volitive, and the participle plus a perfect copula as a
subordinative tense. This class includes some thirty verbs. 123

The perfect is not the normal narrative tense in Biblical Aramaic. When it is the principal tense it is time-indifferent completed action (as in IV.33; V.21; VI.6,7; VII.28; etc.). When the perfect is used with another tense it is usually subordinate to it and anterior in time as well. This is in direct contradiction to Bauer-Leander, section 79a. The perfect is used a great deal with '7 as a relative. This usage can be seen reflected in the following table listing the occurrences of the perfect tense with '7.

II. 8,10,14,23,23,25,26,34,35,37,38,41,42,45,45,48.
III. 2,12,23,24,25,25,27,27,27,27,28,28,28,28,32,33.
IV. 5,10,16,16,16,17,19,21,23,27,30.
V. 2,3,11,11,12,12,14,14,18,21,22,23,25.
VI. 5,10,11,14,15,23,24,25,25,26,28.
VII. 4,4,4,4,9,9,11,19,20,22,22,24,23; V.3,30,31,21,23,29.

The perfect often occurs in subordinate clauses without '7. In this type of usage the perfect indicates the second and consequent tenses in a narrative sequence. Examples of this can be seen in II.29,30,45; III.10,11,12,19,20,22,24,23; V.30; and VII.1. 125 There are four occurrences of a compound tense with the perfect copula. 126 The perfect is also used in questions referring to past time (III.15;
IV.32; VI.21).  

For other uses of and full examples of the subordinative perfect one must see Rosén's article, section 3.423.

The other tenses divide themselves into the categories of point and linear as outlined above. The verbs which share characteristics of both the categories are הנש, וגמ, זוע, ובש, ויר, גבג, עאמר, ויק, ונש, and הזש.  

Rosen does not discuss one use of the imperfect which becomes important for a capturing of the Aramaic's true flavor. This usage is the impersonal use of the third person plural imperfect. In this kind of usage the active voice serves to indicate the passive. The usage has long been noted, but only Kautzsch gives it anything like full treatment.  

The reason for its use, according to Bauer-Leander, is that the aorist (imperfect) passive is lacking in Biblical Aramaic.  

The occurrences of this form are as follows: II.13,18,30; IV.13,22,22,22,23,28,29,29; V.3,20,21,21,23,29,29; VI.17,17,25,25; VII.5,12,13,26.  

The reason behind the use of this form is a mystery, but it seems to be used in both Biblical Aramaic and, to a lesser extent, in Biblical Hebrew to indicate the result of a higher power or being working upon a lower one.  

Included in the above list are those instances where the verbal form in question is not an imperfect plural at all, but rather a plural participle (active), which can also be used in this passive
sense. These participles occur at III.4; IV.22,28,29; VII.5. It is worthy of mention that in just over half of the instances of this verbal circumlocutory passive (about 56%) the object of the verb takes the preposition $ as a prefix.

Another facet of the verbal tenses upon which Rosén does not touch concerns the non-finite verbal forms, that is, the imperative and the infinitive. The imperative is straightforward in Biblical Aramaic and so will not be considered at this point, but the infinitive presents some special problems and so needs some explanation.

Infinitives occur fifty-four or fifty-six times in Danial's Aramaic. These infinitives are derived from a total of thirty-four verbal roots. The exact morphology depends, of course, upon the root radicals of the verbs in question. The verbs will be broken down into their morphological types and a morphological pattern will be given for each. Regular or Strong verb. P^al: (1) miC CaC, ~ (III.2), ~ (V.(12), 16), ~ (IV.23); (k) miC Ceh (with pronominal suffix, VI.21) ~. Pael: 1-CaC^2aCâ, (~) (III.20), (~) (VI.8). Hithp^el: 1-hitC CaCâ, (~) (II.13). Haphel: 1-haC CaCâ, (~) (VII.26), (~) (IV.34).

VII.26); this verb is treated in the Haphel like a Pe-waw verb in that the weak aleph is changed to a waw before the Haphel is formed. The הָוָּא comes from an original הָוָּא. 137


In summary, the characteristics of the infinitive Pe'el is the preformative mem, although there is attested an old form without the mem in the Aramaic of Ezra. In the derived conjugations the form of a feminine singular noun is taken, the form ending in a pure long Roboto. With suffixes this feminine noun-form is changed to the construct form for abstract nouns, ending in Roboto. There is one case of an infinitive used substantivally in the construct state with the ending at. It has been previously mentioned that both finite verb and participle can be passive in their meanings although they are active in their forms. This usage is shared by the infinitive, but unlike both participle and finite verb which have some means to show inflection, the infinitive by its nature has none. The passive meaning must be derived wholly from the context. W. Stinespring, recently retired from Duke University, in an article already alluded to in a note, has drawn attention to this construction in Biblical Aramaic. It should be noted that the vast majority of cases of this passive infinitive take their object prefixed by  nhân.
thereby making that object for all practical purposes a dative. An example of this can be seen in II.12: רָאָשְׁנָה, "and he said (ordered) for all the wise-
men of Babylon to be destroyed." Other instances are similar to the one cited. This passive meaning for the active in-
finite is found, according to Stinespring, some thirteen times in Daniel. 141 I would add to his list the occurrence in VI.20.

Five meaning-classes can be distinguished for infinitives in Biblical Aramaic. Those fourteen occurrences of the active infinitive used passively will be noted in their proper meaning class.

1. Complementary infinitives. Certain verbs take an infinitive to complete their meaning. Such verbs as "to go, to send, to say, to order, to decide, to write, to think, to need, to agree, and to be able" are included here. For a list of passages which have this as their usage see the next major section below. 142 Those infinitives which are passive in meaning, although active in form and belong to this class, are II.12,46; III.2,13,19,20; IV.3; V.2,7; VI.24.

2. An infinitive expressing purpose. These infinitives show an aim or purpose, and the phrase "for the purpose of" can usually be inserted in the translation. The oc-
currences are listed below in the next major section under
number 5.143 The only two infinitives with passive meanings here are VII.26,26.

3. An infinitive used in a purpose clause with ֶל. There are but two infinitives in this group, both of which are passive in meaning. They are found in VI.9,16. These two infinitives do not take an object with the prefixed ֹ.

4. An infinitive used as a substantive. This usage of the infinitive is found most after a preposition and a genitive. For example, see הָבְהָמָלָה in II.25; III.24; and VI.20. It is sometimes found as the subject of the clause and accordingly without a preposition; for example רֶפֶל, אֶשֶר, and דֶל in V.20.

5. An infinitive used in place of a finite verb. Sometimes the infinitive is used more or less in place of a finite verb. This can be seen in the idiomatic temporal clause set up by "as (when) he drew near," VI.21. The infinitive in IV.24 is also most probably to be taken in this way. Neither of these cases are passive in meaning.

THE USE OF THE PREPOSITION ֶל IN DANIEL

The preposition ֶל is one of the most flexible particles in Biblical Aramaic. The following pages are an attempt to justify the preceding statement and to show all
the usages of the particle in Daniel's Aramaic. All the usages of 1- in Daniel have been codified here. One major use of the letter 1 which has not been included is the prefix to the imperfect of the verb הווה. The reason for the omission of this aspect is that the lamedh prefixed to these forms is NOT the preposition at all. It may be connected with the Akkadian precative form לַא, or it may be a change of a form which looked too much like the divine name Yahweh. It may be a combination of these, but nonetheless, it has no place in a discussion of the preposition.

Certain use-categories have been set up and it has been the attempt to assign each occurrence to the preposition to one of the use-categories. In some cases the assignment to particular categories is less than clear and no dogmatism is intended in assigning the occurrences of prepositions to those listed below. Sometimes a form might fit one or more than one category. In the latter case I have chosen the category which seems to most closely fit the usage. One will immediately note the debt in categorization to both major lexica, that of Brown-Driver-and Briggs, and that of Koehler-Baumgartner; although both have been modified somewhat. What follows is a simple listing, made by working through the text of Daniel I-VI and counting, of all the occurrences of the preposition 1-. 
1. The first usage of this preposition is one in which the particle means "to" and occurs after verbs of saying, writing, declaring, giving, and making known as well as in the address and salutation of a letter or decree. The occurrences are:

   II. 4, 5, 7, 14, 15, 16, 16, 17, 19, 21, 21, 23, 23, 24, 24, 25, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 30, 37, 44, 45, 46, 46, 46, 47, 48.

   III. 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 12, 14, 14, 15, 16, 18, 18, 19, 20, 24, 24, 28, 28, 31.

   IV. 4, 13, 14, 22, 28, 29, 32, 33.

   V. 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 28.

   VI. 3, 7, 16, 17, 17, 21, 21, 24, 26.

   VII. 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 14, 22, 27, 27.

The object denoted by the verb form plus the preposition _ is most usually a person. Exceptions to this rule are found in VII.4, 5, 6, 11, 12 (animal); the object is a thing in II.34, 35; III.5, 7, 10, 12, 12, 14, 14, 15, 18, 19, 28, 28. There are eighty-nine total occurrences of this category of use.

2. The second category is that in which the preposition indicates the direction or the aim of movement. The occurrences of this type are as follows:

   II. 17.

   III. 2, 20, 26.

   IV. 8, 8, 17, 17, 19, 19, 31.

   V. 6, 10.

   VI. 8, 11, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, 25.
VII. 5.

In Daniel the direction so indicated by the preposition is always towards a place. In Hebrew of the classical period this usage would be handled by the preposition הָלָּה. Biblical Aramaic knows of one instance where the goal of the movement is toward a person (Ezra 5.5). There are twenty-four total occurrences in this category.

3. A very important usage of the preposition is to mark the accusative case. The normal rule is that ל is used to denote the personal direct object. The occurrences of this category are:

II. 12,14,19,24,25,34,35,48,49.

III. 2,13,19,20,22,30.

IV. 3,22,22,22,29,29,31,31,34.

V. 2,4,7,23,23,23,29.

VI. 2,12,17,28.

VII. 2, (5, cf. 13 below),25.

A statement on page 56 of Rosenthal's Grammar states: "It may, however, be noted that in BA, a large percentage of those cases concerns the direct object of an infinitive or a participle." By actual count, however, twenty-three occurrences (approximately 60%) are with finite verbs, six occurrences (about 15%) are with participles, and nine are with infinitives. The usage of ל as the mark of the accusative
seems to be limited to the following types of cases:

a. Proper names (with infinitive III.13,20; with participle VI.17; with finite verbs II.25,48,49; III.22,30; IV.31; V.29; VI.12,28).

b. A noun (object) in the determined (emphatic) state (with infinitive III.2,19; with participle VII.2; with finite verbs II.34,35; IV.31; V.23; VI.2).

c. A noun (object) determined by a following genitive (with infinitive (II.12),14,24; (IV.3); V.2; with participle IV.34; with finite verbs II.24; V.4,23,23, (23); VII.25).

d. A noun (object) determined by a pronominal suffix (with participle IV.22,22,29; with finite verbs II.19; IV.22,29).

e. The object is a collective preceded by ֵס (with infinitive II.12; IV.3).

f. The object is in a relative clause controlled by '7 (with finite verbs (II.35); VI.28).

In the above chart those verse numbers in parenthesis are those which are listed in more than one category. The major category has no parenthesis, whereas the more subordinate category has.

It should be pointed out that ֵ as the nota accusativi is not consistently used even within the above guidelines, and there are many direct objects which do not
appear with the preposition at all. For example, an exception to category a. above would be II.24; to b. VI.25, and so on. In chapter II alone there are twenty-one direct objects which do not use \_-. Most finite verbs which have direct objects with prefixed \_- are found in either the Haphel or Pael stems in their causative/factitive senses. There are sixteen verbs found with an accusative prefixed by the preposition \_-. They are יָבָשָׁה (Haphel), יָמָה (Haphel), יהְבֶה (Pael), יָדָיב (Pael), יָדֶה (Pael), הָגָה (Pael), יָגְדִּים (Pael), יִבִּים (Shaphel), יֵסִל (Haphel), יֵבָה (Pael), יִבְוע (Pael), יָסִל (Haphel). Not even all these verbs invariably take an object prefixed by \_-. Barring those cases where the verb has an attached pronominal suffix instead of a separate direct object, יָבָשָׁה, יָמָה, יִבִּים (found one time with יָד), יֶבָשָׁה (found one time in the sense of "to prosper" in VI.29), and יֵסִל do not always occur with \_-. The total occurrences in this category number thirty-nine.

4. As has been noted in the last major section there are certain verbs which take an infinitive to complete their meaning. Such verbs as "to go, to send, to say, to order, to decide, to write, to think, to need, to agree," and "to be able" take such complementary infinitives.

II. 9,10,12,26,27,46,47.

IV. 26,31.

III. 2,13,16,17,19,20,29,32.
IV. 3,15,23,24.
V. 2,7,8,8,15,16,16,16,16.
VI. 4,5,5,8,8,15,21,24.
VII. 19,25.

This usage of the preposition - occurs a total of thirty-eight times in the Aramaic of Daniel.

5. As has also been previously mentioned there are infinitives which take a prefixed - and express purpose. The occurrences are as follows:

II. 13,14,16,18,24.
III. 2,20.
IV. -
V. 15,20.
VI. 15.
VII. 26,26.

These types of infinitives with - occur a total of twelve times in Daniel's Aramaic.

6. The next usage of - is one which indicates a specific duration of time. The most common usage here is in the phrase .

II. 4,44,44.
III. 9.
IV. 26,31.
V. 10.
VI. 7,22,27.

VII. 0-

An exception to the phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל "forever" is found in IV.26, 31; יִשְׂרָאֵל.

7. Next is a usage which unites with other propositions to form compounds such as יָבֵשׁ, יָגוּל, and רָכִּי.

II. 31.

III. 3,6,11,15,21,23,24.

IV. 0-

V. 1,5,10.

VI. 0-

VII. 25.

יָבֵשׁ is found in II.31; III.6; V.1,5,10; יָגוּל is found in III.11,15,21,23,24; and רָכִּי is found in VII.25 only. There are twelve total occurrences of this type.

8. The eighth category comprises those occurrences of י- which indicate possession in expression such as "belonging to, possessing, to find belonging to." There are ten total occurrences of this type as follows:

II. 20.

III. 0-

IV. 0-

V. 23.

VI. 5,6,23.
9. Next there are those times when₁- is attached to a word and shows the object or the purpose (\textit{dativus commodi}). This form occurs six times in the Aramaic of Daniel.

\begin{itemize}
  \item II. 34.
  \item III. 3.
  \item IV. 6,9,18,23.
  \item V. -0-
  \item VI. -0-
  \item VII. -0-
\end{itemize}

10. The preposition occurs seven times denoting the destination of a journey or simply of action generally.

\begin{itemize}
  \item II. 34.
  \item III. 3.
  \item IV. 27,27,33.
  \item V. 1.
  \item VI. -0-
  \item VII. 21.
\end{itemize}

There are four categories left. Very few usages are left to be pointed out however. There are only eight occurrences left in the Aramaic of Daniel.

11. Three times ₁- occurs as indicating a peri-
12. The preposition occurs twice with an infinitive after the negative particle *ा* and expresses prohibition.

13. Twice *ल-* expresses the relationship of resemblance to something else.
14. Finally, there is one instance where $l-$ means "in relation to."

II. -0-

III. -0-

IV. 33.

V. -0-

VI. -0-

As was said above, no dogmatism is called for in the assignment of words to these categories. The preposition $l-$ is used a total of 255 times in Daniel's Aramaic.

THE CONSTRUCT-GENITIVE RELATIONSHIP AND ITS CIRCUMLOCUTION

General Introduction

In Biblical Aramaic the many-faceted genitive relationship is expressed in several ways. It is the purpose of the section in hand to identify and briefly investigate these various ways with a view towards their morphological and possible semantic differences. It should be noted at the outset that some terms used here (for example, the genitive of means, or the genitive of content) are basically foreign to Semitic languages. The terms are meant to be functionally descriptive, not actual names of grammatical constructions in Biblical Aramaic.

Rosenthal states (in his Grammar, section 48), ...
there are altogether three different ways to express a genitive construction in Biblical Aramaic:

(a) סמحتו הנבלי עַבְרֵי אֲלָמָה
(b) סמחותו אֱלֹהִים עֲבָדֵי אֲלָמָה
(c) שְׁמוֹתו לְרֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲלָמָה

The patterns are as follows: (a) construct noun-emphatic (or absolute) noun, (b) emphatic noun-di- emphatic noun, (c) suffixed noun-di-emphatic noun. To these should be added a fourth type, (d) לְשָׁנָה, absolute noun-di-absolute noun. These four types, along with some subtypes, account for all the genitives in the Aramaic of Daniel. The occurrences actually number 247. More simply, two families appear; the simple construct-genitive (type a), and the more complex circumlocutory genitive (types b-d). It should be noted here that the dominant criterion for categorizing the types of genitives is the state of the first member of the construction (i.e., in the case of type a, a construct noun, in type b, an emphatic noun, etc.). The subtypes which were mentioned above are mainly characterized by variations in the second member (see below).

Before launching into a discussion of the various types of genitives it would prove helpful to review those characteristics which make a noun emphatic (definite). The first way in which a noun is shown to be definite is by the addition of the emphatic suffix to it (אֵל, אֵלֶּה, אֵלֶם, אֵלָה).

Second, a proper name is inherently definite. Third, a
noun further defined by a construct genitive relationship is considered as definite. For example, מִלְתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל is no longer an indefinite house, but a particular one. Fourth, a noun with a pronominal suffix is definite.

The Simple Construct-Genitive (Type A)

This is the simplest genitive construction in the language. It is found in nearly eighty per cent of the occurrences of the genitive in Daniel's Aramaic (196 times).

The occurrences of this type of genitive are as follows:

II. 10,12,14,18,18,19,21,22,23,24,24,25,28,28,29,35, 37,37,38,38,38,41,43,43,44,47,47,48,48,48,49.

III. 1,1,2,2,3,3,5,5,6,6,7,7,7,10,10,10,10,10,11,12,12,12,14,15, 15,15,17,18,19,20,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,26,27,27,27,
27,28,30,33.

IV. 1,3,3,5,5,6,6,6,7,7,8,9,9,10,12,12,12,13,14,15,16,18, 18,19,20,20,22,22,22,23,26,26,26,27,27,27,28,29,29, 30,31,31,32,33,34.

V. 2,2,3,3,4,5,5,5,6,7,8,10,10,11,11,11,11,11,12,13,14,15, 20,21,21,21,23,23,26.

VI. 1,4,6,7,7,8,13,14,15,18,18,21,23,25,25,27,28,29,29.

VII. 1,1,1,1,2,4,7,8,9,11,11,12,13,13,13,13,14,15,16,18, 22,22,25,25,27,27,27.

There are altogether eight subtypes gathered under the heading of the construct-genitive.

Construct noun-emphatic noun. This subtype comprises nearly sixty-three per cent of the total number of occurrences of type a (123 times). It is, therefore, by far the
most common of the construct-genitive relationships. It occurs as follows:

II. 10,12,14,18,19,23,24,25,29,37,37,38,38,38,38,41,43,44, 48,48.

III. 1,1,2,2,3,3,5,5,7,7,10,10,12,14,15,17,18,20,22,24, 25,26,27,27,28,30.

IV. 3,3,6,7,7,9,9,12,12,14,18,18,19,20,20,22,22,22,26, 28,29,29,30,31,31,32,32,32,34.

V. 2,3,3,4,5,5,7,8,10,12,15,21,21,21,23,23,26.

VI. 4,8,8,13,14,15,18,23,25,25,28,29,29.

VII. 1,2,7,8,11,11,12,13,13,13,16,18,18,22,22,25,25.

The only variant to be found internal to this subtype is that which has a proper name as the second member, and so is inherently definite and equivalent to the pattern construct noun-emphatic noun. These variants have been counted in the list of occurrences above, but for the sake of completeness they are found in II.12,24,24,48,48; III.1,1,30; IV.3; V.7; VI.9,13,29,29; and VII.1,18,22,25.

Construct noun-absolute noun. The second subtype of type a occurs twenty-nine times, or about fifteen per cent of the total type a. This subtype occurs in the following passages:

II. 21,28,35,47,47,47,48.

III. 20,27,33.

IV. 5,6,13,26,26,27.

V. 5,11,14.
VI. 1,21.

VII. 1,1,4,9,9,13,14,27.

Construct noun-suffixed noun. This subtype occurs twenty-six times in the Aramaic of Daniel (about thirteen per cent of the total). It is found in the following passages:

II. 23,28.

III. 19,27.

IV. 2,5,6,9,12,15,15,20,23,27,27,33.

V. 6,11,11,20.

VI. 6,18,27.

VII. 1,9,16.

Construct noun-emphatic noun and suffixed noun. This subtype occurs only in V.10: סָלַמָּה יְרָכָבָגְיָו. It thus accounts for just over .5 per cent of all type a genitives.

Construct noun-emphatic noun and emphatic noun. This subtype occurs four times, II.22; V.2; and VI.9,13, and so accounts for just over two per cent of the total type a genitives. There is a slight variant of this subtype in which the latter two nouns are proper nouns and so inherently definite. This variant occurs in VI.9,13. Construct noun-emphatic noun-emphatic noun-absolute noun-absolute noun. This complex subtype is found only in the list of musical instruments in III.5,7,10,15:
As Rosenthal points out all the nouns of Aramaic (or at least Semitic) origin are in the emphatic state, while those terms which are loan words from Greek have been left undetermined. A construction of this complexity, that is, with mixed emphatic and absolute nouns, is found only here in the Aramaic of Daniel. 144


This subtype is related to the previous one, but because all the nouns are in one state it is actually less complex.

This complex occurs twice in chapter V, verses 4 and 23. The first occurrence is לֶאֶלֶף יְסַפָּר כִּיּוֹם הָעָלֶמִים כָּל צֵאֵל אֶלֶף (V.4); the second merely changes the order of the first two words. The pattern in both cases is identical. This subtype accounts for slightly more than one per cent of the total construct-genitives (type a) in Daniel. Construct noun-construct noun-emphatic noun. The remaining five per cent of type a genitives are of this type. A string of constructs such as this will often be broken by the insertion of a type b, c, or d type genitive in place of the second construct noun. This subtype occurs in the following passages:

II. 18.

III. 6, 11, 12, 15, 21, 26.

IV. -0-
The only variation within this subtype is the substitution of a proper name (always inherently definite) as the second member. This occurs in II.18; and III.12.

Use Categories of Type A

The next task is to break down these construct-genitive types into use-categories. This is a very uncertain process because few grammarians agree on terms for the various genitival use-categories, and, furthermore, few grammarians agree on the limits to be placed on these categories. Consequently any category assignment must be tentative. For example, the title "God of Heaven" (כְּעַל אֱלֹהִים) could be an attributive genitive or a genitive of origin (or perhaps even something else). Genitive of origin perhaps makes better sense at this point, but no dogmatism is called for. With these ambiguities in mind it is possible to categorize the construct-genitive relationships in Daniel's Aramaic as follows.

Genitive of possession. This type of genitive indicates simple possession of a person or thing by another, i.e. ownership. A good example of this type is האֶלֶם הָרוּחִים "the word of the king" (II.10). The total number of constructions
assigned to this use category is sixty-one occurring as follows:

II. 10, 23, 23.

III. 2, 2, 3, 3, 12, 19, 22, 26, 27, 27, 28.

IV. 3, 5, 12, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 22, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 32, 32, 33.

V. 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 21, 26.

VI. 8, 8, 13, 15, 18, 18, 23, 25, 25, 28, 29, 29.

VII. 1, 4, 8, 9, 13, 16, 18, 22, 27, 27.

Genitive of origin. This use-category indicates the place from which a person (or thing) comes or emanates, or the place to which they naturally belong. An example is "God of Heaven" (II.18, 19, etc.), or the wisemen of Babylon" (II.12, etc.). There are forty-seven genitives which fall into this category. They are found in the following passages.

II. 12, 18, 18, 19, 24, 24, 28, 29, 37, 38, 38, 38, 43, 44, 48.

III. 27.

IV. 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 9, 9, 12, 18, 18, 20, 20, 22, 22, 29, 30, 33.

V. 7, 8, 11, 14, 21, 23.

VI. 6, 9, 13.

VII. 2, 7, 13, 13, 15.

Attributive genitive. In this category are included those genitives which give a quality of someone (something),
or its particular species or kind. Also included here are those genitives which have to do with magnitude or value. This genitive is variously termed as genitive of quality, kind, magnitude, etc. An example would be ἑλένης, "a summer threshing floor" (II.31), and another is ἄρμα "kinds of music" (III.5, etc.) Genitives belonging to this use-category occur thirty-seven times.

II. 35,41.

III. 5,5,6,7,7,10,10,11,15,15,17,20,20,21,23,26,27,33.

IV. 6,27,27,31,31. In addition there is ἐνεδρία "twelve" in verse 26.

V. 5,10,12,20.

VI. 1,4,21,27.

VII. 9,9,11,13,14,22,27.

Partitive genitive. This kind of genitive indicates a part of the whole. It is also used to indicate superlatives, such as ἁλένης ἀλληλού "king of kings" (II.37). An example of the partitive use is ἀνάγκης καὶ τῆς ὀνομάτος "(one of) the sons of the exile" (II.25, etc.). The superlative usage is found four times (II.37,37,47; and VII.18), and the whole category is used a total of thirteen times.

II. 18,25,37,37,37,42.

III. -0-

IV. 26,31.
V. 13,21.
VI. 14.
VII. 1,12,18.

**Genitive of reference.** This genitive can sometimes be clearly translated by the phrase "with respect to."
This is one of the most difficult genitives to define. Most of the usages could also be categorized as partitive or even simple possessive genitives. "a revealer of secrets" (II.47) is one example of the genitive of reference. With the exception of two usages in IV.6 and V.11 all the occurrences of genitives belonging to this category are found in chapter II (verses 14,21,22,28,29,47,48).

**Epexegetical genitive.** This is also a difficult category to define. It is closely related to the attributive genitive in that it simply further defines a noun (of course all genitives may be said to do this). It is often used with proper nouns such as "the province of Babylon" (II.48, the province, that is to say Babylon). It could therefore also be called the genitive of name. It occurs seven times in II.48,49; III.1,12,30; IV.6; and V.5.

**Genitive of material.** This category names the material of which a thing (person) is composed. An example is found in III.5, etc., "to the image of gold." This
category of genitive occurs ten times in Daniel's Aramaic. These occurrences are: III.5,7,10,12,14,18; and V.3,3,4,23.

Genitive of aim. The genitive of aim occurs eight times and indicates the object aimed at. In every case it follows the preposition (from a substantive) אֲלֵיה. An example is found in הָלַךְ אֶל הַנוֹבֶל "into the middle of the furnace of blazing fire" (III.7, etc.). All the occurrences of this category are found in chapters III and IV (III.7,11,15,21,23,24; and IV.8,19). Genitive of time. This only occurs three times (IV.26,31; and V.11) and its function is exactly that indicated by its title. An example is found in V.11 הָדוֹן "and in the days of your father." Genitive of separation. This use category indicates separation from something and is found only once, אֵל הַנוֹבֶל... "come out...of the midst of the fire" (III.26). Genitive of means. This final use-category is also found once ( כָּל אֵל הַנוֹבֶל "to be burned by means of fire," VII.11). This genitive is used to indicate the means by which something is accomplished.

The Emphatic Noun-DI-Emphatic Noun (Type B)

The remaining expressions are much less frequent than the simple construct-genitive, and so by sheer number present less of a problem. The morphology of these circumlocutory genitives is complex, however, and must be investigated with some care. The occurrences of the b type of circumlocutory
genitive are as follows:

II. 14,15,19,25,38,49.

III. 22.

IV. 12,20,26.

V. 3,5,5,7,13,16,23,29.

VI. 14,17,20.

VII. 27,28.

Out of the fifty-one occurrences of all three types of circumlocutory genitives, twenty-three are of type b. This amounts to forty-five per cent of the total number of circumlocutory genitives, and just over nine per cent of all the genitives in Daniel. The three morphological subtypes all vary in the second member. Attention must now be turned to these subtypes.

Emphatic noun-di-construct noun-genitive. This subtype is found in V.3,5; and VII.27. The fact that the second member is defined further by another genitive makes the whole second member construction definite. The construction "the plaster of the wall of the palace of the king" in V.5 is such a construction. The phrase is not indefinite, but one particular wall; the equivalent to an emphatic noun.

Emphatic noun-di-proper name. This construction is found three times; in II.25; V.13; and VI.14. All three
cases consist in the phrase יִבְנֵי הַוָּלָם יָד הָיוּ. Since all proper names are definite, this too, although morphologically a bit different from the main type, is its equivalent.

*Emphatic noun-di-suffixed noun.* This subtype is found only at V.23. Since suffixed nouns are also considered to be definiteنسִיִּים הַהָאָנָבָאָנָנָה is equivalent to the main type.

**Use Categories of Type B**

The same ambiguity attends the assignment of these genitives to use-categories which attended the simpler type. The only new category to be added here is that of objective genitive. Genitive of Possession is found in II.14,15; V.23; VI.17,20; and VII.27,28. The occurrences of the Attributive Genitive are IV.12,20,26; and V.5,24. There are six occurrences of the Genitive of Material, II.38; III.22; and V.7,13,16,29. The occurrence in chapter III is perhaps a genitive of quality/attributive genitive. There are three occurrences of the Objective Genitive in II.25,49; and V.13. There is one Epexegetical Genitive at V.3 and one Genitive of Time at II.19.

A further use of this type of genitive deserves a special mention. Often, instead of two or more construct-genitive constructions of type a, one construction of type b is used. Thus a string of construct-genitives is broken up. This string-breaking effect may be seen in כְּבֵרִיתם יָדֶם.
(II.14). It also occurs with the type b circumlocutory genitive in II.25,49; IV.23,26; V.3,5,15; and VI.14. Out of the twenty-three occurrences of the type b genitive nine of them have this string-breaking effect. This amounts to thirty-nine per cent of type b genitives, almost eighteen per cent of all circumlocutory genitives, and about four per cent of all genitives.\textsuperscript{146}

The Suffixed Noun-DI-Emphatic Noun (Type C)

Type c circumlocutory genitive occurs eighteen times in the Aramaic of Daniel, which means that about thirty-four per cent of all circumlocutory genitives are of this type (and just over seven per cent of the total number of genitives).\textsuperscript{147} They occur as follows:

II. 20,32,32,32,33,33,33,34,44.

III. 25,26,28,29.

IV. 23.

V. -0-

VI. 25,27.

VII. 19,19.

There are several subtypes here as well. First, there are the variations which affect the first member of the construction. There are two of these:

Suffixed noun-suffixed noun-di-absolute noun.\textsuperscript{148}

This form is found twice in II.32: יָלָלֹם יָהָעְשָהְנָיִ יִגְּכָנָ ב and
The clause that is produced in these examples requires the addition of the verb "to be." "Its arms and its chest (were) of silver." Suffixixed noun-suffixed preposition-di-absolute noun. This subtype is found in II.33,33,41: מִזְמוֹרְיוֹתָהּ לְזוֹדַיָּהָו עֵצֵי מִזְמוֹרְיוֹתָהּ לְזוֹדַיָּהָו. It also requires the addition of the verb "to be" in English translation. There are also subtypes in which the latter member is the one affected. There are two of these subtypes.

Suffixixed noun-di-proper noun. This subtype is found twice, III.8; VI.25, in the idiom "to eat the pieces of (someone)" (i.e., "to slander someone"). The other occurrence of this subtype is found at VI.27: בָּעֵד פָּרֹת אֵל יִדְבּוּ הַיְּמִין. The other occurrence of this subtype is once with this type of genitive. That one occurrence is found in III.8; VI.25, in the idiom "from before Daniel's God." Suffixixed noun-di-absolute noun. The two occurrences in II.32 have already been mentioned above. Other instances of this subtype are found in II.32 (a third time),33,33,150 and VII.19,19. The verb "to be" must also be supplied here in the English translation. An example is "its head (was) of fine gold," II.32.

Use Categories of Type C

There are three use-categories into which type c circumlocutory genitives fall. The first of these is the simple possessive genitive. This category is found once in chapter two and four times in chapter three, II.20; III.25,26,28,29.
There are two attributive genitives, II.44; and IV.23. Most of the genitives of type c are genitives of material. The occurrences of this category are II.32,32,32,33,33,33,34; and VII.19,19. It will be noted here that whereas the genitives of material in type b (emphatic noun-di- emphatic noun) do not require the insertion of the verb "to be" in the English translation, all the examples of this kind except II.34 do. The last named verse is the only example of a type c genitive of material with the normal suffixed noun-di- emphatic noun pattern. All the others are of the subtype suffixed noun-di-absolute noun mentioned above. The string-breaking effect which has been discussed above is found only once with this type of genitive. That one occurrence is found in IV.23: (מִאָרְאָה לָשׁוֹנָהוּ). This amounts to about five and one-half per cent of type c genitives, two per cent of all circumlocutory genitives, and under one-half of one per cent of all the genitives in Daniel's Aramaic.

Absolute Noun-Dî-Absolute Noun (Type D)

This last type of circumlocutory genitive is found ten times in the Aramaic of Daniel, and accounts for about twenty-one per cent of the total number of circumlocutory genitives and just over four per cent of the total number of genitives. This pattern occurs in the following passages:

II. 41.
III. 1.

IV. 12,20.

V. 5.

VI. -0-

VII. 4,6,7,9,10.

There are three variations on this basic type. One varies the first member and the other two vary the second.

Absolute noun-di-absolute noun-absolute noun. The first subtype is found in IV.12,20: נַעַרְמֵי נָחַם נָחַם 152 יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל צֵלְוֶה. The second member is, for all practical purposes, an emphatic noun. The reason why this subtype is placed here under type d instead of as a variant to b is that, as was said at the outset, the determinant criterion for categorization is in each case the first element. Since the first member of this subtype is an absolute noun it is placed here under type d. The third subtype is of the pattern absolute noun-numeral-di-absolute noun. This is seen only in VII.6.

Use Categories of Type D

There are three use categories of type d circumlocutory genitive. First, the attributive genitive is found in II.41; VII.6. In the literal translation of VII.6, 'וַיִּקְרָא אֶלְוַה, "and to him (were) four wings of a bird," the verb
"to be" must be inserted. In the idiomatic English translation, however, "to have" is required. "And he (it) (had) four bird-wings." A possible sub-category here would be the so-called genitive of genus/species found in V.5 and VII.4. The last use-category here is the genitive of material found in IV.12,20 and VII.7,9,10. Both members of the subtype absolute noun-di-absolute noun-absolute noun are to be found here. Only one of these genitives of material requires the insertion of the verb "to be" in the English translation; "his throne (was) flames of fire." As has been seen above concerning the insertion of the verb "to have," so here in the idiomatic English translation of "and he (had) teeth of iron." The string-breaking effect is seen once in this type of genitive: (V.5). This accounts for ten per cent of type d genitives, about two per cent of all circumlocutory genitives, and less than one-half of one per cent of all the genitives in the Aramaic section of the book.153

Conclusions

What is the difference between type a on the one hand and types b-d on the other? Why are the different forms used? The basic reason why one particular form is chosen over another in a specific context of a piece of literature, of course, always remains locked in the mind of the author, if
even he knows. Some basic patterns of usage do emerge how-

ever. First of all, it is fairly safe to assume that the

circumlocutory genitives were used for literary variety,
much as in English prose the native Saxon genitive (God's

house) is alternated for variety with a circumlocutory gen-

itive "the house of God." Involved in the question of lit-

erary variety as well is the string-breaking effect of the
circumlocutory genitive. This device is only used for vari-

ety, however, as there are a number of unbroken strings in

Daniel. The total number of construct strings (broken or

unbroken) is nineteen. Of this number eleven (about fifty-
eight per cent) are broken with a circumlocutory genitive,

while eight strings (about forty-two per cent) remain un-

broken. The most one can say in this respect is that the

string-breaking effect is one possible use of the circum-

locutory genitive.

Second, the circumlocutory genitive is used to ex-

press ideas which are either difficult or impossible to

express in a simple construct-genitive, type a, relationship.

Three examples of this will suffice. It is well known that

a simple construct-genitive cannot have a compound first

element. When one wished to say, for example, "its arms and

chest were of silver," one was forced to use the rather awk-

ward and obtuse 'גככ מיעפ倾向ו or התייעב ורצעי ל"המך סכמך. The

alternative to these ways of expressing the idea is to simply
say דודיה נולעתה. This is done twice in II.32. This example also offers another point. The use of a circumlocutory genitive is a simple way of constructing a noun clause that is at the same time a possessive clause. It is also well-known that nothing (except the rare inseparable preposition) can come between the construct and its genitive. In VII.6 a number comes between these two elements: נַחֲלַת אַרְעָא הַל_שַׁעְי_טַו_ג_ך. In order to put the form into a simple construct-genitive relationship the position of the number would have to be changed. This is possible in Biblical Aramaic, but one finds the text in the only way one could find it using a circumlocutory genitive.

To repeat, what is the difference between the various types? There are really so few cases that are really parallel that any comparison is difficult. In VI.8,13,25 one finds דָּנְע הָרָא אֵרִיָא appended אֵרִיָא, while in VI.17,20 one finds דָּנְע הָרָא אֵרִיָא appended אֵרִיָא. In the latter instance the reference may be to a specific den of lions, while in the former any den of lions is indicated, but this is far from certain. It is very difficult to make out any semantic differences between רֵבִיָא רֵיֵיָא רֵיֵיָא (II.49), and רֵבִיָא רֵיֵיָא רֵיֵיָא (II.12, etc.).

It is just possible that the type c construction (suffixed noun-
\(\text{di-}\)-emphatic noun) brings an emphasis or a demonstrative force to the construction. In the cases where there is no verbal clause formed by the insertion of the verb
"to be" in the translation, then such meanings are possible.
Three examples would be אֶתְנָא יְרֵה שִׁבְּרוּ, "the very name of God" (II.20), בֶּרֶדֶשׁ נְרוֹחֵץ, "true servants of God" (III.26), and אֶתְנָא יְרֵה שִׁבְּרוּ, "that God of Shadrach, etc..." (III.28).
Other such meanings are at least possible in II.34,44; III. 25,28,29; and IV.23. Other than these possible variations in meaning, there is little semantic difference (if any) between the normal construct-genitive of type a and those circumlocutory genitives of types b-d.
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LITERARY PROBLEMS IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT
OF DANIEL I-VI

CHAPTER II

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with those problems which are more-or-less connected with the reading of Daniel chapters I-VI as literature. In order to understand the scope of these problems it will once again be necessary to travel outside of the limits of chapters I-VI into other parts of the book as well as into other contemporary works of literature. The problems presented and discussed in the current chapter cluster about two sets of issues.

The first of these clusters deals with the unity (and the lack of it) in the book. Involved in this general topic are the questions of the authorship, whether single or composite, and the book's bilinguality, which is perhaps the most outstanding formal-literary characteristic of the book. Once some kind of answer is reached on the unity and the bilinguality of the book the question of date can be raised. As was seen in the last chapter, the Aramaic of Daniel leaves the date open. It could range from circa 500 BC (or perhaps earlier) down to the date assigned to it by many critical
The second cluster of problems deals with the Gattung of chapters I-VI both generally and individually. The importance of the Gattung is more than a scholarly interest that drives one to know what kind of literature is contained in a work. Knowledge of the Gattung allows for a more intelligent reading of the text, and therefore a more intelligent exegesis. In order to more fully understand the kinds of literature contained in chapters I-VI, biblical parallels will be pointed out. After the Gattung is fixed a concluding question on the oral prehistory of chapters I-VI can be asked and a possible solution posited.

UNITY, AUTHORSHIP, BILINGUALITY AND DATE

Many commentators have found and discussed a "unity" in the book of Daniel. Where is this unity to be found? One reading of the book in English will show the reader that there are two kinds of literature in the book; stories (for lack of a more precise word at present) found in chapters I-VI, and visions found in chapters VII-XII. Thus from a point of view of the kinds of literature the book is bipartite. There is no unity here. A single reading of the book in the original languages will show that the book falls into two parts according to language, and that unfortunately the division is not the same as the division into stories and
visions. Chapters I.1-II.4a and chapters VIII-XII are written in Hebrew and chapters II.4b-VII.28 are in Aramaic. More to this, part of the book narrates the story in the third-person (I.1-VII.1) while the rest narrates in the first person. From these three factors alone a disunity in the book is surely patent. No matter what else is said there is a fundamental disunity in Daniel that cannot be gainsaid nor made into a unity. If there is a measure of unity in the book it must therefore by only a partial unity and must lie somewhere else than in these three obvious traits.

Most of the past commentators who have defended the unity of the book have done so on grounds of single authorship of the whole. If the case for one author can be proved then the three above disunities will be subsumed to the purposes of one man in one lifetime and the book will be able to be called a unity with accuracy. When it was widely assumed that Daniel himself working in the sixth century was the author of the whole book the problem of unity was not felt so acutely, but with the rise of modern criticism those who saw more than one author in the book on the basis of the problems outlined above (and some others) began to express themselves. Bertholdt, the father of modern critical commentators, found nine authors in the book. Before him both Spinoza and Newton had remarked that the book was bipartite (both on the basis of the change in language) and the work
of two different authors. It is interesting to note in passing that many critical theories of authorship and composition coincided roughly with the dominant theory of pentateuchal criticism at the time. There was what could be called an "early documentary hypothesis" (Spinoza, Newton) in which Daniel was thought to have had a significant role in the creation of the book, but which included later documents as well (this could also be called a supplementary hypothesis). There was as well a "fragmentary hypothesis" (Bertholdt, et al.) in which it was thought that the book was made up of pieces welded together. This view was revived in 1891 by Lagarde. There is also the "modern documentary hypothesis" (Dalman, Torrey, Hölscher, Montgomery, et al.). Of course there were those scholars, other than those who would not allow anything but a genuine Danielic production, who did not go along with any of these theories (at least wholeheartedly). To name but three of these, S. R. Driver, R. H. Charles, and H. H. Rowley, always subscribed to one author (although allowing that he may have used some traditional material at times) for the whole. The line of demarcation in the critical camp is on the point of authorship of the various segments of the book.

1. H. H. Rowley restated the case for unity in authorship some twenty years ago in his article "The Unity of the C. Book of Daniel" which was reprinted in The Servant of the
Lord in 1952 and in a revised edition of the same work in 1965. He also states the variety involved in the divisive position so that anything but a brief summary of the position would constitute nothing but repetition.

Rowley is quite right when he points out that there is no unity of position in the divisive school, but that is no reason to assume that no such division of Daniel is legitimate as Rowley seems to indicate. The crucial decision to be made is what is to be done with chapter VII. The fact that this is the dividing point on the theories which split Daniel up into segments is to be expected because it is chapter VII which is joined to I-VI by language, but to VIII-XII by genre. It is chapter VII as well which has in it the change from the third to the first person. So chapter VII shares in all three disunities set forth above. The facet which unites the vast majority of the divisionists is that they see the first part of the book (either I-VI or I-VII) as earlier than the second part of the book. What divides them, generally speaking, is whether or not they include VII with I-VI or with the latter chapters or let it stand on its own. Although differing somewhat in matters of detail it is legitimate to group the divisionists into three groups:

1. Those who divide the book I-VI, VII-XII; included in this group are such scholars as Dalman (1892), Torrey (1909), C. F. Kent (1926), Montgomery (1927), Eissfeldt (1934),
Vriezen (1948), and C. Kuhl (1961). Those who, following Hölscher, look on chapter VII as basically belonging with I-VI, but as a later appendix are Sellin (1910 ff.), W. F. Albright (1921), Gressmann (1929), C. Kuhl, earlier (1930), Meinhold, later (1932), Obbink (1932), Bentezen (1937 ff.), and more generally Nyberg (1948).

3. Those who divide the book simply into I-VII, VIII-XII, are M. Thilo (1926), A. C. Welch (1922 ff.), Eerdmans (1932), R. B. Y. Scott (1930), Weiser (1939), and less directly E. W. Heaton (1956).

To the list above, which does little but repeat Rowley, may be added the commentaries of Porteous (1962/1965), Plöger (1965), and Delcor (1971), all of whom basically follow Rowley (or at least agree with him) in finding one author for the whole. It should be noted that all three allow for the use of earlier material in the work by the author (as does Rowley himself). A point of agreement between the vast majority of the divisionists and those who posit one author is that chapters VIII-XII come from the Maccabean era. The disagreement, then, involves only chapters I-VII. If it can be proved that one author composed the whole of Daniel, or it can be shown that the theory which would divide the book into halves does not explain the facts, then the case for the unity of Daniel is secured and the searched-for unity of the composition located in the mind.
of one author.

The case for the unity of authorship has been set out in the critical school many times. To name only three of these attempts must suffice here. Perhaps the first real critical attempt came from Friedrich Bleek in 1822. Bleek set forth the case so strongly that for most of the middle years of the nineteenth century the case was considered proved. In 1875 Lenormant published his *La Divination et la science des présages chez les Chaldeens* which took the point-of-view that the whole was written in Hebrew originally and that the Aramaic in the book was a later insertion when part of the original was lost. In addition to Lenormant's endeavors, works were published by Meinhold (1884, 1888, 1889) and others which defended the bipartite nature of the book. Meinhold's view was that chapters II-VI were written circa 300 BC, followed by chapter VII at a slightly later date, followed in the Maccabean age by I.1-II.4a and VIII-XII. To answer these persons and others Augustus Freiherr von Gall published, in 1895, *Die Einheitlichkeit des Buches Daniel*. This work was followed in 1901 by Karl Marti and in 1905 by Cornill in his *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, and some others, but the long-lasting effect which Bleek's article had achieved was not repeated. The divisionists were well-entrenched in the critical school and were at that time in the majority, as they remain to this
day.

To repeat, the most recent defense of the unity authorship theory came from H. H. Rowley. Others since him have subscribed to the unity theory, but these have basically followed Rowley's lead. Since the discussion of unity in Rowley was revised and updated in 1965 it can be taken to represent a fairly contemporary view of the unity-of-authorship argument. For this reason it seems wise to examine each of Rowley's thirteen points in favor of the unity of the work to see whether his case is proved, or whether the case of the divisionists is so damaged by it that the latter view is untenable.

(1) "It is generally agreed that chapters 8-12 come from a single hand, and are to be related to the events of the Maccabean age." This is true, as has been stated above, but this says nothing directly for or against the case for unity of the book. It should be remarked here that not all agree that chapters VIII-XII come from a single hand.

(2) "Chapter 7 is closely bound to chapter 8." Rowley points out the similarities between the Little Horn in VII.8,21,25-27 and VIII.11,12, and 25. As has been stated already, most of the divisionists find no difficulty in assigning VIII-XII to the Maccabean period. It would seem, however, that unless one wishes to stratify chapter VII into
various sections (as some scholars do\textsuperscript{25}) that a case can be made for chapters VII and VIII belonging together. It could be said in answer to this that the author of VIII-XII used chapter VII as a guide and so naturally the two will resemble each other. However, the references to Antiochus Epiphanes which can be so easily seen by most scholars in chapters VIII-XII are just as clearly seen in chapter VII, for example, in verse 25. This would seem to strike a blow at those who wish to join chapter VII to the first six, either as an integral part or as a later appendix, but it does nothing to those who divide the book at the end of VI.

(3) "Chapter 7 is also closely bound to chapter 2."\textsuperscript{26} The four kingdoms outlined in chapter II--Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece--are found in the seventh chapter as well. Rowley is right in arguing against Ginsberg's theory that \textit{\textsuperscript{7}UJ} means "was destroyed" in VII.5.\textsuperscript{27} It means here "to stand erect." Ginsberg's solution to the problem here does rest on a dubious textual emendation and must be discarded. This aside, what can be said about the similarity between the chapters? One would have to be rather unininitiated to see no similarities between chapters II and VII; striking similarities at that. This fact does not prove, however, that one man wrote both chapters. More important than the similarities (from the point-of-view of authorship)
are the differences between these chapters. The major difference is the attitude of the narrator(s) to the action which takes place. In chapter II there is not a hint of a growing wickedness in the kingdoms, nor an imminent or present persecution of God's chosen people. There is not a hint of moral condemnation of Nebuchadnezzar, nor of his nor the other pagan kingdoms. There is a simple narration; God will set up his kingdom and will win at last over all the kingdoms of the earth. In chapter VII, on the other hand, the picture of the fourth monarchy and its monarch is one of evil. There is, in verse 25, the sign of persecution of God's chosen people. In the end he and his pagan kingdom are judged guilty (verse 26) and destroyed. In chapter II there is no judgment of guilt. The coming of the kingdom of God impeaches all other kingdoms and that is the judgment. Furthermore, the point of VII is to point to the time of the end and God's victory there. The points of II are first to show Daniel's superior wisdom, wisdom which has been given to him by his God who is, therefore, a superior God; second, to tell the story of mighty Nebuchadnezzar being converted to this superior God, the God of a captive people; and third, to state that this same God is in control of history. These are the three major themes of chapter II presented in their order of dominance. So while II and VII are definitely related
there is no proof that this relationship must be one of common authorship. A theory which accords as well with the facts is that a later author adapted and contemporized the story of chapter II in chapter VII. To repeat, there is nothing in the connection of the two chapters that demands common authorship.

(4) "The emasculation of chapter 2 by the removal of alleged glosses rests on no solid evidence and merely reduces the effectiveness of the story." The alleged glosses are "...and toes..." in II.41a and II.41b-43. These words are considered glosses by, among others, Ginsberg. They are thought to be such because the words give an interpretation of something which is not found in the original vision. This may seem like firm grounds for assuming a gloss, but even if this is not granted the case is not substantially changed. Torrey, following Bertholdt and others, assigned the events in II.41-43 to the period of the marriage of Antiochus II to Berenice, i.e., circa 250 BC. Rowley points out that it could as easily refer to the marriage of Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus III, and Ptolemy Epiphanes in circa 200 BC. The former marriage was a failure and led to the Laodicean War about 246 when Berenice's brother Ptolemy III took most of Syria and Babylon away from Seleucus II. The latter led to war in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Rowley says that it is completely arbitrary to
choose one over the other. 31 If the first marriage alliance is chosen then the iron represents the house of Ptolemy and the clay the house of Seleucus, whereas if the second is chosen the elements are simply reversed. 32

As was said above, the attitude of chapter II seems to be rather dispassionate if not tacitly approving of the pagan monarchies. True, they are all replaced by God's kingdom, but there seems to be no urgency in chapter II. It is only said that the final kingdom will crush the preceding three. There is no hint of persecution. In chapter VII Antiochus Epiphanes appears as well as his persecution of the Jewish people. If II originated in the same time then the last significant event which the author saw was not the persecution, but the marriage of Cleopatra and Ptolemy since this is mentioned just before the in-breaking of the kingdom of God. The last fact tends to make one believe that Torrey was right in choosing the former date (circa 250) for chapter II, or that Ginsberg is right in assigning that date to verses 41-43. It would seem to put at jeopardy the theories which would place chapter VII with I-VI and strengthen the view which breaks the book into the sections I-VI and VII-XII. This is not to deny that people living in the Maccabean age could have found a relevance and significance to the content of chapter II. In fact they might have thought of the marriage of Cleopatra and Ptolemy which had led to war
in their own time, but that does not speak against an origin in the middle of the third century for chapter II. On the other hand, it is possible (if less probable) to maintain with Rowley that the major primary reference in chapter II is to the marriage of Cleopatra and Ptolemy.

(5) "The emasculation of chapter 7 by the removal of alleged glosses rests on no more solid evidence, and leaves the story with little identifiable point." With this the present author quite agrees. In chapter VII verses 8, 20b, 21, 24, and 25 there are clear references to the Maccabean age and to the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes. There are, so far as the present author is concerned, no grounds for cutting these verses out as a Maccabean gloss to a pre-Maccabean story. Again Rowley is right when he claims that equally well one could remove all those elements from the rest of VIII-XII which refer to the Maccabean age and claim an earlier authorship for the whole. The only reason to cut out the verses in chapter VII would seem to be a modern writer's theory which endeavors to make the text fit the theory. The verses which the various scholars would eliminate all make perfect sense where they are and they do not give problems of interruption of a narrative or jerky transition from one section of a story to another (which are the major marks of interpolation). Likewise there seem to be no grammatical problems which would make one lean towards an
excision of any verses in the narrative. Again, as before, it would seem that those who wish chapter VII to go with chapters I-VI have but little to back their claim. This point of Rowley's does nothing, however, to answer those who place chapter VII with what follows it.

(6) "Despite the efforts that have been made to prove that the Aramaic of chapter 7 is different from that of chapters 2-6, no real difference can be established." This is again basically true. Most of the differences in language can easily be accounted for by the difference in genre of I-VI and VII. It can be argued that a difference in hand could well be disguised by the difference in genre, and that even one author would show marked differences in two such different types of writing as tales and apocalyptic. There would not be much difference in form because of the relative stability of Imperial Aramaic. The differences in vocabulary can most easily be explained, if not by the difference in genre, by the difference in subject matter between I-VI and VII. One major difference that could be pointed out is that VII is almost wholly lacking in loan words, but this, too, may be due to the difference in both subject matter and genre. In no way does this lack of difference speak against a composite authorship.

(7) "Chapter 7 is linked with the earlier chapters in that it is written in Aramaic, and equally with the later
chapters, in that it has many links of phraseology with them, despite the fact that they are written in Hebrew.\(^4^0\) Rowley here does nothing but restate the problem of chapter VII; it is linked to what goes before by language and to what follows by genre. Various correspondences in phraseology between VII and VIII-XII are pointed out, and one cannot deny their presence.\(^4^1\) Again, this vocabulary similarity is most probably due to the similarity in genre and subject matter of chapters VII-XII, but even if this is not wholly the case the similarities tend to link VII with what follows rather than with what precedes. This leaves the problem of the relationship of VII to I-VI (by language) hanging in the balance, and this question must be taken up in due course.

(8) "Chapter 7 is linked both with the preceding anonymous chapters and with the succeeding pseudonymous chapters."\(^4^2\) What this states is that chapter VII is a transitional chapter. It contains the transition from the third to the first person. Chapter VII is also more closely tied than any other chapter to one of the stories (\textit{i.e.}, chapter II).

"...This feature of the book as a whole does not...demand plurality of authorship."\(^4^3\) This is true, but neither does it speak against plurality of authorship. There is nothing in VII to forbid the hypothesis that an author of the Maccabean age, to which chapter VII clearly refers (8,21,25), wrote chapter VII in imitation of chapter II, using II as a
model and contemporizing it. He found II along with the
other stories in a pre-existent corpus which had been trans-
mitted either orally or in writing. Rowley makes the state-
ment that the theory of plural authorship is not demanded.
Neither is his own theory. This point demands neither and
allows both.

(9) "The mental and literary characteristics of the
book are the same throughout." Rowley notes that chapters
I-VI are full of repetitions, and he posits these as well for
chapter VII. His two examples are "peoples, nations, and
tongues," VII.14 and chapter III, and "dominion and glory and
kingship," VII.14 and chapter III. By any stretch of the
imagination, these repetitions in chapter VII are really in-
significant when compared to the massive repetition in chap-
ters IV and V, and prove nothing except that perhaps both of
Rowley's examples are common idioms. Rowley does note that
VIII-XII do not seem to use this device of repetition. This
would seem to speak for VII being a transitional chapter (if
the two repetitions are actually from chapter III), but more
closely bound to VIII-XII which do not use the techniques of
repetition. Rowley then points to the "nails of brass" in
VII.19, comparing them to Nebuchadnezzar's hair growing long
like eagle-feathers, and his nails like bird's claws (IV.
30). The present author cannot see that the two cases are
really comparable other than the fact that both are rep-
etitions, and that both add elements not in the original phrase. In chapter VII the intrusive phrase really does nothing to further the story; it is merely one more piece of description. In IV.30, however, the author's use of repetition is quite different. This verse is remarkable in that it has pieces of IV.22, 29 in it. What is expected to follow "he was wet with the dew of the heaven" from previous repetitions in chapter IV is "until he knew that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men..." In IV.30, however, the case is different. The second half of the so-called repetition starts with the same phrase ('ת יָא), but instead of what is expected by the reader after two verbatim repetitions, the story is brought to a turning point by the simple device of the insertion of the new phrase "until his hair grew long like eagle's feathers..." The occurrence in chapter VII does in no wise the same thing. A more comparable instance between VII.19 and a part of the first six chapters would be II.41a, "...and toes..." although this does not take its place in a literal repetition. This point again, it seems, links VII to what follows it in its relatively small use of repetition, but it does nothing to speak against the theory that chapters I-VI are a separate unit.

(10) "The unhistorical representation of Belshazzar as king figures in chapters 5, 7, and 8." This is true.

This would also be the case if a Maccabean author was using
I-VI as a source book. This would be especially true if he considered I-VI to be accurate history. Even if he knew better the alternative would have been to do major surgery on chapter V; excising Belshazzar and inserting Nabonidus (who figures nowhere in the book by name) or some other.

(11) "The unhistorical Darius the Mede also figures in both halves of the book." The same answer may be given here as was given to point (10) above. Neither demands that one author composed I-XII.

(12) "Just as the later chapters contain a clear reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, so chapter 3 contains a clear reference of the same age in the Greek terms it uses." From a certain point of view this is Rowley's best argument. The alternatives left to one have already been outlined in chapter I, pages 37-43. If one does not assume that σομπωνία names a musical instrument, but a concord of instruments, then the problem is not acute. If, however, σομπωνία does refer to a musical instrument one has a difficult time maintaining a pre-Maccabean date for chapter III, or at least a Maccabean revision of the chapter. This is the clearest pointer in chapters I-VI of a date around the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. If one, with Rowley himself, admits that a Maccabean author took older traditions and reworked them, could this not be one of the more obvious reworkings?

This is the textual surgery which Rowley decries on page 275:
"To resort to textual surgery wherever the evidence is inconvenient is ruthless propaganda for a theory, rather than the scientific study of the evidence." The Greek words must be explained, perhaps as a direct reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, but this is surely not the only viable course. In fact the word ὄμφωνια may not even refer to a musical instrument. These words could also have come into the text at a later date.

(13) "Point can be found for every story of the first half of the book in the setting of the Maccabean age to which the latter part is assigned." This, again, is true. This does not mean, however, that the stories were composed then. As Rowley admits in a note already alluded to, "...I hold that the author made use of traditions older than his day, but moulded them to serve his purpose." How is this different than admitting dual or plural authorship? The fact that the stories were relevant to the Maccabean crisis does not mean that the Maccabean author of the latter part of the book created these stories. One mark of good literature is that it has relevance beyond its immediate Sitz im Leben and is subject to later reinterpretation.

The division of Daniel into two parts has not been disproved by Rowley (or anyone else). What Rowley has done is make it more likely that the division, if a division is allowed, comes after chapter VI and not after chapter VII.
As in the case of the dating of the Aramaic, so here; this is an issue which can be debated, never proved. Some will be convinced by Rowley's unity arguments, some will not. The present author is one of the latter. It must be pointed out, however, that he would allow that Rowley's hypothesis is a possibility. The evidence can be read that way, but it is certainly not necessary to do so.

It is dubious that the persecution, if it can be called that, which came on Daniel and his friends could be called a national persecution. It could certainly have been read that way in the Maccabean age when the stories and the visions were put together into one book. Nowhere in I-VI does it indicate that any Jew other than the four, Daniel, Hananiah, Misha-el, and Azariah, were involved. Also, undue emphasis on the persecution in chapters III and VI (the main source for the so-called persecution motif) overlooks the basic reason behind it. The persecution comes down to a question of intra-governmental rivalry and jealousy. Babylonians were jealous of the abilities of the captive Jews and so decided to remove them from competition, but the God who gave the superior ability to the Jews Daniel, Hananiah, Misha-el, and Azariah in the first place caused the plans to go awry and come back upon the Babylonians. 54

The stories of I-VI have a good attitude towards service in a pagan government, as has been pointed out time and
again—and which even Rowley finally admits. But surely this would not do at all in a Maccabean age when the very crux of the matter was complicity with the ways of foreigners. Why, if the Maccabean author has worked over the stories to the extent that Rowley seems to assume, did he do nothing to change the approving, concerned attitude of Daniel (and his friends) to the heathen king and his service? This attitude of approval, so prevalent in the first six chapters, and passed over in a single sentence by Rowley, stands as one of the strongest cases for a separation of I-VI and VII-XII.

Rowley contends that although it is possible that a Maccabean author used I-VI in a fixed form and considered these chapters to represent correct history, "...It can scarcely be denied that they could be better accounted for by community of authorship..." Why is it a better explanation?

That chapter VII belongs to both halves of the book is patent, but this does not demand a single author for the whole of the book. It likewise does not demand a series of authors, or even two. The case must rest there. While Rowley's points do not prove a single authorship, some of them allow for it. Therefore, neither option may be smugly taken as proved (or disproved). It seems that what the divisionists and Rowley agree on is that some older material was
used in I-VI. The emphasis put on this older material determines into which group one will fall.

If one looks at chapters I-VI themselves one will find certain marks of disunity even there. For example, in I.5 it is narrated that the young men taken into exile were to be educated for three years. In II.1ff. one finds Daniel fully operative and at the height of his powers in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar, that is, at least a year before he graduated from school. He is made the chief magician at the end of chapter II and yet he graduates a year or more later.57 Another example is the fact that Daniel nowhere appears in chapter III, and apart from a few small statements in chapter II (excluding chapter I from the discussion for the moment), Daniel's friends do not take part in the action of the rest of the book.

This last fact has led scholars to posit that the stories were originally independent narratives which were united by means of the introduction in chapter I which ties Daniel and his comrades together.58 In spite of these inconsistencies, however, I-VI appear as a general unity at least in their present form. Aage Bentzen has said:

Anderseits werden c. 1-6 durch eine Reihe von Erscheinungen doch als eine Einheit angewiesen: c. 5 blickt auf c. 4 zurück...in c. 2 wo im übrigen Daniel allein der Handelnde ist, werden die Freunde wenigstens nebenbei erwähnt...c. 1, das offenbar nachträglich den Erzählungen von c. 2-6 als Einleitung vorangestellt ist und zum
But what about the book as a whole? Is there no unity that is to be found in it? It has been seen that Rowley and others would find unity in the mind of a single author, but it has also been demonstrated that this hypothesis is not definite. Is there, in spite of the possibility of two authors, a unity to be seen in the literary structure, or must literary unity be given up and any unity which lies in the book be searched for in its theological content? The second of these questions will be investigated in due course, but it is time now to look closer at the literary structure of the whole. Perhaps unity is to be found there.

The most striking formal characteristic of Daniel is perhaps its bilinguality. This characteristic cannot help but strike the reader immediately. This trait of Daniel is another problem which is, in the end, insoluble. Solutions have been and continue to be posited, but these will always remain hypotheses. No one will ever know the real reason why I.1-II.4a are in Hebrew (along with VIII-XII) and II.4b-VII.28 are in Aramaic. The issue is, in spite of all attempts "...ein immer noch ungelöstes Rätsel."60

To be satisfactory any hypothesis seeking to explain this riddle must first make as few assumptions of historical
accidents as possible. If one needs to posit several historical accidents to explain the bilinguality of Daniel, then surely other explanations can be found or constructed which have no need to resort to these accidents. The second qualification which any explanatory hypothesis must possess is that it put as few thoughts into the mind of the author as possible, since these thoughts are obviously impossible to know.

The wisest course seems to be to investigate various past hypotheses purporting to explain the phenomenon. It is very difficult to claim originality when looking for a solution since the problem has been felt by interpreters of Daniel from the beginning. "In the discussion of the book of Daniel originality is hard," said Rowley, and with this the current author agrees with him. Georg Fohrer has categorized the past explanations into four categories, each of which will be examined in light of the two criteria set up above.

(1) The Mechanical view: The book of Daniel was originally written entirely in Hebrew. The current bilingual nature of the book is due to the circumstances under which the book was produced and transmitted. Bevan (1892) was one proponent of this theory. He posited that Daniel was written in Hebrew throughout on analogy of the books of Enoch and Jubilees, but early translated into Aramaic to
establish a wider readership. He felt that in the heat of the Maccabean persecution all the Hebrew copies of part of the book were lost and that a scribe filled up the gap from the Aramaic version. Bevan cites as evidence for this theory Antiochus Epiphanes' attempt to destroy copies of the Torah. This hypothesis, then attributes the bilinguality of the book to the accident of the loss of part of the manuscript. It seems to be first followed by Lenormant (1875), Bevan (1892), von Gall (1895), Kampenhausen (1896), Barton (1898), and Prince (1899).

The critique of this view is obvious. It assumes a historical accident which cannot be proved or disproved. Further, both Marti and Rowley have noted that if one assumes a Maccabean composition-time for the whole, one must also note that the time indicated is just before the rededication of the temple, i.e., when the Maccabean rebels were winning, so making the destruction of a manuscript unlikely. Added to this is the fact that if part of the Hebrew manuscript had been lost the author, or anyone who wrote in both Hebrew and Aramaic could have restored the lacuna. To the present writer's knowledge no major commentator has held this view since the turn of the present century. There is a variant of this hypothesis which holds that the book was originally written in Aramaic throughout, and after part of the original was lost, the gap filled by
Hebrew. This view is liable to the same critique as the other mechanical view. According to Montgomery, this second variant was followed by Huet in his Demonstratio evangelica (1679). Montgomery also attributes this view to Marti and Charles, but this is in error. Both Marti and Charles felt that the book was composed wholly in Aramaic, but for different reasons which we shall have cause to consider below.

(2) The Aramaic view: In a way this view is related to the above because it attributes the bilinguality of Daniel to the fate of the text after its publication. This view has been followed by Bertholdt (1806 ff.), Buhl (1896 ff.), Marti (1901), Wright (1906), Charles (1913 ff.), Zimmermann (1938 f.), and Ginsberg (1948). The dating of the various sections of the book does not concern us here, but rather the fate of the book. Charles, who held that the book is the work of one man working in the Maccabean age, posited that the book was written wholly in Aramaic, but sometime later (circa 150) a translator put parts of it into Hebrew in order to get the book into the canon of scripture. There could be no wholly Aramaic book in the canon as there was no precedent; but a book partly in Aramaic could be accepted on the precedent of Ezra. Ginsberg, who sees I-VI originating in the early to mid third century BC, is almost identical to Charles in his argument
for the book's bilingual nature. "Within a generation after the Maccabean revolt, Daniel B (VII-XII) was joined to Daniel A (I-VI); and around the year 140, when the purport of the former was still understood by many, the whole was accorded recognition as part of the national heritage." Marti is not so clear as these two as to whether the change in language is to be attributed to the author (one man for the whole) or to a later translator. Rowley's criticism that this view contends that the book was written with a view towards canonization is not fair. It was made clear by both Charles and Ginsberg that it was not the author who made the translation, but a later translator. It is, however, fair to ask why the whole of the book was not translated into Hebrew. This would make canonization easier still. Ginsberg attempted to answer this by stating that VII-XII were written in Aramaic because Daniel was known only from the Aramaic stories of I-VI. II. 4b-VI were left in Aramaic because they purported to be conversations which were originally in that language. This leaves a question as to why chapter VII was left in Aramaic. Ginsberg notes the difficulty, and imports a theory from Dalman and Torrey (at least partly) to solve it. Chapter VII was left in Aramaic in order to form a linguistic bond between the literally different sections. This causes two problems to arise. First, if Daniel was known only from
I-VI, at least as an exilic figure, could not some more famous ancient have been found for a canonical work? This is not an overly important question, but the second is more important. If the author did not want to change the popular stories in I-VI into Hebrew because of their popularity, as is implied in Ginsberg's argument (why else speak of canonization within twenty-five years of composition?), was not the second part of the book equally popular? Was it not this second part which pointed directly to the persecution through which the nation had just passed? Why then was not the Holy Tongue fit for both sections? Could not a better model than Ezra (as a book not as a man) be found as a model? These are questions which this theory and its proponents must answer.

Ginsberg and Zimmermann both give impressive arrays of forms which could point to an Aramaic original for the latter five chapters. The facts marshalled by both scholars could point to an Aramaic original, but they could as easily point to an Aramaized Hebrew. This theory makes little assumption of historical accident. It assumes only that the book was canonized some twenty-five years after its final composition. It puts no thoughts in the author's mind whatsoever since he had nothing to do with the change in language. This theory, then, remains a possibility. The present author shares Bentzen's doubt, however, that the
theory shows much more than the late Aramaized character of the Hebrew of Daniel—and with it the late date of the final composition of the book as we have it. 89

(3) The one author/bilingual theory: This solution assumes one author for the whole book which naturally means that this author was bilingual, writing sometimes in Aramaic and sometimes in Hebrew. For the reason that one author is assumed, this theory rests upon an assumption of a unity of authorship theory. Not unnaturally, in modern times this view has been associated with the name of H. H. Rowley, although other scholars have assumed it as well. Rowley's theory of bilinguality was set forth in 1932 in an article entitled "The Bilingual Problem of Daniel" which has already been alluded to. 90 Rowley constructs his theory as follows: Daniel was a legendary hero about whom popular stories were current in the post-exilic period. A Maccabean author issued the stories in II-VI as edifying tales. Chapter VII was similarly issued in Aramaic, but the author was now writing a different kind of literature—one less suited to the common man—so he wrote the rest of the book in Hebrew, the literary language. Later he wrote an introduction to the whole (I.1-II.4a) in Hebrew, the language of his later efforts. 91 Rowley posited that the introduction was written in Hebrew because by this time the author had already started writing in Hebrew and he preferred to go on with
that language. The stories in I-VI were issued separately (thus the inconsistencies in them). The introduction ties the whole product together. It is somewhat of a mystery why the Aramaic ends after chapter VII. Rowley said that VII is a transition chapter after the writing of which the author decided that Hebrew was a more suitable language for his subject matter.\(^{92}\)

An earlier variant of Rowley's position was taken up by such writers as Behrmann (1894),\(^ {93}\) Kampenhausen (1899),\(^ {94}\) and less enthusiastically by Driver (1900).\(^ {95}\) The general outline of the theory is that the author introduced Aramaic in II.4b as the speech of the Chaldeans and after that continues it...

... on account of its greater convenience both for himself and for his original readers, both in the narrative portions and in the following (seventh) chapter, the piece in companionship to chapter ii; for the last three visions (viii, ix, x-xii) a return to Hebrew was suggested by the consideration that this had from of old been the usual language for prophetic subjects.\(^ {96}\)

Charles criticized this position by the statement that the language of the Chaldeans was not Aramaic but Babylonian.\(^ {97}\) This misses the point. The author may have known very well that the Chaldeans did not speak Aramaic, but if half the book had been in some form of Akkadian, it would have been totally unintelligible to the overwhelming majority of readers and the book would have gained no popularity.
What Kampenhausen and the others are suggesting is that the Aramaic is used as a literary device representing a foreign tongue. If the change in language is a literary device it is a good one, but the fact that the Aramaic language continues until the end of chapter VII the fact that II and VII are parallel does little to explain. The real fault with the theory is that it assumes that Aramaic was more convenient for either the writer or the readers.

Other variants of this view are those of Cyrus Gordon and Otto Eissfeldt. Gordon feels that the author of Daniel was using a pattern which can be seen elsewhere in the Ancient Near East. For example the Code of Hammurabi or the book of Job start with prose, have a middle poetic or legal section, and end with prose. He feels that Daniel was purposely composed on this scheme, but using different languages instead of different genres. Eissfeldt thinks the author used the model of Ezra which cites its documents in Aramaic. Eissfeldt criticizes his own view when he admits that if II.4b-VI are considered documents, why not I.1-II.4a? Then there is the question of chapter VII being considered a document when the latter three visions are evidently not so considered since they are written in Hebrew. Eissfeldt's theory falls on its own criticism of it. Gordon assumes that the author followed consciously a pattern current in the Ancient Near East from as widely divergent times
and places as the Code of Hammurabi and the book of Job. It also assumes a transition in the mind of the author concerning the use of this A-B-A pattern (prose-poetry-prose, etc.) to the use of language instead of genre. This last factor reduces greatly the likelihood of Gordon's hypothesis, ingenious though it is.

(4) The two book view: This view goes hand-in-hand with the assumption of plural authorship. There is some diversity within the confines of this view because of the diversity of view among those who claim multiple authorship of the book (see above). Three of the variants assume the change in language to be due to a change in time and author alone. First there is the theory of Meinhold (formed in 1884),\textsuperscript{102} who assumes that II.4b-VI were written circa 300 BC, followed at a slightly later date by chapter VII. I.1-II.4a and VIII-XII were written some century and a third later in the Maccabean age. When Höscher published his "Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel" in 1919, Meinhold modified his view to that of Höscher.\textsuperscript{103} Höscher's view, as set out above, is that I-VI date from the third century, VII from some time later, and VIII-XII from the Maccabean age. The only real difference between Höscher and the earlier Meinhold is the different dating of the introductory section. The followers of this theory of bilinguality are those followers of Höscher's theory of authorship discussed
above. The third variant of this two-book view includes Thilo and his followers, who would simply divide the sections I-VII and VIII-XII. The common ground of all these theories is that they assume that a different author writing in a different time accounts for Daniel's bilinguality. They make no assumption of historical accidents nor do they put thoughts and motives in the mind of the author. As has been seen above, however, it is highly doubtful if chapter VII is to be included with I-VI. Chapter VII definitely refers to the Maccabean age and to Antiochus Epiphanes; so, rather than split VII into sources, it has seemed the wiser course to include it with the other visions in chapters VIII-XII.

There is a fourth variant group, however, which divides the book into two sections, I-VI and VII-XII. To the present author's knowledge the first proponent of this theory was Dalman in 1898. He was followed, evidently independently, by C. C. Torrey in 1909. Montgomery followed both men in 1927. H. Preiswerk holds forth a similar view in his doctoral dissertation Der Sprachenwechsel im Buche Daniel (1902). Typical of this variant is Torrey who held that a Maccabean author had before him a corpus of Aramaic stories (I-VI) and his own Hebrew visions (VIII-XII). It was his desire to make the book into a unity. If he were simply to append his visions to the stories the
result would be not one book but two. In other words, this author felt the problem of the unity of Daniel at the time of its final composition and compilation. Torrey explained:

He...made a dove-tail joint which was both as simple, and as effective as anything of the kind that can be found in all literature. He wrote the first of his Visions, chap. 7, in Aramaic; it is thus inseparable, on the one hand, from the preceding chapters, while on the other hand its contents and necessary connection with the following visions of the series render it quite inseparable from chaps. 8-12. But even this was not enough; the dove-tailing process had need of another step, in order to be absolutely finished. He translated into Hebrew the introductory part of the older narrative. By so doing he united the beginning of the book most securely to the later chapters which he himself had written, while on the other hand this introduction was indispensable to the stories which immediately followed it. 109

A major difference between Torrey and Dalman is that while Dalman held that the author of I-VI was separate, he held that the author of VII-XII translated his first vision into Aramaic, while Torrey above, clearly claims that he wrote it so. 110 The assumptions which this theory make are, first, that the author of Daniel was himself bilingual (in common with the unity theorists), an easy enough assumption to make for a learned Maccabean man—which the author of Daniel VII-XII clearly was. Second, this theory assumes that this man foresaw the problem of unity in his book and solved it in a most satisfactory way—a way which has left the parts of the book tied together for nearly twenty-two centuries.
These two assumptions seem to the present author to be eminently reasonable and seem to explain the situation in the book of Daniel most satisfactorily. The author sought to give the book a literary unity--formal though it was--at the very points at which disunity was seen above. Although I-1-II.4a are indispensable introduction to the rest of the tales, these verses are tied to the language of the visions. Chapter VII, which is tied to chapter II anyway is linked to the whole of II.4b-VI by language. By making these "dove-tail joints" the author tied together diverse material. His desire for unity also probably prompted him to set the first part of VII in the third person and the rest of the book in the first--an additional dove-tail joint. Consequently, in spite of the diverse genres of the book, in spite of the two languages of the book; in fact, because of them according to this theory, the book of Daniel is a literary unity that refuses to be pulled apart.

One further question presents itself. Although following the general lines of Torrey's argument it is possible to ask the state of the literature in I-VI which the Maccabean author took over. Was this literature fixed in written form, or was it fixed in oral form? Both Fohrer and Bentzen have raised this question. This is a difficult question and one which cannot be answered with complete surety. What are the criteria by which orally transmitted
Eduard Nielsen in a monograph entitled *Oral Tradition* (which is actually a translation of three articles which originally appeared in *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* in 1952)\(^{112}\) concludes his second chapter by listing several criteria useful in spotting orally transmitted narratives.

If there is only one narration of a story the criteria are:

- a monotonous style, catch-words (that is, mnemonic devices which bring the narrative into the memory), a flowing rhythmic style, and anacolutha, which would never, says Nielsen, get by the literary artist, but which come naturally to speech patterns.

If there are dual (or multiple) narratives dealing with the same story, then the criteria are as follows. Words which are read wrongly or omitted altogether by dittography or haplography would indicate a written text; whereas words which are heard wrongly, parts of the narrative which are supplied from memory, but which are in the wrong place indicate an oral narrative.\(^{113}\)

Perhaps one of the most striking literary phenomena in chapters I-VI is the repetition of phrases and whole clauses from narratives which have preceded. A complete notation of these repetitions would be excessively time-consuming at this point, and any complete account would lead far from the basic point. As an example of the kind of literary repetition one finds in I-VI, chapter V has been
chosen. It is sufficient merely to show the passages where one passage depends, most times quite literally, upon another.

V.9 is dependent on V.6
V.12: V.6; VI.16
V.14: V.11,12
V.15: V.6,7,11; IV.5,6,15
V.16: V.7,12,14,15
V.18: II.37

V.21: IV.12,13,14,20,22, 29,30
V.23: V.2,3
V.29: V.7,16

Chapter V is slightly richer in repetitions than some other chapters, but not as rich in them as, for example, chapter III. The author's use of these repetitions is not important here. What is important is their occurrence. The repetitions need not be precise, but they do need to be close enough to grasp the reader or auditor immediately. Beyond the shadow of doubt these repetitions give the book a monotonous style. They also could be considered as a type of catch-word, marking a division in the story. The repetition of a stock phrase could bring the next part of the story to mind. These literary devices could lend credence to the notes of Fohrer and Bentzen wherein both state that the stories circulated for some time in an oral form. Just how long this period was and when it ended, that is, when the stories came to be written down, is impossible to determine.

It will be helpful to summarize the positions taken in the preceding section. The book of Daniel contains three
disunities; a disunity in the language, a disunity in the
genre, and a disunity in the person of the narrator. There
is every bit as much reason to assume two authors in Daniel
as there is to assume one, neither case is, however, defini-
tely provable. It has seemed wiser to divide the book
along genre-lines rather than along language-lines. Chap-
ters I-VI are older than chapters VII-XII, dating from some-
time in the early or middle third century. The last six
chapters date from the Maccabean era, more specifically
from the time of the persecution perpetrated upon the Jews
by Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 167-165 BC). The author of
the later chapters welded the book into a unity by writing
his first vision (chapter VII) in Aramaic and translating
I-1.II.4a into Hebrew. He also (most probably) consciously
varied the person of the narrator in VII to form a transi-
tion between the earlier book and the visions. These "dove-
tail joints" give the book a formal unity at precisely the
three points at which disunity has been most keenly felt,
that is, the language, the genre, and the person of the
narrator. There is a good possibility due to the repeti-
tions in chapters I-VI that the stories were transmitted
orally for some period. It is impossible to determine wheth-
er the tales were in written or oral form when they were
taken over and modified by the Maccabean author of chapters
VII-XII.
THE GENRE OF CHAPTERS I-VI

The first division of genre in Daniel I-VI is between poetry and prose. This division can be deceptive because much of the prose is written in a flowing rhythmic style which resembles poetic free verse (for example, chapter IV, apart from the poetic sections), and some of the poetry (for example IV.7b-9,11-14a) is a kind of free verse that resembles prose. Nonetheless, the sections in which verse is definitely found are II.20-23; III.33; IV.7b-9, 11-14a,31-32; VI.27b-28. The major genres represented in this poetry are Song of Thanksgiving, Poetic Dream Report, and Doxology (Hymn).

II.20-23 has been called a Song of Thanksgiving because of its close resemblance to the psalm-type of the same name. The subject is God's wisdom. James Barr has called this section a Hymn of Praise and a Wisdom Hymn.114 The major difference between a Thanksgiving and a simple Hymn is that the former gives thanks for a more specific kind of deliverance or act of God whereas a Hymn usually is more general in its praise.115

A typical example of the Thanksgiving (Individual) is found in Psalm 116. The outline of the form of this Psalm is as follows: 1. The introductory call to praise (verses 1-3); 2. The reason for praise or thanksgiving
(verses 3-4); 3. The actual praise or thanksgiving (verses 5-11); 4. The announcement of the thank-offering (verses 12-19). This last element is often missing from the Thanksgiving Psalm. In II.20-23 one sees the introductory call to praise: "Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; to whom belong wisdom and might" (20). This is followed in verses 21-22 by the reason for the praise and thanksgiving: "(For) he changes times and seasons; he removes kings, and he establishes kings." "He gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to the ones who are knowledgeable and show perspicacity." "He reveals the deep things and the mysterious things; he knows what is in the darkness and light dwells in him." The actual thanksgiving, in this case thanking God for the wisdom to interpret the king's dream, comes in verse 23: "To you, O God of my fathers, I (give) thanks and praise, for you have given wisdom and strength to me." "And now you have informed me of what we sought from you; in that you have informed us of the king's matter." The category is thus clearly established.

The introduction (verse 20) bears a remarkable resemblance to Psalms 113.2 and 41.14.

Daniel II.20: וֹלְדוֹאְשָׁס שִׁבָּר לָא לָאָרְמִלָא וָלָא לָאָרְמִלָא
Psalms 113.2: יְחַיָּשׁ כְּנַלְכָּה אֱלֹהֵי עַל עָלֶה וָדַעְתָּא
Psalms 41.14: בֶּלֶכֶל יְהֹוָה אֵלֶּה שָׁזָּרָא שֶׁמֶרִיִּי זָאָר וָלָאָרְמִלָא

Such parallels do not necessarily imply literary dependence on the part of the author of Daniel, but they do imply a
common liturgical tradition. The content of verses 21-22 find close parallels in Job 12.13,15,18, and 22 (especially in verses 13 and 22). The images of darkness and light find parallels in Psalms 36.9; 56.3; 104.2; Isaiah 10.17; Wisdom of Solomon 7.26-27; and elsewhere. The comparison with the New Testament passages in the Johannine writings is also an obvious one.

There is a transition from the third to the second person in addressing God here. Verses 20-22 speak of God in the third person, while Daniel's thanksgiving addresses him in the second. According to Bentzen this change sometimes occurs in the Hymnic Psalms. The change adds to the vividness of Daniel's praise by giving the direct address of God by his servant Daniel. The switch between third and second persons can also be seen outside the Old Testament. In the Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus the change occurs.

For example, H2a ii, lines 23-26:

(23) ...with the fear of whose great god-head heavens
(24) and earth are filled, like his (ziμišu) countenance heavens
(25) and earth are outspread; without thee (la kašu) who
(26) does anything?...

The other passage in Daniel that has affinities with the Song of Thanksgiving is IV.31-32. Although formally more aligned with the Hymn of Praise, the circumstances of Nebuchadnezzar's relief from madness make the
thanksgiving of IV.31-32 implicit. More will be said of this passage at the appropriate time.

The second genre represented in poetry is the Dream Report in IV.7b-9,11-14a. These verses describe the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and the decree of the "watcher." The fact that this group of verses, although in poetic form, might be better translated into English prose is shown by the handling of the passage by the RSV which prints this section in the style of prose. Montgomery calls 11-14a "free verse," although he finds a metrical pattern in 7b-9.\textsuperscript{118} The reason why this type of report should be found in verse is not altogether clear. Most Dream Reports in the Old Testament are written in prose; for example, Genesis 20.3-7; 31.10-13, 24; 37.5-10; 40.1-23; 41.1-57; Judges 7.13-14; I Kings 3.4-15. Eissfeldt places "Accounts of Dreams and Visions" under the rubric of "Prose Types."\textsuperscript{119} Even the visions of the prophets are most times narrated in prose (e.g., Isaiah 6.1-8; Jeremiah 1.11-19; Ezekiel 1.1-28; 8.1-11.25; 37.1-14; 40.1-48.35; etc.). Eissfeldt notes, however, that the imaginative type of literature contained in a dream narrative is well-suited to poetic embellishment; it is well-suited to the rhythmic form of poetry. Poetry is by its very nature more suited to imaginative themes.\textsuperscript{120} The Dream Report is narrated from the point-of-view of King Nebuchadnezzar throughout, but the decree of the watcher in verses 11-14a
(it continues in prose until the end of verse 14) is cited directly, giving the illusion of a change of person. The subject-matter of the dream is most probably drawn from Ezekiel 31.3-14, the allegory of the cedar; but it is most probable that the Ancient Near Eastern myth of a "World-Tree" is behind the images both here and in Ezekiel. There is a prose dream-report found in II.31-35.

The third type of literature found in the poetic sections of Daniel I-VI is the Hymn or Doxology. A common trait of chapters II, III, IV, and VI is that all end with a confession of God's sovereignty and power. The specific passages are II.46-47; III.33; IV.31-34; and VI.27-28. Of these the second, part of the third, and the fourth are in poetic form. These poetic passages will be dealt with in turn. Porteous calls III.33 a doxology, while Delcor calls it a hymn. For the purpose of this section, the two terms will be taken as synonymous. Any hymn breaks into two or three parts: 1. The Introduction, usually a call to praise; 2. The reason for praise; 3. The praise itself. Not all hymns contain all three elements. In fact the poem in question here is only the actual praise itself. Verse 33b closely resembles Psalm 145.13, although neither is necessarily citing the other.

III.33b: סלע וברונח דתיש וסיבא יבר דתיש יבר ובר
Psalm 145.13: מלכותי לך וברע מועשיך וברע יבר
Chapter IV is set up in an epistolary form (starting in the Aramaic text at III.31 and continuing through IV.34). Bentzen has noted that this hymnic bit is a standard part of the epistolary form as can be seen reflected in the New Testament epistles, e.g., II Corinthians 1.3 ff.; Ephesians 1.3 ff.; I Peter 1.3 ff. The whole of III.31-IV.34 is set up, then, in the form of a letter from Nebuchadnezzar to his subjects, although the narrative is not actually a letter; the epistolary form is used as a literary device here just as in the New Testament book of Revelation (which also has the hymnic element in the opening of the "epistle," verses 6-8 of chapter 1), or Richardson's epistolary novel Pamela.

The whole unit of the hymn is mixed between poetry and prose. The introduction to the poetic bit (part 1 of the hymn form) is the single sentence of verse 32. This mixing of poetry and prose in the psalm form is a unique element in the book of Daniel, so far as the Bible is concerned. This phenomenon is seen again in IV.31-34 and attention must now be turned to that passage.

IV.31-34 is most interesting. It has been noted above that it is actually a hymn or doxology, but because of its position in the story—the return of Nebuchadnezzar's sanity—it shares in the characteristics of the Thanksgiving as well. The reason for giving thanks and praise is stated tersely in prose at verse 31a: "At the end of the days
(i.e., his seven years of insanity) I, Nebuchadnezzar lifted my eyes to the heavens and my reason (knowledge) returned to me." This reason for giving thanks, although in the end only praise is given, makes the thanks to God implicit in the song of praise which follows.

The hymn's constituent elements are as follows:

1. An introductory call to praise: הלַעֲלֹא יִברַכְתֶּךָ יִתְנָא אֹלֵלַי אֶלְּעָם, "the one who lives forever," finds parallels in XII.7 (חכֹי הָאָדָם) and is picked up again in the New Testament book of Revelation, כָּלַּה תַמְּנַה בִּינְּאַשְּאֵו (1.18); דִּכְּלָה תַמְּנַה בִּינְּאַשְּאֵו... (4.9); and דִּכְּלָה תַמְּנַה בִּינְּאַשְּאֵו... (15.7). The New Testament passages follow the translation of Theodotion. Part 2 of the form (the reason for praise) is found in verses 31b-32:

דִּכְּלָה תַמְּנַה בִּינְּאַשְּאֵו... (4.9); and דִּכְּלָה תַמְּנַה בִּינְּאַשְּאֵו... (15.7). The New Testament passages follow the translation of Theodotion. Part 2 of the form (the reason for praise) is found in verses 31b-32:
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The most obvious parallel to verse 31b is again Psalm 145.13, which was seen as parallel to III.33 above. This time the order is reversed both from the Psalm and from the previous passage, perhaps for literary variety. A close parallel to verse 32aa ( requestId="27023" ) is Isaiah 40.17אָלֹא אָלֹа" in our passage could have been derived from the Hebrew אֲבֵן לֵשְׁנוֹת of Deuteronomy 4.19; I Kings 22.19. On
the phrase מִן מָוָן in verse 32b, see מַעְשֵׂהַנָּל in Isaiah 45.9; Job 9.12; and Ecclesiastes 8.4.129

This passage, like III.33, is a composite form, made up of both prose and poetry. IV.33-34 continue this hymn, but in prose; elevated, rhythmic prose, but prose nonetheless. Verse 33 actually continues the reason for praise; giving the specific reason why Nebuchadnezzar is praising the Most High. Verse 34 gives the third part of the hymn outline, the actual praise itself. What the composite nature of the last two passages indicates is hard to determine. Since hymns are traditionally in poetry it could indicate a reworking of the text; but why would a later editor rework only part of the psalm into prose? It is more likely that this is a creative bit of literary work on the part of the author, although a reworking remains a possible answer.

VI.27b-28 is the last passage in chapters I-VI found in poetry. It is given by Nebuchadnezzar after Daniel is proved safe from the lion's den. It is a bit surprising to find the king rather than Daniel praising God here. This passage holds much in common with the previous two in that it contains many of the same ideas, a mixture between poetry and prose, and the hymn form. Many of the same phrases found in IV.31-34 are also found here. The introduction to the hymn is found in a decree, whereas the previous hymn was found in a letter. The
introduction itself is contained in prose in verse 27: אֲנִי וְאַשְׁמֵרְךָ מְלֹא כֹּל הָאָדָמָה וְיָדַעְתִּי אֶת הָאָדָמָה וְיָדַעְתִּי אֶת הָאָדָמָה. This is followed by the reason for praise in verses 27b-28 which is actually in poetic form. An alternate explanation would be that the reason for praise ends with verse 27 and all of verse 28 is actual praise.

Thus, it has been seen that there are three distinct types of poetic genres in Daniel I-VI. Now each of these has its special use. The Song of Thanksgiving in II.20-23 serves to postpone the climax—the retelling of Nebuchadnezzar's dream—while at the same time developing a wisdom theme. The Dream Narrative in IV.7b-9,11-14a serves to carry the story a bit further. Finally, the hymns or doxologies in III.33; IV.31-34; and VI.27-28 serve to show a pagan monarch taking time to praise Israel's God, confessing that he is the true God and the Lord of Nature. The next section of this study must deal with the vast majority of the material in chapters I-VI, the prose sections.

The poetic elements which have just been studied are taken up and used in prose narratives. What kind of general statement can one make concerning the genre of I-VI? It is obvious that these chapters contain stories, but what kind of stories are they? Delcor calls them Midrash. Midrash is commonly thought of as an expansion or an exposition of a biblical text. It is broken down into two kinds; Halachah
and Haggadah. The former deals with the legal sections of the Bible and so it is the latter with which we have to deal here. Haggadah's aim is to spur the faithful on to do the duty which is set out by Halachah. 131

According to Epstein the book of Daniel would not technically be Haggadah because it is not a work of scriptural exposition or interpretation, but in a looser sense it does use the methods of Haggadah, which are, "...story, saga, legend, parable, homily, maxim, proverbs, and wise sayings." 132 In a general, loose sense, then, the book of Daniel can be termed Haggadah. 133 Just as in any Haggadah, the aim of the narratives in Daniel is edificatory. It aims the reader or hearer at an undying loyalty to God. Can the chapters be broken down into more specific kinds of literature within the general structure of Haggadah? The literature in I-VI certainly amounts to legend. The historical problems lead one to believe that historical narration forms no part of the author's aim.

Upon closer examination, the legends of I-VI break into two groups: (I), III, and VI alongside of (I), II, IV, and V. The introductory chapter can be seen to tie the two types of legend or tale together. The first group, comprising chapters III and VI, can legitimately be called martyr legend, if one, following Bentzen, uses the term "martyr" in the more general sense of "witness." 134
obvious elements in chapter I which are of this type are verses 5-16, although the whole of the chapter is permeated by the witness of Daniel and his friends. Bentzen places the martyr legend in the larger category of "devotional legend." The characteristics of the devotional legend are that they deal with pious persons, they are told for an edifying purpose, and they often have a penchant for the miraculous. The theme underlying these martyr legends is that loyalty and faithfulness to God and his law are more important than anything else, even life itself.

Chapters II, IV, and V (along with part of chapter I) are what could be called "wisdom tales." They are also definitely told to edify, but they emphasize the wisdom of the protagonist. The theme of these chapters is related to that set out above, but approaches it from the other side: the God of Daniel is superior to the pagan gods because he gives superior wisdom to Daniel and his friends as a reward for their loyalty and faithfulness to him.

There are, within these larger genres, smaller units or topics of literature. It is now the task to discover what these are, and to describe them briefly. The first type of literature embedded in Daniel I-VI is the announcement or decree. This is found in III.4-6,29; V.7; and VI.26a. In addition to the decree in III.4-6, there is a repetition in verses 10-11. To this list may be added the indirect report
of an edict found in IV.23. Most often the decree is set off by the words ἔν στίς (III.10,29; IV.23; VI.27a) or by the address of the recipients of the announcement ("all peoples, nations, and tongues" in III.4,29; "all wisemen of Babylon" in V.7). Following these introductory formulae (both of which are used in III.29), the decree or announcement itself is given.

Closely connected with these decrees are the epistles, "...a type of literature which in spite of its outward form is no real letter." The edict of Nebuchadnezzar in III.31-IV.34 is one of these pieces of literature in epistolary form. The epistolary greeting combined with the decree and psalm of praise in VI.26-29 is another example of this form. In the section on the hymn in III.33 above it was noted that the epistle uses a poetic hymn as part of its form (see above). While speaking of hymns it should be noted that there are two prose paeans of praise, one in II.47 and the other in III.28. Both are uttered by Nebuchadnezzar after he has seen the mighty signs and wonders wrought by the God of Daniel and his friends. Enough has been said about the form of these hymns above. That these passages are prose where one would normally expect to find poetry might lead either to the assumption of a reworking of the text or a breaking down of the form-critical categories in the time of the writing of these parts of Daniel.
Two other kinds of literature embedded in Daniel are much more important. They are actually two halves of one phenomenon. The first is the dream narrative. The poetic dream narrative in IV.9 ff. has already been noted above. There is a prose dream narrative recorded in II.31-35. In the Ancient Near East generally two types of dreams were found. If the dream was a simple one, readily understood by anyone, such as the dreams recorded in Genesis 20,3,6-7; or I Kings 3.5 ff., then no problem in deriving the meaning existed. If, on the other hand, the dream was a symbolic one, the meaning is locked up—it is a mystery (חֲרִישׁ) which mystery can only be unlocked by a properly qualified dream interpreter giving an interpretation (חריש). A parallel between the first six chapters of Daniel and Joseph narratives can be clearly seen here (cf., Genesis 37.5-10; 40.5 ff.; 41.1 ff.). The symbolic dream is the type found in Daniel chapters II and IV along with the vision of the inscription on the wall in chapter V. This category may be called by its Aramaic name רָז. In all three רָזִין in chapters I-VI the source of the dream is explicitly said to be God himself (II.28; IV.21; V.24). This leads naturally to the second half of the phenomenon.

The interpretation (חריש) is the meaning of the רָז, given by God to chosen interpreters; in the case of the stories here, to Daniel. There is never any doubt that the
interpretation of the dream comes from God. The revelation of the meaning of the mystery led to a widening of the concept of pesher at Qumran. All scripture is the message of God and this message is split into two parts, the rāz and the pesher. So, for example, the Habakkuk commentary (1QpHab), has words of the prophet--considered to be the rāz, along with the community's commentary--considered to be the pesher. All this is a later development of the incipient stages of the pesher seen in Daniel I-VI. This incipient stage, simply the interpretation of a dream or vision, is seen in the Joseph story as well. The related Hebrew word is רומ (noun form רומ) which is used of Joseph's interpretation of the dreams of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker (Genesis 40.4-21), or of the dream of Pharaoh himself (41. 25-36). The word רומ is itself found, apparently as an Aramaic loan-word, in Ecclesiastes 8.1. In Daniel VII-XII the usage of the pesher idea is much closer to that of Qumran than it is to the usage of I-VI (the word itself does not occur in the latter chapters). Chapter IX especially is very close to the peshers found at Qumran. This may speak of a later date for chapters VII-XII.

At the end of the section on the genre of Daniel I-VI and related to the issue of rāz and pesher, it might be helpful to digress only slightly to discuss the type of individual who could give the correct pesher to a specific
The qualifications for a dream interpreter are found in a speech of the queen to Belshazzar in V.11. The RSV puts it so:

There is in your kingdom a man in whom is the spirit of the holy gods. In the days of your father light and understanding and wisdom like the wisdom of the gods, were found in him...

Again in verse 14:

I have heard of you that the spirit of the holy gods is in you, and that light and understanding and excellent wisdom are found in you.

This latter verse is spoken to Daniel by Belshazzar. What is interesting and crucial for the present matter is not the first phrase, but the three terms "light" (כד), "understanding" (בָּין), and "wisdom" (חכמה).

The Biblical Aramaic noun נלון is found in only the two passages cited above. This makes any study of contexts apart from the present ones impossible. It is clear that נלון is a noun derived from the pa·el stem of the verb נלון "to illuminate (in the pa·el)." The abstract noun is thus "illumination." The cognate languages prove interesting, but not overly helpful at the basic task of clarifying the meaning in this context. What kind of illumination does Daniel possess? It is most likely that the queen (V.11) is referring to the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dreams, reported in chapters II and IV. She knows of this Daniel's ability to interpret difficult matters, either from previous
experience or from reports of his activity. If someone is "illumined" he must be illumined from a light-source. The dream or vision was considered to be a method of communication between god and man. In the Old Testament the ultimate source of all dreams is considered to be God. This is not a great deal different from the view of the rest of the Ancient Near East (allowing, of course, for polytheism there). The prime qualification for the interpreter of the rāz would have to be the ability or the knowledge to obtain a satisfactory meaning. Divine illumination would be a necessary possession of the dream interpreter. Since the dream came from the divine, only the divine could reveal its meaning (Daniel II.22 states that "light" dwells in him (God)). God can be seen to be this light source. When God "lets the mortal in on the secret," it is probably known as כ"א. Once the mortal is "let in on" the secret (rāz), however, he must have the good sense and competence and skill to use the illumination for a good purpose. Unfortunately the term כ"א is a rare word in Biblical Aramaic (V.11,12,14). The verb of the same root is used one time in the hithpa'el in VII.8. The meaning there is probably "to consider" (so RSV), "to contemplate," or simply "to look" (so Jerusalem Bible). Such a meaning is found in the Targum to Numbers 21.9 where the participle כ"א translates the Hebrew כ"א.
In Syriac the ethpa′al of the verb means "to perceive" in Luke 20.23 and John 7.17, and "to recognize" in Mark 6.54. In Jewish Palestinian Aramaic there is an abstract noun "insight," as well as a noun "intelligent." Note might also be taken here of the Akkadian "clever," and of the abstract "cleverness." The most promising place to find enough occurrences for a real sample is, naturally enough, the Hebrew part of the Old Testament. A bit of caution must be exercised in assuming that Hebrew and Aramaic are equivalent, and if the word means something in Hebrew it must mean the same thing in Aramaic. Study of the root has shown that the meanings are similar enough in the sectors of the Semitic group wherein it is found to proceed with a study of the uses of the Hebrew , however.

The verb is found some sixty times in the Hebrew Old Testament. Of these, well over one-fourth occur in the Wisdom Literature. The Hebrew portion of Daniel accounts for fifteen per cent of the occurrences in the entire Old Testament. The root belongs basically to the Wisdom tradition. Since the interpretation of dreams is the question here, and since this is surely the kind of thing in which the Wisdom Literature is at least marginally interested, it is natural to look at the use of the term in the biblical Wisdom Literature.
The verb connotes competence, effectiveness, and a possession of good sense. Thus in Proverbs 10.5 the קרא is the man who gets the job done; thus the competent man. In Proverbs 15.24 Professor McKane rightly translates קרא by "discriminating man." He comments: "...that the חכם--the man with the intellectual grasp who gets at the truth and is in control of the situation--will choose the path of life and avoid Sheol." Other translations of חכם by McKane are: "he who has control over," "he who is quick to take the point," "being effective in obtaining results," "able man." The root meaning of חכם is thus clearly "to be effective, competent, successful." The more or less static translation of the RSV and others--such as "to be wise, to act wisely, to show understanding," pale beside the bold dynamism of "to be effective, etc." The usage of the verb in Daniel itself (two-thirds of the occurrences are as substantival participles and infinitives) in general conforms to what has been said about the book of Proverbs.

There is no abstract noun equivalent to חכמה in Biblical Hebrew, but there is a segholate חכמה (חכמה) found fifteen times. Of this usage, forty per cent are in Proverbs. The same basic meaning that attaches itself to the verb evinces itself in the noun. Thus, in Proverbs 13.15 חכמה is "good sense" (RSV, McKane), or perhaps
"intelligent prudence" (Jerusalem Bible). "This "šekel is the capacity for sane appraisal and sound intellectual judgment."159 In the context of Proverbs 3.4 McKane translates שָׂכֶל as "good success,"160 while the RSV has "good repute" in the text (the margin has the hardly more clear "good understanding"). The word שָׂכֶל is a practical word. It speaks of the best use of talent and intellect, not their mere possession. More often than not the word can be translated as "good sense."161

Returning to the book of Daniel; it has been said that Daniel possesses (and by implication that any good dream interpreter should possess) divine illumination, insight, נוֹבַע. His כְּעָנֹן or "good sense" is the ability resident in him which allows him to interpret the dream or vision successfully. In other words it is his skill which is able to deduce the correct meaning—the successful meaning—from dreams that causes the queen to speak of Daniel as one in whom Nebuchadnezzar had found נוֹבַע. Daniel has both qualities necessary in a good dream interpreter: inspiration and skill.

There is one more term in the formula describing the qualities of a good dream interpreter, wisdom (נְוָן). One cannot go far into the comparative study of the usage of the term in Daniel and the rest of the Old Testament without being struck by the difference in what is meant by it in the former.162 Much has already been written on the meaning of
The term in the Old Testament generally. In Daniel the word takes on the meaning "esoteric knowledge." The verb קדש is not found in Biblical Aramaic, but this is no reason to assume that it did not exist in the Aramaic spoken at that place and time. The vocabulary of Biblical Aramaic is relatively small and the fact that the verb does exist in both Egyptian Aramaic and Jewish Palestinian Aramaic leads one to believe that it did, in fact, exist. The two derivatives of קדש in Biblical Aramaic are קדש "wise, wiseman," and קדש "wisdom." There are enough occurrences of these derivatives in Biblical Aramaic to make a comparative study of the contexts. The term קדש is used to indicate a "wise man" as an official class of persons thirteen out of fourteen times. The exception, II.21, is in poetry and is parallel to the word קדש, "knowledge." The parallelism in II.21 is synonymous with an explicative waw. This surely means that the "wise (man)" is that person with קדש. The other thirteen occurrences evidently name some kind of dream interpreter. This is shown by the relation of קדש to other occult functionaries in II.27 and V.15. In addition to this, the context of all the occurrences of קדש in Daniel is that of dream interpretation. קדש is found on its own in II.12,13,14,18,24,48; IV.16,18; and V.7,8 making it likely that the term is a general one for these occult functionaries, the specific types of which are given in the two cases where the word is
found in conjunction with those lists of specific functionaries. In other words, it is the general title "dream interpreter" under which all the others may be subsumed.

The noun מְדַבֶּר is found nine times in the first six chapters of Daniel. The first thing that becomes clear is that, whatever wisdom is it is inherent naturally in God. It is furthermore clear that it is the gift of God's wisdom to Daniel that makes him outstanding. A good example of this is to be found in I.17 where it states, "...God gave them learning and skill in all letters and wisdom..." Even the pagan queen assumes the wisdom which Daniel has to be a characteristic of the gods and (implicitly) in their gift. This is again seen in Daniel's song of thanksgiving in II.20-23. At the beginning of the song (verse 20) Daniel states that "wisdom and might" have been transferred from God to him.

It was pointed out above that the מְדַבֶּר were those people who generally had some kind of esoteric knowledge, i.e., the dream interpreters. It would be reasonable to assume that the noun form should have some relation to knowledge also. In fact, every case of מְדַבֶּר in Daniel is closely bound to verbs and nouns of knowing and perceiving. The whole context of the thanksgiving of II.20-23 is that of a נֵז revealed, as can be seen from verses 19 and 20. The parallel to "He gives wisdom to the wise" in verse 21 is "and knowl-
edge to those who are perspicacious (literally to the knowers of perspicacity). In verse 21 the word above translated as "knowledge" is סְלַמֶּרֶד. In II.30 the whole purpose of Daniel's mission to Nebuchadnezzar is to make the king "know" ( signUp ). In all three occurrences in chapter I the noun חכמה is closely related to בְּיָנוֹן, "perspicacity." The words חכמה and בְּיָנוֹן do not have to be connected with occult knowledge and dream interpretation. Words are neutral until they are put into a context, and the context of both words when in connection with חכמה in Daniel belies any attempt to make them general knowledge and general perspicacity. They indicate knowledge and perspicacity used in the context of mysteries, visions, dreams, and interpretations.

Returning to the catalogue of talents essential for the dream interpreter; it is clear that he must have three things, inspiration, skill, and what else? It is most likely that חכמה in the present context—and generally in Daniel I-VI—should mean the general knowledge of occult affairs, just as מַכָּל has been suggested to mean the general title for a dream interpreter. Consequently, Professor McKane's term "esoteric knowledge" is as good as any for חכמה in Daniel I-VI.

OTHER LITERARY PROBLEMS

It is now possible to proceed to other literary
problems. These will be three in number. First, some ac-
count of the historical problems or errors in Daniel I-VI
will be taken, followed by a brief examination of Qumran
materials relevant to Daniel. After these two sets of issues
have been discussed the current chapter will be closed with
a detailed outline of Daniel I-VI.

Historical Problems

In view of the fact that Daniel I-VI has been typed
as Haggadah, and as such has an edificatory purpose rather
than a historical one, the historical problems encountered in
the text become less important for an understanding of the
book. The date suggested above for chapters I-VI would put
its composition at a distance of some 250 years from the
events which the book purports to narrate. This chronolog-
ical distance is sufficient time for the author to have be-
come confused on correct historical sequence, even if his
purpose had been historical narration. The fact, however,
that his aim is wholly edificatory coupled with the fact of
a revision in the Antiochene persecution (when chapters VII-
XII were added) means that the author could legitimately con-
dense and rearrange history to suit his aim. It is also
likely that his audience knew no more about accurate history
of the period than the author did, and did not read the book
as an accurate historical treatise. In recognition of the
facts of composition, date, and type of literature, the his-
torical inaccuracies in the book need only be set out in a
list. Those who would defend a sixth century date for the
whole must answer these, but in the case of the present work,
they are not really important.

1. The succession of kings in Daniel is Nebuchad-
nezzar—Belshazzar—Darius the Mede—Cyrus the Persian. The
problem here is two-fold, first, Belshazzar did not follow
Nebuchadnezzar (more on Belshazzar below), Evil-Merodach did.
Second, historical records know nothing of Darius the Mede,
in fact there is no historical room for him between Nabonidus
(the last neo-Babylonian king) and Cyrus the Persian.

2. The book of Daniel gives 606 BC as the date of a
siege in Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Again, secular his-
torical records know nothing of this siege. Nebuchadnezzar
did not even become king until 605.\textsuperscript{172} The first siege of
Jerusalem was in 597.

3. Belshazzar is portrayed as the son of Nebuchad-
nezzar. This is simply inaccurate. He was the son of Nabon-
idus. The author of the book of Daniel seems to know
nothing of Nabonidus, however.

4. Belshazzar is portrayed as king. That Belshaz-
zar is the son of Nebuchadnezzar is shown by the previous
note to be inaccurate. It is known from contemporary ac-
counts that Nabonidus was away from Babylon in Tema for part
of his reign. The so-called "Nabonidus Chronicle" alluded to in the preceding note makes it clear that during the king's absence the crown prince stayed in Babylon. Nowhere in the accounts is it indicated that Belshazzar was the king of Babylon, however. H. H. Rowley set forth an argument against the assumption that Belshazzar was king. Rowley's arguments do not always avoid triviality, but two major points are to be noticed. First, nowhere is Belshazzar called šarru; the most he is called is mar-šarri. Second, it is clear that the New Year's Festival was not held in Babylon during Nabonidus' absence in Tema. If Belshazzar had been king, even a co-regent, this most certainly would have been done. A third, and subsidiary argument is that nowhere in contemporary recorded history do we have documents dated by the year of Belshazzar's reign. This, in itself, is not fatal to the theory of co-regency, but to date a document by the younger partner in a co-regency while the older partner was still alive would be a singular occurrence. For other arguments against the statement that Belshazzar was king, the reader is directed to Rowley's article. Other "un-historical" bits in the fifth chapter of Daniel are also answered by Rowley. The problems are not serious if one remembers that "...this is not history but story-telling for the communication of religious truth...the accompanying local colour...is no proof of the historical accuracy of the events
narrated. 178

5. The madness of Nebuchadnezzar has no external documentary support. The only support at all for the story is what Porteous calls a "shadowy popular tradition" to the effect that Nebuchadnezzar, under some type of inspiration, predicted the fall of Babylon. After the prediction Nebuchadnezzar disappears. This tradition is found recorded by Eusebius 179 who is citing a certain Abydenus, who is, in turn, using Megasthenes as a source. Most modern commentators refer to this passage. 180 This ecstasy of Nebuchadnezzar is perhaps not even a reminiscence of the same tradition. The discovery of the "Prayer of Nabonidus" at Qumran makes it possible that the tradition recorded in Daniel originally referred to Nabonidus and was somehow (either deliberately or accidentally) changed to refer to Nebuchadnezzar. For a more detailed discussion of the "Prayer of Nabonidus" see the next section.

It must be re-emphasized that these and other historical problems and irregularities present no problem to the interpreter if one remembers that the writer was writing theology and not history. If one accepts a later date for these chapters, ample time for confusion of traditions is also given. If, on the other hand, the view is taken that Daniel is a contemporary of the events narrated one is indeed pressed to make some sense out of these errors. Their
solution is imperative if any view of Danielic authorship is
to be maintained. Since the latter view is nowhere here de-
defended nor maintained, no further general discussion of these
historical problems seems warranted here.

Daniel I-VI and Qumran

The most enlightening article of Professor Bruce in
the Black Festschrift (which has already been alluded to in the
above notes) gives an ample summary of the importance of Qum-
ran for studies in Daniel I-VI. It is clear both from
looking at the relevant Qumran Texts and at Bruce's article
that nothing from Qumran adds anything towards a solution of
the bilingual problem of Daniel. IQDn shows the transition
from Hebrew to Aramaic in II.4:

Two fragments, containing the transition from Aramaic to
Hebrew have not, at present, been published (4QDn, 4QDn),
but evidently they contain the transition as is found in the
present Massoretic Text.

Also as yet unpublished, three Aramaic pseudo-Daniel
fragments (4QpsDn, ) make it clear that the Daniel-cycle
was at one time larger than is collected in the canonical
book of Daniel. The additions to Daniel found in the Greek
Versions ("The Prayer of the Three Holy Children," "The Prayer of Azariah," "Susannah," and "Bel and the Dragon") are also most probably members of this wider cycle of Daniel-stories. 184

Perhaps the most interesting fragment relating to Daniel I-VI is the so-called "Prayer of Nabonidus" (4QOr Nab). 185 The Aramaic text of 4QOrNab follows.
The literary relationship (if not dependence) is clear. According to Bruce one can trace the suggestion that many of the stories in Daniel, which in their present form are told of Nebuchadnezzar, but which actually are about Nabonidus, as far back as 1899. Certainly Sidney Smith thought so in 1924. It is a moot point whether or not the Qumranians were responsible for the preservation of the name Nabonidus in their tradition or whether it came from the Babylonian diasporate as Freedman claims. Freedman is most probably correct in asserting, however, that the puzzle in chapter V. 25-28 is, in measure, solved by the assumption that Nabonidus is one of the kings involved in the first part of Daniel (at least originally).

It is generally agreed that קָדָמ, סְפָנ, and יֹּדֶה do not only stand for the meanings assigned to them by Daniel, but also for a series of Babylonian weights. These are: the mina, the shekel, and the half-mina (or the half-shekel). Nebuchadnezzar is the greatest and so to him is given the greatest weight, the mina. Belshazzar is obviously last, the half-shekel. The question is, "who is the shekel"? Freedman quite rightly contends that the middle term should be filled by Nabonidus. The question then becomes, who substituted the name of Nebuchadnezzar for that of Nabonidus? It may be, as Bruce suggests, that the abbreviation for Nabonidus (nbnd) became corrupted to or confused with that for Nebuchadnezzar.
( nbkd ) who had the more familiar name and reputation. Indeed the biblical material knows nothing at all of Nabonidus. It may be that the compiler of the present book of Daniel himself made the substitution for the better-known monarch. At present the question cannot be answered.

The solution posited by Freedman is that chapter II and chapter III deal with Nebuchadnezzar, chapter IV with Nabonidus, and chapter V with Belshazzar. If it is remembered that in V.2,11,13,18 ff. Nebuchadnezzar is called Belshazzar’s father, then one must change the name from Nebuchadnezzar to Nabonidus in chapter V as well. As has been seen Nabonidus was the father of Belshazzar and so a problem in the text is removed. This solution is attractive, but must remain tentative as it rests on much speculation.

OUTLINE OF DANIEL I-VI

To conclude the present chapter a detailed outline of the contents of Daniel chapters I-VI follows. The only modern commentator of which the present author is aware who attempts this is Arthur Jeffery in the Interpreter’s Bible. The present outline, independently attained, agrees with Jeffery in so much as it also sees a central portion to each tale surrounded by a prologue ascending to it and an epilogue falling away from it. It disagrees in that this central section is often divided into major parts, whereas Jeffery sees it as
I. INTRODUCTORY TALE ABOUT DANIEL AND HIS FRIENDS IN THE NEO-BABYLONIAN COURT (chapter I).

A. Prologue (I.1-7)
1. "historical" connection (I.1-2)
2. decree to bring youths to Babylon and to maintain them (I.3-5)
3. introduction of Daniel, Hananiah, Misha-el, and Azariah along with the changing of their names to Belteshazzar, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (I.6-7)

B. God's dietary laws are tested (I.8-16)
1. Daniel's resolve to keep himself faithful to God (I.8)
2. the test of the faithful (I.9-14)
3. the outcome of the test: victory for the faithful (I.15-16)

C. The reward for faithfulness is wisdom for Daniel and his friends (I.18-20).

D. Epilogue: a "historical" connection (I.21)

II. NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM OF THE IMAGE (chapter II)

A. Prologue (II.1-11)
1. "historical" connection (II.1a)
2. Nebuchadnezzar's dream (II.1b)
3. Nebuchadnezzar calls for the professional dream interpreters and they are helpless (II.2-11).

B. Daniel the wise dream interpreter (II.12-45)
1. the king's decree (II.12-13)
2. Daniel requests an attempt at interpretation of the dream (II.14-16).
3. Daniel tells his friends of developments and asks God for wisdom (II.17-18).
4. the mystery (rāz) revealed to Daniel (II.19)
5. Daniel's song of thanksgiving (II.20-23)
   a. introductory call to praise (II.20)
   b. reason for praise/thanksgiving (II.21-22)
   c. actual thanksgiving (II.23)
   a. request that wisemen not be killed (II.24)
   b. Arioch brings Daniel before Nebuchadnezzar (II.25).
c. Nebuchadnezzar asks Daniel about his ability to interpret dreams (II.26)
d. Daniel answers by giving glory and honor to God (II.27-30)
7. The dream is recounted (II.31-35).
a. the image in general (II.31)
b. the head of gold (II.32a)
c. the breast and arms of silver (II.32a)
d. the belly and thighs of bronze (II.32b)
e. the legs of iron (II.33a)
f. the feet partly of iron, partly of clay (II.33b)
g. The stone "cut without hands" shatters the image and fills the whole earth (II.34-35).
8. The pesher of the dream (II.36-45)
a. introduction (II.36)
b. Nebuchadnezzar is represented by the head of gold (II.37-38).
c. The next kingdom after Nebuchadnezzar's is represented by silver (II.39a).
d. A third kingdom is represented by bronze (II.39b).
e. A fourth kingdom is represented by iron because of the strength found in both iron and that kingdom (II.40).
   (1). Feet and toes (the latter not in the dream) of iron and clay represents a divided kingdom (II.41-42).
   (2). They shall mix in marriage, but shall not hold together (II.43).
f. The establishment of God's kingdom upon earth is represented by the stone "cut without hands" (II.44-45).

C. Epilogue (II.46-49)
2. High honors are given to Daniel and his friends (II.48-49).

III. THE THREE YOUNG MEN IN THE FIERY FURNACE (III.1-30; EV Chapter III).

A. Prologue (III.1-7)
1. Nebuchadnezzar sets up the image (III.1-6).
   a. The image is described (III.1).
   b. Nebuchadnezzar assembles the nobles and requires all peoples, nations, and tongues to worship the image (III.2-6).
2. The people worship the image (III.7).
B. The faithfulness of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego is tested by fire (III.8-23).
   1. The Chaldeans accuse the three (III.8-12).
   2. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego are brought before Nebuchadnezzar to answer charges (III.13-15).
   3. The three answer the king (III.16-18).
   4. The sentence is imposed by Nebuchadnezzar (III.19).
   5. The sentence is carried out (III.20-23).

C. Aftermath and deliverance (III.24-27)
   1. The angel protected Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (III.24-25).
   2. The three are saved and are seen to be saved by all (III.26-27).

D. Epilogue (III.28-30)
   1. Nebuchadnezzar praises God (III.28).
   2. The king makes the religion of the three a licit religion (III.29).
   3. Nebuchadnezzar promotes Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego (III.30).

IV. NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM AND MADNESS (III.31-IV.34; EV IV.1-37)

A. Prologue (III.31-IV.6; EV IV.1-9)
   1. Nebuchadnezzar writes an epistle (III.31-33; EV IV.1-3).
      a. introduction (III.31; EV IV.1)
      b. doxology (III.32-33; EV IV.2-3)
         (1). introductory call to praise (III.32; EV IV.2)
         (2). praise (III.33; EV IV.3)
   2. Nebuchadnezzar has a dream and its outcome is generally told (IV.1-6; EV IV.4-9).
      a. the dream (IV.1-2; EV IV.4-5)
      b. the incapacity of the king's dream interpreters to help (IV.3-4; EV IV.6-7)
      c. Daniel is asked for his interpretation of the matter (IV.5-6; EV IV.8-9).

B. The dream (IV.7-14; EV IV.10-17)
   1. The great tree is described (IV.7-9; EV IV.10-12).
   2. The holy watcher cuts down the tree (IV.10-14; EV IV.13-17).
      a. the decree to cut down the tree: judgment (IV.10-11; EV IV.13-14)
b. "leave a stump": salvation (IV.12a; EV IV.15a)

c. Nebuchadnezzar's madness described (IV.12b-13; EV IV.15b-16)

d. the reason for the sentence (IV.14; EV IV.17).

C. Nebuchadnezzar's plea and Daniel's pesher (IV.15-24; EV IV.18-27)

1. The king pleads for Daniel's aid (IV.15; EV IV.18).

2. The pesher is given (IV.16-23; EV IV.19-26).
   a. Daniel understands the dream and is dismayed (IV.16; EV IV.19).
   b. Nebuchadnezzar is represented by the tree (IV.17-19; EV IV.20-22).
   c. The watcher, etc., represents Nebuchadnezzar's madness (IV.20-23; EV IV.23-26).

D. Daniel pleads for the king's repentance (IV.24; EV IV.27).

E. The fulfillment of the dream (IV.25-30; EV IV.28-33)

1. introduction and "historical" connection (IV.25-26; EV IV.28-29)

2. Nebuchadnezzar's boast of greatness (IV.27; EV IV.30)

3. The sentence of madness carried out (IV.28-30; EV IV.31-33)
   a. the sentence (IV.28-29; EV IV.31-32)
   b. the execution of the sentence (IV.30; EV IV.33)

F. Epilogue: a hymn of thanksgiving (IV.31-34; EV IV.34-37)

1. Salvation comes to Nebuchadnezzar (IV.31a; EV IV.34a).

2. The king gives his reason for praise and thanksgiving (IV.31b-33; EV IV.34b-36).

3. The king gives specific praise and thanksgiving (IV.34; EV IV.37).

V. BELSHAZZAR'S FEAST (Chapter V)

A. Prologue (V.1-4)

B. The handwriting on the wall (V.5-28)
   1. The hand writes the unknown words (V.5-6).
   2. The call is given to the royal dream interpreters and the reward to be given to the
successful one is related (V.7).

3. The royal dream interpreters are powerless (V.8-9).

4. The queen enters and speaks (V.10-12).
   a. introduction (V.10)
   b. The queen suggests Daniel as a dream interpreter because he had helped in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar's father (V.11-12).

5. Daniel is brought before Belshazzar (V.13-16).

   a. Nebuchadnezzar's glory, folly, fall, and salvation (V.17-21)
   b. Belshazzar is compared to Nebuchadnezzar—his folly and immanent fall is foretold (V.22-23).

7. The inscription is described (V.24-25).
   a. introduction, tying with the previous section (V.24)
   b. the actual inscription: דק אשתית (V.25)

8. The pesher is given (V.26-28).
   a. כף: "numbered" (V.26)
   b. כף: "weighed" (V.27)
   c. מון: "divided" (V.28)

C. Epilogue (V.29-VI.1; EV V.29-31)
   1. Daniel is rewarded (V.29).
   2. Belshazzar is slain (V.30).
   3. Darius the Mede receives the kingdom (VI.1; EV VI.1).

VI. DANIEL IN THE LION'S DEN (VI.2-29; EV Chapter VI)

A. Prologue (VI.2-4; EV VI.1-3)
   1. "Historical" connection given (VI.2-3; EV VI.1-2).
   2. Daniel prospers (VI.4; EV VI.3).

B. Daniel's faith is tested (VI.5-25; EV VI.4-24).
   1. There is professional jealousy among Daniel's co-civil servants (VI.5-10; EV VI.4-9).
   2. The co-civil servants conspire to trap Daniel (VI.11-14; EV VI.10-13).
   3. Darius sets his mind on Daniel's rescue (VI.15-16; EV VI.14-15).
   4. Daniel is sentences and thrown into the lion's den (VI.17-19; EV VI.16-18).
   5. Daniel is delivered by an angel (VI.20-24; EV VI.19-23).
6. The conspirators are punished (VI.25; EV VI.24).

C. Epilogue (VI.26-29; EV VI.25-28)
      a. introduction (VI.27a; EV VI.26a)
      b. the reason for praise (VI.27b-28; EV VI.26b-27)
   2. Daniel prospers: a final "historical" connection (VI.29; EV VI.28).
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CHAPTER III

THEOLOGICAL ISSUES IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT
OF DANIEL I-VI

GENERAL INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The theology of any given biblical writing is an illusive quality to entrap in words. The term as used in the present study means the basic affirmations made by the author concerning (primarily) God, man, and the world, but including also such categories as the last things and history. It is axiomatic that any biblical book (or section of a book) will lay stress on some facets and retreat or remain silent on others. This leads to the conclusion that in order to understand fully the theology of a biblical book one must look at that book's theology within the context of the canon.

The specific task at hand is a survey of the theological elements in Daniel I-VI. This overview must remain, by definition, incomplete because I-VI constitutes only one-half of the biblical book. Questions of diversity apart, the book came into the canon as a unity, one book, and as such it must be kept for theological consideration. The study must remain incomplete by reason of space in that a full comparison with the rest of the canon would lead to a long study in its own...
right. In order to alleviate some of the tension of the first restriction, an overview of the theological affirmations of the whole of Daniel will be included below, although it is recognized that any full treatment of chapters VII-XII lies without the scope of the present study. Other than this glance at the total theological affirmation of the book this study will attempt to sketch the broad theological faith statements made in the first six chapters of Daniel.

Many of the theological themes which are simply stated in the stories of I-VI find their development in VII-XII. The relatively uncomplicated nature of these stories leads to a rather uncomplicated theology. The sophisticated literary forms in VII-XII lead to a complexifying of that which was simple in I-VI. It is vital to recognize that the main features of the theology of VII-XII find at least a ground in I-VI. For example, in III.25; IV.10,14,20 (EV IV.13,17,23); and VI.23 (EV VI.22) angels are mentioned as messengers of God. By the time one reaches passages such as VIII.15, the angel has been given a specific function and even a specific name—indicative of a panoply of angels, all with specific functions and names. Another example: the basic affirmation coming out most fully in chapters I, III, and VI is that God rewards absolute loyalty. This reward is taken far beyond the earthly bounds of I-VI when in XII.2 a
resurrection of the dead is posited and the reward is carried into the next world.

For the reason that VII-XII, in the main, develop that which is already incipient in I-VI, the book is a theological unity even though the stance here taken on authorship would put a wedge between the sections; which diversity is heightened by the difference in genre and the diversity of language. Thus the main part of what follows must be read in the light of the further development that these themes receive in chapters VII-XII.

The procedure will be to survey in brief the whole of the book theologically. After this brief statement the main task will be to look at the several facets of the theology of chapters I-VI. No attempt will be made at systematization, the task is one of description. Theology which is naturally simple should be left that way. If, in the end, the theological content, the end point of biblical interpretation, is rather smaller than all the mass of work that has gone into deducing it, this is to be admitted without any attempt to see more there than is actually in the text.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL AFFIRMATIONS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL

First, the present is full of possibilities for good or ill. Daniel's author thought the world was permeated by
a sovereign and purposeful God who rewards faith. There are three implications on the sovereignty of God. A. Man is not trapped by the status quo, that is, there is a reward of personal fulfillment in living in certain ways. Hope of better conditions causes man to have unrest if he is living in an undesirable way. The world can be changed, but the visions show that man cannot expect to change things alone (i.e., he cannot "bring in the kingdom" by himself). The help of God is imperative (also cf. II.30). Man and God together bring in the kingdom of God. This is one meaning of "being created in God's image." B. Man's future is based on divine norms. Responsibility beyond one's own person comes from living in a world under God's sovereignty. It is impossible for man to live in the world without some sort of struggle and at the same time to live a fulfilling life, but there is a fixed order which cannot be denied. If this affirmation made by the book of Daniel is right then sin could be seen as denying both the struggle and the norms by living in hopeless ways; by attitudes of presumption of knowledge and the future (living apart from the norms), by despair (refusing to believe that there is a significant future through struggle under God's norms), or by acquiescence (separating oneself from the present as a possible groundwork for a better world). C. Man's future demands immediate response (chapter V). The decision to follow divine norms is
urgent. The good possibilities can be missed by not living in submission to God's norms in the present. Irrevocable forces can be set in motion by one's action. Frustrations, wrecked relationships, and unhappiness can be the result of a failure to respond in the moment.

The second major theological affirmation of Daniel is that Man's future lies through fulfillment in a historical process. This has ramifications which lead beyond the book of Daniel, to Jesus the Christ, and through him to the church. These ramifications are basically two-fold. A. God works through history towards a goal. Daniel's plan for world history was wrong--it was a failure because divine fulfillment of divine promise always transcends human expectation. God is the lord of history and of time. Plotting the plan of the ages is usurping the divine role. God establishes his ends chronologically not instantaneously. Man may not understand the shape of the fulfillment, he may only affirm that the fulfillment will take place. The author of Daniel, especially in the apocalyptic portion, assumed that he knew both the fact and the shape of the fulfillment. From a historical point of view his prediction of the shape of the fulfillment is demonstrably in error, but his basic affirmation that the fulfillment will happen can still be shared in faith. God works through the historical process by calling and luring, not by coercing man to the divine ends.¹
B. God works through the son of man, used both individually as a synonym for man himself *(cf. Ezekiel 2.1,3 etc.)*, or collectively *(cf. Psalm 80.17)*. This latter usage is dominant in the book of Daniel, but the individual is not missing. On the one hand the kingdom belongs to the righteous (in a collective sense), but every kingdom has a king (an individual). By extrapolation one can say that for the Christian, Christ is head of the church, but the church is also the son of man. The author of Daniel VII uses the image Son of Man to symbolize the kingdom of God in the context of creation imagery *(VII.2, the great sea)*. Man was given the task at creation of subduing the creation *(Genesis 1.28)*, but he has not been able to do it. The author of Daniel resounds with the affirmation that the days are coming when man **shall** subdue the creation. The theophany imagery of the son of man coming with the clouds is a **divine** image. The whole passage is a clever play on images to suggest that man will accomplish the creation goal, but only with the help of the Most High.

The third major theological affirmation found in the book is that man's future will involve a cosmic revolution of all things in the completion of creation. The prophets spoke of a historical process leading to a divine goal; Daniel speaks of a radical cosmic destruction.

The ramifications of this affirmation are two in
number. A. The future will see a radically new form of life; that is, the form of the future will be unexpected as creation comes to completion. As has been seen previously, one of Daniel's problems is that it attempts to show the shape of the future too exactly. The author of Daniel in chapter VII (and this finds its basis in chapter II) is pointing out that the God who subdued chaos in the beginning is the same one creating and subduing chaos at the end of time as the redeemer. The final chaos that is to be subdued will not be the sea monsters and weird beasts of chapter VII, but men and the death they bring, more closely in line with chapter II. The book of Daniel affirms that in the end chaos will not only be subdued as it was at the creation, but destroyed.

B. The future will involve each person (XII.1-2). Unless man can conquer death his hope cannot be complete, nor can his reward for faithfulness be radical enough. The first six chapters of Daniel state that loyalty to God is more important than earthly life (especially chapters III and VI). This loyalty to God "pays off" not only in this world, but in the world to come. This is a vital part of Daniel's hope for a new world, and its importance is carried right into the New Testament.
The general affirmations which are made in the first six chapters of the book are quite simple. Since the stories are basically of two types, the theological affirmations in them are of two types. The first is found in I.1-17; III; and VI. It can be stated simply: "Loyalty to God is more important than anything else, even life itself." The first chapter shows God's dietary laws tested (verses 8-16). Although it is not directly a life and death test in chapter I, in the other two chapters, this point is well-drawn. The test is definitely that of loyalty to God in face of what seems to be certain doom.

The second theological theme that runs through the first six chapters is that "God rewards absolute loyalty." It can be seen clearly reflected in I.18-21, where the reward is wisdom for Daniel and his three friends. Daniel's reward for loyalty to God is also seen in chapter II, although Daniel's loyalty must be assumed here because it is not explicitly stated. The reward for the faithfulness of the three confessors in chapter III is not only life itself, but the promotion which Nebuchadnezzar gives to them in III.30. In chapter IV, which is similar to chapter II, the loyalty of Daniel must be somewhat assumed, although his rejoinder
to the king in verse 24 does indicate it:

Therefore, O King, let my counsel be acceptable to you; break off your sins by practicing righteousness, and your iniquities by showing mercy to the oppressed, that there may perhaps be a lengthening of your tranquility.

Again in chapter V, Daniel the loyal Hebrew is the only one granted the wisdom to interpret the inscription. Chapter VI clearly shows Daniel as receiving both life and prosperity as a reward for his faithfulness to God.

These two general theological affirmations are not the only two theological tendencies that may be derived from Daniel I-VI, but they do permeate the stories. There are specific statements made about God, man, and the world to be found in these chapters. It is now the task to ferret out these other theological statements.

SPECIFIC THEOLOGICAL STATEMENTS: GOD

Names of God

Daniel I-VI uses sixteen different names for God. Some of these can be counted as variants of others. These titles for God are found forty-four times in our chapters. Certain characteristics of God are to be derived from the titles used to name him. These titles cluster about certain basic designations for God. Variations on the words God ( ) and Lord ( ) account for nearly eighty per cent of the occurrences. It is now the task to survey
briefly the names used for God in order to derive from them characteristics of God as seen by the author of I-VI. It is recognized that the titles had use in other cultures both before and after the writing of the book of Daniel. While the background to the terms is interesting it is basically irrelevant for the purposes of the current study.

Combinations of the generic Semitic name for God (אֱלֹהִים, אלוהים) account for thirty-three occurrences (seventy-five per cent of the total). The title occurs alone twelve times. The phrases are "house of God," בֵּית אֱלֹהִים I.2; בֵּית אֱלֹהִים V.3; "law of God," לְכֹה אֱלֹהִים VI.6; and "name of God," שֵׁמוֹ אֱלֹהִים II.20. This general name does little to reveal anything about the picture of God in Daniel. It undoubtedly refers to Yahweh although he is never named explicitly in chapters I-VI. The phrases "house of God," and "law of God" show little more than this God was pictured as having an earthly dwelling (in Jerusalem), and a set of instructions (a law) which his followers considered to be normative. Perhaps the sheer fact that his followers did consider this law to be normative shows that God had the authority to make laws, but this contributes little to the discussion since this could be said of any god. Basically different from the above two phrases is שְׁמוֹ אֱלֹהִים found in II.20. The grammatical structure of the construction has been explained in chapter I of the current study (pages 84-
The phrase occurs in Daniel's blessing of God for granting wisdom to him. As is well-known the name identifies the character of the bearer in the Semitic world. It gives a clue to his character and, with reference to God, is most often synonymous with his revealed character. What has been revealed to Daniel can generally be called wisdom (specifically the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream). The revealed character of God at this point can be said to consist of wisdom. It is probably most wise not to read too much into the name of God here as it is likely a circumlocution for God himself. It will be necessary to return to the passage in II.20-23 later in order to discover what theological statements are found therein.

The title "the God of Heaven" is found four times in Daniel (II.18,19,37,44) and a slight variant on this "the God in Heaven is found in II.28. Originally the former phrase probably was a genitive of origin, showing the abode of God. The phrase is found seven times in the Aramaic section of Ezra (5.11,12; 6.9,10; 7.12,21,23); and either seven or nine times in Cowley's Aramaic Papyri. The Biblical Hebrew counterpart, הַנִּלְיוֹן, is found in Jonah 1.9; Ezra 1.2; Nehemiah 1.4,5; 2.4,20; 2 Chronicles 36.23; and Genesis 24.3,7. All these Biblical Hebrew passages are late with the exception of the Genesis passage which is usually assigned to the J stratum, but which may show later additions. According to
Montgomery this name for God was disregarded by Israel until after the exile because of its pagan connotations. It became the official title by which the Persian government recognized the Jewish God. It was also similar to the later Zeus Ouranos and so fell out of use. The title is found in the New Testament in Revelation 11.13.

Theologically the terms "God of Heaven" and "God in Heaven" indicate that God is removed from the earth, i.e., he is wholly unlike the human kind and above it. God's sovereignty is shown by a related term, "king of Heaven," found only in Daniel IV.34. The idea of God as a king is certainly frequently found in Old Testament literature. The passage in IV.34 confesses God as king in heaven, but more to that, Nebuchadnezzar realizes that he rules on the earth by the pleasure of the "King of Heaven." "Nebuchadnezzar holds his fief from Him who is King in heaven and in the kingdom of man." This sovereignty is also shown by an equivalent phrase to "king of heaven," the "lord of heaven" in V.23.

What has been indicated thus far is that God is wholly other, above the kingdom of men and sovereign in both heaven and upon the earth. More will be said about this sovereignty later.

The fact that God, although wholly different and separate from man, is capable of dealing with them in a personal way is suggested by the titles "God of Shadrach, Meshach, and
Abed-nego," (III.28-29), and "the God of Daniel" (VI.27). These titles merely suggest this theological theme; it is more closely borne out by the stories themselves. It would strain the text to deduce a personal God from these two names alone. All three occurrences are found in the mouths of pagans who, in the respective stories, would naturally identify the saving God with the names of those who were saved.

The title "God of (my) fathers" (II.23) shows that Daniel's God is not some new God, but the historic God of Israel, the God who showed himself in the Exodus and the bringing of the Exile. It is this same God whom Daniel is worshipping in Babylon. The one occurrence of this title is in a hymn of thanksgiving which Daniel delivers to God after wisdom is granted him by God. This is a common term in the Old Testament, being found forty-five times in the books of Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, and Ezra. It is found one other time in Daniel, in XI.37. In the New Testament it is found four times in the book of Acts.11

The title "God of gods," (II.47) is obviously a superlative meaning something such as "most divine."12 This phrase is put into the mouth of a pagan king and so does not automatically speak of only one god. What it definitely does say is that Daniel's God is the most divine god, the quintessence of "god-ness" in the view of the king.
This phrase is found in the absolute state (undefined) in XI.36. Other than the two occurrences here in Daniel the phrase is found only in Deuteronomy 10.17.

Theologically the phrase "the living God," נָחַר (VI.21,27) has a two-fold meaning. First of all it means obviously that God is alive as opposed to dead. He is not one of the gods of silver and gold, of bronze, iron, wood, and stone, which do not hear or see or know (V.23), rather he is a vital, living God who is active and who sees and hear and know. Since God is sovereign in both heaven and earth, and since he is alive, it can be extrapolated that life finds its source in him. This must be extrapolated and is not directly contained in the title "living God." The second facet of this title draws its implication from the context of the story in which it is found. Since God, by means of an angel, has saved Daniel's life, he may legitimately be called the living God in that he has the power to save (and presumably destroy) life. Further, if God is living that means he is active. He is aware of man's problems and perils. Because he is sovereign in both heaven and upon earth he is able to do something about these problems and perils. Therefore loyalty to a living God can bring great rewards to life. The term is actually more common in the New Testament than it is in the Old; being found fifteen times in the books of Matthew, John, Acts, Romans, 2 Corin-
thians, 1 Timothy, Hebrews, and Revelation. In the Old Testament the term is used twelve times (other than the two usages in Daniel) in the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, 1 Samuel, 2 Kings, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Hosea.

The title "a great god," הָגוֹיָה (II.45) is possibly to be taken as a proper title "Great God." This is possible, but it is to be pointed out here that Daniel is speaking to a pagan who had many gods. There is the possibility that Daniel was, for the purposes of preaching, giving Nebuchadnezzar's gods a sort of existence. Scholars are divided over which reading is to be preferred. Those who favor reading a definite title include Prince, Montgomery, Bentzen, and Delcor. On the other side are Bevan, Behrman, Marti, Driver, Charles, and Plöger. Whichever reading is chosen there is no doubt about which god Daniel has in mind. It is, of course, the same God whom he has been faithfully serving all through the book.

There is another group of divine epithets which center around the term "Most High," הַשָּׁם. The variant is הַשָּׁם הַשָּׁם "Most High God." These two may be treated together. Both of these terms have a long history in Semitic religions. In the Canaanite pantheon it simply stood for the chief god. In the Old Testament this name refers to Yahweh as being the highest of the heavenly council. The Hebrew counterpart to
It occurs in the Hebrew portion of the Old Testament some twenty-four or twenty-five times, mostly in poetic passages. Also occurring are phrases such as "sons of the Most High," ֵָּלְמָ רֵםְן (Psalm 82.6), "Yahweh the Most High," ֵָּלְמָ רֵם (Psalm 47.3), "the name of Yahweh the Most High," ֵָּלְמָ רֵם (Psalm 7.18), and the clause "Yahweh is the Most High over all the earth," ֵָּלְמָ רֵם (Psalms 83.19; 97.19). That Yahweh is meant by ֵָּלְמָ רֵם is shown by such passages as those above and Genesis 14.22, and it further galvanized by parallelisms such as those found in 2 Samuel 22.14:

Yahweh thundered from the heavens,
and the Most High gave his voice.

Except for Genesis 14.18,22, the passages in which the term ֵָּלְמָ רֵם is found are all in poetry. The term is found quite often in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature, being especially common in Sirach, 1 Esdras, Enoch, Jubilees, and 4 Ezra. In the New Testament the term is found in its Greek dress (σαράγη) in Mark 5.7; Luke 8.28; Acts 7.48; 16.17; and Hebrews 7.1. It is most interesting that many times this name for God is found in the mouths of pagans: Genesis 14.18,19,20; Numbers 24.16; Isaiah 14.14; 1 Esdras 2.14; and Acts 16.17. It is spoken by a demon in Mark 5.7.

The theological meaning of the term here in Daniel is actually rather straightforward. It simply means the highest god from a polytheistic point of view, and the chief of the
heavenly council from a monotheistic point of view. The one who is most high is by definition over everything else and this implies omnipotence (from a monotheistic point of view). Along with such names as "the Lord/God of Heaven," this title also indicates one that is wholly removed from the world and different from it. The two terms "Most High" and "Most High God" occur nine times in Daniel I-VI. The former occurs in IV.14,21,22,29,31; and the latter in III.26,32; and V.18,21.

There are three divine appellatives which cluster around the general title LORD, one of which (Lord of heaven, V.23) has already been discussed. Of the remaining two the first simply "Lord," יְהֹוָה, יָהָה, found in I.2.27 In the Old Testament, when referring to another human being the form is יְהֹוָה. It is a title of respect equivalent to "sir," as in Numbers 12.11 (Aaron speaking to Moses): "Oh, my lord, do not punish us because we have done foolishly and have sinned."28 It is often used of a servant speaking to one of higher authority as in Genesis 44.19 (Judah speaking to Joseph): "My lord (יְהֹוָה) asked his servants, saying, 'Have you a father or a brother?"29 In human terms, then, it is a title of respect sometimes used by a lower office when addressing a higher one. If the term "Lord" is used of God (as it is over 450 times in the Old Testament30) it is usually found in the plural with the first-person-common-singular pronominal suffix (יְהֹוָה). Literally, then, it is "my
Lords," although the plural form is to be regarded as the plural **majestatis** (perhaps on analogy of **יְלֵיהֶם**). The pointing of the name is always 'יְהֹוָה' to distinguish it from 'יְהֹוָהוָנוֹ"my lords." It is extremely doubtful if there was originally any difference between 'יְהֹוָהוָנוֹ and 'יְהֹוָהוָנוֹ, but rather that the present difference is a Massoretic convention. In relation to the divine the word is an extension of its reference to the human and means "master, ruler" and is indicative that its user places God on a higher plane than himself and puts himself under God's sovereignty. This title, then, simply shows God's sovereignty over whoever uses it.

The Aramaic equivalent of יְהֹוָה is **אַדָם**. It is found in the most interesting divine title יְהֹוָה יָלֵין(II.47). This name is found in conjunction with יְהֹוָה יָלֵין, which has been discussed as a Hebrew superlative. As has also been pointed out, the only other place where "God of gods" is used as a divine title is Deuteronomy 10.17. Montgomery compares the term to the Persian "King of Kings," and the Akkadian **šar-sarrani**, both royal titles. He also posits (along with others) that יְהֹוָה יָלֵין in Daniel II.47 is equivalent to יְהֹוָה יָלֵין in Deuteronomy 10.17. This solution is wholly possible. If it is the case that the title should be translated "Lord of Kings," then the theological content of such a title would be that of sovereignty over earthly monarchs. By implication, if God is sovereign over the king of a country he is certain-
ly king over the mere inhabitants. This then, is an economical way of saying that God is master of the affairs of man.

Although this theology would not be seriously changed by a modification to the theory as set forth by Montgomery, it is interesting to note that H. L. Ginsberg has insisted that the last word of the title should be vocalized mulkhin or molkhin and derived from a root *mulk, "kingship, kingdom" rather than *malk, "king."\(^{34}\) According to Ginsberg the title should be "Lord of Kingdoms." Perhaps more importantly for Ginsberg's argument is the fact that מַלְכוּת, "Lord of Kingdoms" is held to be exactly equivalent to the Ptolemaic royal title קְוָּדָס בְּרֶשֶׁת᾽ מֵי וָי.\(^{35}\) To Ginsberg this amounts to corroborative evidence for his dating of the first six chapters of Daniel. The rightness or wrongness of Ginsberg's theory cannot be discussed here, it is noted as a variant on the theory of Montgomery and a possible alternative to it.

There are two other divine titles used in Daniel I-VI. The first is "revealor of mysteries," פִּיזֶר אֹזוֹ (II.47). In the context of the story of chapter II, the mystery that is revealed is the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. In the discussion on pages 145-147 it was noted that a revelation from God is a רָז (Mystery) until God gives the answer or interpretation (pesher). Both halves of the divine self-communication are the property of and in the gift of God.
The title "revealer of rāzin" simply indicates that God is the giver of both. This esoteric knowledge given by God has been called wisdom. "Revealer of mysteries" indicates that God is a wisdom-giver and this indication is made explicit in a passage such as II.20-23.

Finally, the title כּוֹנֵן "heavens" as a surrogate-name for God in IV.23 is unique in the Old Testament literature although it became more widely used in both the intertestamental and New Testament periods. It is also found in the Mishnah according to Bevan. Further rabbinic parallels are pointed out by Dalman in *The Words of Jesus*:

- Aboth i.3 כּוֹנֵן אַלְכָּל "fear of heaven"
- Berakhoth ii.2 כּוֹנֵן מִצְרַיִם "sovereignty of heaven"
- Sanhedrin vi.4 כּוֹנֵן כָּנָה "name of heaven"

In all of the above examples and more which Dalman gives the word heaven simply equals the word God. This usage reveals little about God except that he is thought to live in heaven. It is actually an avoidance of uttering the name "God" at all, lest a mere mortal should defame it by its utterance.

It is perhaps best to pull together those facets of God's "personality" which have been suggested by the various names used for him in Daniel I-VI. God is removed from humans and above them ("God in/of Heaven"), he is omnipotent and sovereign over men and the world ("Lord of Heaven," "Lord," "Most High," "Lord of Kings," "King of Heaven").
Even if the possibility of other gods exists, Daniel's God is the most divine ("God of Gods"). He is the God revealed to Moses at Sinai; the same God who had acted in all Israel's history to save her, care for her, and chastise her ("God of my fathers"), and is still alive and capable of action in the world ("Living God"). In addition to these characteristics God is the possessor of wisdom, and all wisdom in man is his gift ("Revealer of Mysteries").

Throughout the present discussion it has been noted that the diverse names used for God merely suggest characteristics in his personality. A name as such makes no concrete statement, and any theological meaning in it is actually extrapolated from the words in the name. This theological meaning often lies quite near the surface of the name, but it is suggested nonetheless. There are, however, concrete statements made about God in Daniel I-VI which reveal his character much more surely than the names used for him. To these attention must now be turned.

**Statements about God**

By far the most numerous and most important faith affirmations in Daniel I-VI concern God and his character and work in the world. The reason for this is that contained in these statements about God are statements that, when looked at from slightly different perspective, are statements
about man and his world. The whole of the theological-affirmation content of Daniel I-VI can be summed up in the God-affirmations, although the implications of these statements must be separately worked out as they apply to man and the world. The faith affirmations run closely together with those already suggested in the previous sub-section.

According to II.20b wisdom belongs to God. In the case of the context here, the wisdom is esoteric knowledge. Both רָצ and pesher have their source in him. The first faith affirmation concerning God, then, is that he is the fount of wisdom. This assertion is galvanized by sections such as I.22b, "...he knows what is in the darkness, and the light dwells with him." It is not only wisdom which is resident in God, but also the closely allied term knowledge, which is closely associated with נוּח, "occult functioning, dream and vision interpretation, etc." But the fact that God is the fount of this wisdom does not in itself indicate that these qualities can be imparted to men. This is made explicit, however, in II.21b, "...He gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who are perspicacious." It is doubtful that much distinction should be seen here between wisdom and knowledge as they are undoubtedly synonymously parallel. What is important to note is that God gives wisdom and knowledge to no one but the wise and the perspicacious. By the latter term is meant one who has the insight
and the competence (חכמיה) -- good sense -- to use his insight properly; the wise man. God's wisdom is a gift to those discerning enough to use it. The fact that divine wisdom is available to man can be seen also from I. 17; II.22a, 28, 45, and 47. The fact that not everyone can understand is shown by II.45: "A great God has made known to the king what shall be hereafter." Nebuchadnezzar did not know that this is what the dream meant, nor did he have the slightest inkling of how to interpret his dream until "let in on" the secret by a man of perspicacity, or the man of perspicacity, Daniel. From this it would seem that another criterion for understanding the wisdom of God is loyalty to him. Daniel is the only one who is granted this divine knowledge and wisdom in every case (chapters II, IV, and V), and Daniel is the book's paragon of loyalty.

God is not only the source of wisdom and knowledge, but (also according to II.20b) the owner of "might," or "strength," בשןלכ. The arena of God's strength is primarily the historical process as is made plain by the often repeated phrase, "The Most High rules (is powerful) in the kingdom of men and gives it to whom he will," (IV.14; cf. IV. 22, 30; V.21). God is the Lord of history and controls the events of the world. "And the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his (i.e., Nebuchadnezzar's) hand..." (I.2). "He changes times and seasons; he removes kings and sets up
kings..." (II.21a). "He sets over it the lowliest of men," (IV.14). "Heaven rules," (IV.23). "All the inhabitants of the earth are accounted as nothing; and he does according to his will in the host of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand or say to him, 'What doest thou?'" (IV.32). Also see II.37-38,44; and V.17,20, 26.

It is also made very clear that not only is God the Lord of the ongoing historical process, but also the controller of history's end. This is made explicit in statements about the eternal nature of God's rule or kingdom. "And in the days of those kings the God of Heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed..." (II.44a). "...His dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom endures from generation to generation," (IV.31; cf. III.33). "...He is the living God, enduring forever; his kingdom shall never be destroyed, and his dominion shall be to the end," (VI.27).

That God is the Lord of the world and history leads to the assertion that, although he is other than the world, he does not rule from a great distance, but is rather active in the world. He gives rewards to his loyal servants. These rewards are seen as material prosperity, political position (II.49; III.30; V.29; VI.29), and wisdom (I.17). Other evidence can be found in such passages as "(God) has de-
livered his servants..." (III.28), "...he does according to his will in the host of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth," (IV.32), and "...Those who walk in pride he is able to abase." Another sign that God is active and able to act in the world is seen in the already cited phrase "the Most High rules in the kingdom of men." The term translated as "rules" here is (CaC which is an adjective meaning "powerful." Also "he delivers and rescues" (VI.28). III.17 might be taken as evidence of the activity of God in the world, but the text at this point is so obscure and possibly corrupt that it is better not to base a theological assertion on it. A very important facet of God's action in the world can be seen in the fact that this action can either be to destroy what is adverse to him (as he does with the kingdoms in chapter II) or to save that which is loyal and dear to him (as he does with the three confessors in chapter III and with Daniel himself in chapter VI).

Other characteristics of God are seen to be his righteousness (rightness) and his justice (IV.34). If one wanted to sum the affirmations concerning God in chapters I-VI one could not do better than to cite the hymn of II.20-22, and the statement of IV.14 (cf., IV.22,30; V.21): 

II.20 May the name of God be blessed forever and ever since wisdom and power are his alone.
His, to control the procession of times and seasons, to make and unmake kings, to confer wisdom on the wise, and knowledge on those with wit to discern; his to uncover depths and mysteries to know what lies in darkness; and light dwells with him.

IV.14

...The Most High rules over the kingship of men, he confers it on whom he pleases and raises the lowest of mankind.

SPECIFIC THEOLOGICAL STATEMENTS:
MAN AND THE WORLD

In actuality a great deal has already been said about man and the world in the preceding section. It remains to close this chapter (and with it Section I) with a few observations more specifically concerning man and his life in the world. The author of chapters I-VI is more concerned to paint a picture of an omnipotent, active, wisdom-giving God than he is to give a picture of man or the world. This emphasis on God may be explained most probably by the fact that the author thought that the readers or hearers knew who they were and what their world looked like. What was in question for them was the character of God for man in the world.

God is omnipotent and this means that man lives by his will (his very breath is in God's hand, V.23) whether or not he knows it or admits it. Both Nebuchadnezzar and Darius confess in the end that they are not masters of the world,
but God is. Since God is all-powerful and active in the world, the world lives by his pleasure and under his norms. It is not made explicit in these chapters the full extent of these norms, but one can assume that the early audience of Daniel knew what these norms were; most probably the Law and perhaps the Prophets. Daniel I-VI gives simple examples of these norms, such as dietary laws (chapter I), and laws forbidding idol-worship (chapters III and VI).

It is clear that God calls man to live under his norms whether by the Torah or by "signs and wonders in the heavens and upon the earth" (VI.28). God's call is followed by his promise of victory in life (and in chapter XII beyond it) to the man who perseveres in living under them. Violating God's norms, it follows, have inevitable ill-consequences as can be seen in chapter V. Belshazzar is payed for his pollution of the temple vessels and his overweening pride by death; the logical outcome of a violation of the norms of the Most High.

The stories in chapters I-VI are each one overstatements, simplified to bare bones to make a theological point. To read the literature here contained as anything else than literature to make a theological point is to miss its point, although it may be greatly appreciated on both linguistic and literary planes. An example of the overstatement is
found in chapter I. The only laws mentioned there are dietary laws. It cannot be assumed that because the author mentioned these laws only, they are the most important laws contained in the Torah. The statement is exemplary. The reward for faithfulness to God's dietary laws is seen very simply as an enhancement of qualities already in the four heroes. The lesson here is broader than "Keep dietary laws and win success and fame." The lesson is that loyalty brings reward--and yet broader, that actions have ramifications. It is a corollary of God's character that man cannot predict what the reward is to be, but the reward is promised nonetheless. It is this promised reward that brought the author of chapter XII to see that men do not always receive it before they die. Since God has promised a reward, and since God does not lie, a reward may be assumed beyond death. Another example is chapter V, which has much the same point as chapter I. The lesson is not "Do not drink wine with friends, especially from Temple Vessels or death will surely ensue." This would, of course, be hopelessly narrow and a totally uncreative deduction to draw from the story, and one which would show a complete misunderstanding of the genre of Hag-gadah. The lesson of chapter V is two-fold. The first part of it could be phrased "present choices (for good or ill) have more than present ramifications and implications." Secondly, "God calls man to live under his norms and this call is
urgent." Not responding to God's call can end in tragedy, thus the imperative need for immediate response.

Again, due to the character of God, man can rest in faith that the whole of history is in God's control. He especially controls its conclusion. Daniel II points to an establishment of the divine kingdom. The kingdom of God is to be long-lived and evidently shared by those loyal to God. Taken as a whole the book of Daniel expects the imminent establishment of this kingdom with a concommitant end to human history and a victory for Israel and her God. In this expectation the book is a failure—in this faith, however, it is a resounding success. In the words of Norman Porteous:

...There were those who did not lose heart because the end did not come as the author of this book expected it would. Alongside the developing Rabbinism with its lowered temperature, the belief survived that one day God would act, as act he did. The realized eschatology of Christianity leaves room for a final end which, near or far, will be the ultimate justification of the faith which produced the Book of Daniel.46
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GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The oldest translation of the book of Daniel is apparently that of the Old Greek version which is also commonly called the Alexandrian version or simply the Septuagint (LXX). This version is important because of the relatively early date of the translation. It is interesting because of the wide divergences between it and the Massoretic text. The purpose of the chapter in hand is to introduce in a general way the Septuaginal text of Daniel I-VI.

Before proceeding it is perhaps wise to state the textual sources of information on the LXX of Daniel. There are only three witnesses to this text, consisting of Codex Chisianus (ninth or eleventh century AD, abbreviated by the siglum 88), the Chester Beatty Papyrus X (late second or early third century AD, abbreviated by the siglum 967), and the indirect witness of the so-called Syro-hexaplar of Paul of Tella (circa 617 AD, abbreviated by the siglum Syh). The reason for this paucity of textual witnesses is easily discovered. Fairly early on in the history of the church, certainly by the time of Jerome (late fourth century AD), the
church had rejected the LXX of Daniel and replaced it with the translation of Theodotion. Jerome himself professed ignorance of the reasons for the change, but assumed one of them to be the vast discrepancies between the LXX and the Massoretic text. 1

Without use in the church it is easy to appreciate how the LXX translation could almost disappear. Indeed, although Codex Chisianus was known to Leo Allatius in the seventeenth century, it was first published by Simon de Magistris in 1772. 2 The Syro-hexaplar text for Daniel was first published by Bugati in 1788. 3 Until the discovery of the Chester Beatty Papyri in 1931 (and subsequent publication beginning in 1933), these two witnesses were the only textual authorities of any great size to the LXX text of Daniel. 4

The major importance of the Beatty papyri was twofold; first, their early date, second, the fact that they offer a pre-hexaplaric text.

According to a note in Jellicoe's Septuagint and Modern Study (p. 250), "...Other leaves, as yet unpublished, are at Cologne and Madrid." In 1968 and the following year the greater part of the Cologne part of 967 was published by A. Geissen and W. Hamm. 5 This means that now by far the larger share of Daniel has a third witness to the LXX text. The actual lacunae which remain after the publication of the
Kenyon and Cologne portions of 967 are: III.1-71, 98-100; IV.1-6, 10, 14b-15, 20-21, 26-27; VII.26-27; VIII.5-6; XI.9-10a, 11-14, 15b-16a, 20b-22, 26b-40a, 41; XII.1-2a, 7-8a. Still further publication of fragments from chapters III and IV is promised by Hamm in his preface. 6

The current study is concerned only with those parts of Daniel I-VI which are to be found in the Massoretic text. This simply means that the section of the LXX between III.23 and 24 in the Massoretic text are left out of consideration here. It now seems best to proceed with a closer look at the structure of the three Greek witnesses and their relation to the Massoretic text (MT).

THE STRUCTURE OF 88, SYH, AND 967 AND THEIR RELATION TO THE MT

It is widely known and agreed that the LXX of Daniel breaks into two parts. Chapters I-III and VII-XII follow the MT within the free limits of the translation style of the LXX in general. Chapters IV-VI on the other hand are incredibly confused. 7 Two views of the situation from the end of the last century put the matter well in sum.

In chapters iii to vi...the original thread of the narrative is often lost in a chaos of accretions, alterations and displacements, 8

And from August Bludau:

In chapters 1 and 2 the Alexandrian translator gives
a clear translation with insignificant variants; in the beginning of chapter 3 the discrepancies become more frequent. In chapters 4-6 the Greek text deviates from our Aramaic one in such a way that we seem to no longer be dealing with variant readings, but with two independent stories with the same content. 9

It is now possible to go through the text of Daniel I-VI chapter by chapter in order to survey the differences between the three Greek witnesses and their relation to the MT.

Chapters I and II

In these chapters the Greek follows the MT in a fairly close manner. In addition to scribal errors such as the omission of letters (e.g., νεανισκοῦ, 967 for νεανισκοῦς, 88, I.4), syllables (ἐπιλέξ, 967 for επιλέκτως, 88, I.3), words (ὄνοματα, I.7), or phrases (καθαπέρ εωράκατε οτί απεστη απ' έμουτο πράγμα, II.8), and similar changes in 967 there are more important variants. As has been pointed out before, 967 is very important in that it offers a pre-Hexaplaric text-form. Thus in those passages in 88-Syh which include more than the MT (and are marked with an obelisk in the Hexapla), 967 has at times less than 88-Syh. 10 An example of this is II.8: καθαπερ οὖν προστετα, 967; καθαπερ οὖν προστετακα outings εσται Ι, 88-Syh. Much more frequently 967 and 88-Syh agree in the obelisked passages, for example I.17 καὶ εὖ παση σοφία, 967; καὶ εὖ παση σοφία Ι, 88-Syh. Other comparisons may be made, for example I.20; II.9, 11, 18, (38), 48. 11
Bludau comes to the conclusion that most of the additions of 88 over the MT are insignificant additions of particles, pronouns, etc. The remaining additions in 88 are those of an epexegetical nature and some of them are considerable. An example is found in I.3: εκ των υιων των κεφισταντων του Ισραηλ (this addition is also found in 967). It is impossible, according to Bludau, to determine whether these additions are attributable to the LXX translator, to his Vorlage, or to later "revisors, copyists, and zealous readers of the Greek text." The majority of cases in which Syh can be a witness to variants of this type sees it in agreement with 88. The exceptions to this are: νεανιας των αλλογενων, 88-967; νεανιας Syh (I.10), α ανακαλυπτων, Syh-967; ανακαλυπτων, 88 (II.29), ουν το ευπνιον, 967-Syh; τον ευπνιον, 88 (II.6), και απο, 967; απο, Syh; omitted by homoioteleuton, 88 (II.41).

In six passages where there is less in the LXX than in the MT and so are asterisked in 88-Syh, 967 does not witness the additions. An example of this is seen in I.2: εις Βαβυλωνα χεις την Σενααρ (και) εις οικον του Θεου αυτου και τα σκευηυς 88; εις Βαβυλωνα χεις οικον του Θεου αυτου και τα σκευηυς, Syh; εις την Βαβυλωνιαν, 967. Other passages with asterisk are to be found at II.5, 15, 40, 40, 41. In four of these places 88 and Syh concur, but in II.40 there is a difference: και χ νεανιας, 88; χ και ως σενααρ, Syh; και, 967.
The greater number of omissions, according to Bludau, are those of an inconsequential nature. The LXX translator (as witnessed by 88-Syh) leaves out particles which are unimportant for the sense of the sentences in Greek. For example, γράφει is left out in II.9 by 88, but inserted from the Syh (&oacute;υ); in addition καὶ is left out in II.37. The Greek translator also simplifies a rather circuitous Semitic idiom; as ἠδρωπίας μετὰ ἑαυτοῦ by εἰς βασιλείαν ἰσωτὰς ἡ τῆς ὅποιας 88-Syh. He also tends to simplify lists of names, etc., but this is seen in chapter III more than in the chapters under discussion here. Bludau tacitly assumes that the Greek translator considered the book as holy writ. This would tend to cause caution as to omissions on the part of a pious translator. Thus Bludau thinks that the vast majority of omissions in the LXX were made for syntactic clarity and that the rest were due to possible accidents and oversights in translation.

Another type of variation shown by 967 over against 88-Syh is seen in presence of transpositions in the text, four of which are large displacements (II.17,19,37,41). In all four of these "grössere Umstellung" 88-Syh align against 967. An example is II.41: μέρος μεν τι οστρακον κεραμικον μέρος δε τι σιδηρον, 88-Syh (=MT); μέρος μεν τι σιδηρον μέρος δε τι οστρακον κεραμικον, 967. In all instances of these large transpositions 88-Syh matches the order of the MT, leading Hamm to
posit that 88-Syh have been corrected following the MT or Theodotion, and that 967 is original in its word order. There are twenty-four smaller transpositions in chapters I and II in the investigation of which Hamm prefers the reading of 967 thirteen times.

Hamm has carefully set out the relationship of 967 to 88 and to the MT generally for these two chapters. A useful summary is found on pages 44-55 and to repeat here would only be time-consuming.

In general the variant readings of 967 do little to change the meaning of 88-Syh. The general style of these two chapters, although varying in detail, is still as was set out in 1897 by Bludau. His judgment was that in chapters I-III and VII-XII the translator worked to render a Semitic original into flowing Greek. This means that he had to change the syntax of many passages. He added explanatory glosses at some points thereby expanding the text while he simplified the text at other points. In all the translation of chapters I and II could be called a remarkable achievement (eine staunenswerthe Leistung). 20

Chapter III

Only fragments of 967 have been published for chapter III. For this reason 88 and Syh are the major textual authorities. Ziegler has made use of the 967 fragments in his
publication of the variants. 21 967 does not include III.98-100 which has been given an asterisk in 88-Syh. In III.93 (26) 967 has been corrected following the MT in three places: καὶ τῶν =MT and Theodotion; συμφωνεῖ τοῦ Theodotion; μετέχων =MT and Theodotion. In III.93 (26) a final clause (οὕτως οὖν καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς εἰκ μεσοῦ τοῦ πυρὸς) is eliminated due to homoioteleuton. 22 In verse 96 (29) 967 omits οὕτως due to haplography. 23 According to Ziegler 967 offers a better text than 88-Syh in III.94 (27) where the former reads ἀχριπατριώτατοι and the latter read καὶ ἀχριπατριώτατοι. In the same verse it is also better to read ὁσκηνοῦσας as in 967 than ὁσκῆ τοῦνοῦτος in 88. 24 It must be added that these variants in 967 are really not very significant. Finally it is difficult to decide whether 967 or 88 is to be considered original in verse 97 (30). 967 reads χωράς αὐτῶν and 88 is a simple χωρας. 25

As has been said, verses 98-100 are missing from 967. In 88-Syh they are added with an asterisk, evidently from Theodotion. The fact that the content of these verses is added at the end of chapter IV (verses 34b,c) leads one to believe that 967 was original in omitting them. These verses obviously belong with the following tale and will be discussed there.

The text of chapter III matches quite well in 88-Syh and in the fragments of 967. Within the freedom which is
characteristic of the LXX of Daniel as a whole the translation is (at most points) tolerably close to the MT. Other than the dislocation of verses 98-100 to the end of chapter IV the major deviation from the MT comes in the insertion of sixty-seven verses found between verses 23 and 24 of the MT. These insertions are called: a) The Prayer of Azariah (verses 24-45), b) further narrative material describing the heating of the furnace (verses 46-50), c) The Song of the Three Children (verses 51-90). These verses may be found in the Protestant Apocrypha. The Apocryphal additions to Daniel form no part of this discussion and so will not be further dealt with.

The major textual differences between the LXX and the MT grow out of these Apocryphal additions. Verses 22-24 are quite different in the two versions.

LXX: επειδή το προσταγμὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ηπείγε καὶ η καμινὸς εξεκαυθή ὑπὲρ το προτερὸν επτὰ πλασίως, καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς οἱ προσεχίζοντες συμποδιούντες αὐτούς καὶ προσαγαγόντες τὴν καμινῆς ενεβαλόσαν εἰς αὐτήν.

MT: καὶ κύβλε ἐνευρήματα ἀλλὰ μικρὰ μικρὰ μεταφέρει ἐκάθεν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἔφεσθαι τῷ ἀλεξάνδρῳ Σέλενου τῷ ἀλέξανδρῳ ἅγιῳ τῇ δόξῃ τῆς καμινοῦ εὐεργεσίᾳ καὶ ἀπεκτείνειν αὐτοῖς δὲ συντικηθῆσαν.

V.22

V.23
In verse 22 the LXX follows the MT up to the point at which the guards are killed. In the LXX they are not killed at this point. This narration is put aside to a more pregnant point in verse 48: καὶ εγένετο ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τοῦ βασιλεᾶ οὐνοματῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἔστως ἔθεσεν αὐτοὺς ἁμαρτᾶς, τὸτε ἐβουλοθοῦσον ὁ βασιλεὺς ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἀνέστη σπεύδας...

The phrase which ends verse 22 in the LXX (ἐνεβαλοσανεῖς αὐτῶν) is more or less found in MT23: ἥμαρτων ἡμῖν ἁμαρτίαν. Verse 91 (24) is obviously affected by the additions of the LXX in the following way. The mention of σφήνας in the LXX is an obvious reference to the addition in verses 51-90. Ἐθέσει αὐτοὺς ἁμαρτᾶς, while not depending directly on the foregoing additions in verse 51-90, is an addition for effect and is not found in the MT.

Other dissimilarities between the two versions of the text can be seen in the following chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX has more than MT</th>
<th>LXX has less than MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 1</strong> Ἐτοὺς ... Αἰδίοπας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 2</strong> βασιλεὺς καὶ κυρίων τῆς οἰκουμενίας ὅλης, τα ἐθνὰ καὶ φυλὰς καὶ γλωσσὰς, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην</td>
<td><strong>V. 3</strong> (The verse is much condensed in LXX.) It simply reads: καὶ εστησαν οἱ προσγραμμενοι κατέναν της εἰκόνος. In the hexapla the whole is filled out with massive additions most probably from Th.: ἄρτε συνηθησαν υπατοι στρατηγοὶ τοπαρχαι ἑρωμενοι τοργανοι μεγαλοι οἱ επεξουσιαν καὶ πάντας οἱ ἀρχοντες των χωρων (το ελθειν 88) εἰς τὸν έφαινον της εἰκόνος της εστησε Ναβουχοδονοσορ · καὶ εστησαν οἱ προσγραμμενοι κατεναντι της εἰκόνος ἃ * εστησαν Ναβουχοδονοσορ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 3</strong> οἱ προσγραμμενοι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 4</strong> τὸις ὀχλοις, παραγγελλεται, (καὶ) χωραί</td>
<td><strong>V. 4</strong> τοις ὀχλοις, παραγγελλεται, (καὶ) χωραί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 9</strong> κυρίε (before βασιλεύ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 14</strong> σου καὶ συνίδων</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 16</strong> adds βασιλεύ (after Ναβουχοδονοσορ)</td>
<td><strong>V. 7</strong> The list of musical instruments is missing συριγγος τε (missing Syh) καὶ κιδαρας σαμποτης τε καὶ ψαλτηριον 88-Syh. The addition matches Th. After king's name 88-Syh add ἃ. ο βασιλευ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 17</strong> adds εἰς κυρίος ημῶν (after εὐθανασίοις). It is marked with an obelisk from ἐν ἡμῶν in 88-Syh.</td>
<td><strong>V. 9</strong> 88-Syh add ἃ. Ναβουχοδονοσορ τω βασιλεῖ to match MT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vv. 22-91(24) --See above--</td>
<td><strong>V. 10</strong> The list of musical instruments is missing as in v. 7. The same addition is made with an asterisk in 88-Syh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 93</strong>(26) At the end 88-Syh add αυτως σων εξηλον οἱ ἀνδρες ἐκ μεσου του πυρος. 967 omits this phrase by homoioteleuton (see above).</td>
<td><strong>V. 15</strong> The list of musical instruments is missing as in vv. 7,10, see there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. 95</strong>(28) 88-Syh add (after Εὐλογητος;) κυρίος, εν εμπυρισιον marked with an obelisk in 88-Syh.</td>
<td><strong>V. 16</strong> The LXX leaves out the pronominal object on της καιομενής =MT and Th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>V. 17</strong> 88-Syh (as well as Tertullian) add ἃ. τῆς καϊομενής =MT and Th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX has more than MT</td>
<td>LXX has less than MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 96(29) κωριον</td>
<td>V. 19 88 ἕκτης ἀριθμοῦ Μισσαχ καὶ Ἀβέναγ (after ἡλλονθῇ). Syh adds without asterisk. When the addition is made the text MT and Th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 97(28) 88 omits o Θεοῦ.</td>
<td>Vv. 22-91(24)—See above—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vv. 98-100—See above—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there are some readings in the LXX which have most probably mistaken the Aramaic original for something else. First of all there is verse 1: ἐν πεδίῳ τοῦ περιβόλου; MT: Αἰβιτ Νυξαρ (Theodotion: εν πεδίῳ Δειτρια). The LXX translator has mistaken Νιλ, the proper name, for a common noun deriving from Νιλ a dwelling place.” In Akkadian duru is a "wall, castle." The substantival use of περιβόλος by the LXX most probably means "enclosed area, wall," and this makes little sense—"The plain of the enclosure." 27

In verse 17 the LXX translator has taken "if" (Hebrew וְ), as ו or וְה "behold, for" although the particle ו can mean "if" in Hebrew as well. The translator renders with וְפ "for." He is not alone in this kind of rendering (which probably had its basis in an offended orthodoxy) since Theodotion also translates with ופ and the Vulgate with ecce enim. More will be said on this verse in chapter V
of the current study.

Verse 18 follows verse 17 by paraphrasing יְרֵא into *(kai) ῥοθε. This translation is followed by the Peshitta and the Vulgate. Again here one is most probably dealing with a translation based in offended orthodoxy. In verse 96 (29) the LXX translates יְרֵא לֶחָנְבִּים, "his house will be made into a dunghill" by the paraphrase καὶ ὁ ἱερὸς αὐτοῦ δὲμασθήσεται, "and his house will be confiscated as public property."

Bludau thinks that the last three examples should be grouped together as passages changed by the translator because in their original form they were objectionable to his religious and moral sensibilities. Another alternative is that the LXX translator did not know the Aramaic word יְרֵא (which may be an Akkadian loan word). The word יְרֵא is found in the Targums as a verb. It is also found at II.5 where it is paraphrased by the LXX in a different manner. In Ezra 6.11 the word is also paraphrased. It is, of course, impossible to know if the LXX translator knew the word יְרֵא or not and in any case Bludau's suggestion is probably correct.

Chapter IV

With this chapter begin three of the most midrashic chapters in the whole of the LXX. According to Bludau chapter IV (and this might be said of chapters V and VI as well) is more of a paraphrase or an epitome than a real transla-


Since the Old Greek follows only the general story of the MT in these chapters any detailed comparison of the two texts is difficult. Nevertheless it is important that such a detailed comparison be at least attempted. In chapter IV 967 is available for verses 1,2,7,9,11-14a,16-19, 22b-25a,28b-29a,30a-30c,34b-34c (with lacunae).

The original LXX text, according to the witness of both the hexapla and the pre-hexaplaric papyrus 967, did not include the verses which in the translation of Theodotion are given the numbers III.98-100. It is important to realize, however, that the content of these verses is displaced and included in IV.34b,c. It is unknown whether the text of 34c especially originally stood at the head of chapter IV where by meaning it belongs. Certainly the material makes better sense there. It is therefore understandable that Hahn places verses 34b,c at the head of the chapter. Montgomery (on page 248) says that the future tense ὄροδες shows the correct original placement of the section. On page 144 of his book Bludau allows the possibility that someone in the copying of the manuscript may have omitted inadvertently the words in MT III.31-33 and put them at the end of chapter IV. If this transposition did take place, even working with the information accessible to Bludau, it must have happened before circa 617 because the Syh witnesses the dislocation as well. With the discovery of 967 the date of this disloca-
tion would be pushed back even further to the mid-third century or earlier. It is quite likely that the original LXX text contained this dislocation of material. Other materials are dislocated in the LXX (although the present instance is one of the largest). Charles assumes that the LXX is original at this point for reasons that are shaky at best.\footnote{In any case, the style of verses 34b,c is that of midrash such as one finds, for example, in the Lamentations Targum and in this style it is much closer to the translation methods of chapters IV-VI than it is to the style of chapter III. A more detailed account of these verses will be given later.}

A comparison between the three Greek witnesses to the LXX text is reflected in the following chart, given in the form of a critical apparatus to the text of the LXX chapter IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Critical Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>a. ἐνυψιον 967 per errorem pro ἐνυσπιον 88-Syth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. ἡμαληθην 967, cum ε 88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>a. 967 add. post ἐπεξεσεν, ἐπι της κοιτης μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. ἐκαθεσων om. 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. δενδρον ωφηλον 88; add. ἐπι inter δενδρον- ωφηλον 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. η ὀρασις 88; και η ὀρασις 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>a. ὦ 967 per errorem pro ως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. praet a πετεινα add. ἐν αυτω 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(967 has lacuna 9b-11a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Critical Apparatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>(967 has lacuna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>(967 has lacuna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>a. ἀπὸ 88; ὠπὸ 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>a. αὐτῷ 88; αὐτῷ 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>a. ἵστασθαι 88-Syhm; ἵστασθαι 967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14.   | a. γινώ 88; γινοῖ 967  
|       | b. ἄν 88; ἄν 967  
|       | c. ποιεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς Syh; ποιεῖν ποιεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς 88  
|       |    ποιεῖν αὐτοῖς 967 |
| 14a.  | a. post ἡμέρα μιᾷ add. τῆς ἡμέρας 967 (ex. seq.)  
|       | b. ἐρρήσῃ 88; ἐρρήσῃ 967  
|       | c. καὶ τοὺς χρήσαν 88-Syh; om. καὶ 967  
|       |    (after παρέσδοθη 967 has lacuna until v. 16) |
| 15.   | (967 has a lacuna)  |
| 16.   | (to λαβοντὸς 967 has lacuna)  
|       | a. to ἐνυπνιον τοῦτο τοῖς μίσουσι 88-Syh; τοῖς μίσουσι  
|       |    σε τὸ ἐνυπνιον τοῦτο 967  
|       | b. καὶ ἡ συμμετοχή αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐξορίσῃ σου ἐπέλθῃ 88-Syh; καὶ  
|       |    τοῖς ἐξορίσῃ σου ἐπέλθῃ ἡ συμμετοχή αὐτοῦ 967 |
| 18.   | a. ἡ 881-967; om. 88  
|       | b. post ὁμόθεμοι add. αἱ 967 (ditto) |
| 19.   | a. ψωψαθῆς 88; ὑπερψωψαθῆ 967  
<p>|       |    (last part of v. missing in 967, lacuna through 22a) |
| 20.   | (967 has lacuna)  |
| 21.   | (967 has lacuna)  |
| 22.   | (only last two words witnessed by 967) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Critical Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 23.   | a. ἵδον 88-Syh; om. 967  
b. prae καὶ μαστίγωσον 88-Syh add. μαστιγείς 967 (Prov. 19.29)  
c. post ἐπαξίουν 88-Syh add. σε 967  
d. πασί 967 per errorem pro παση 88-Syh |
| 24.   | a. ἀμαστίων σου 88-Syh; om. σου 967  
b. γενή 88; γενήσει 967  
c. καταφθείον σε 88; om. σε Syh; καταφθαρῆς 967 |
| 25.   | (967 has lacuna after τοὺς λόγους) |
| 26.   | (967 has lacuna) |
| 27.   | (967 has lacuna) |
| 28.   | (967 has lacuna to καὶ ετερω)  
a. εἶπεν ἑως 88; εἶπεν 967  
b. τοῦ θεοῦ σου 88-Syh; τοῦ θεοῦ σου 967  
c. δωσεί αὐτήν 88-Syh; om. αὐτήν 967  
d. Init. add. ετί τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ στόματι τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτοῦ 967 |
| 29.   | a. ἐπὶ ετή 88-967; om. ἐπὶ Syh  
b. λαλίςσης 88; λαλίςσεις 967  
(967 has lacuna after ἵδον αντὶ running through last of v. 30a) |
| 30.   | (967 has lacuna) |
| 30a.  | (967 has lacuna until ἁγνοίων μου ...) |
| 30c.  | a. ἀπολυόμενος 88-Syh; ἀπολυόμενος 967  
b. λέγων Ναρκόγονος 88-Syh; om. λέγων 967  
(967 has lacuna after δουλεύον lasting through the last of v. 34) |
| 34.   | (967 has lacuna until καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ Χρονου)  
a. βασιλεύν ὁ βασιλεὺς 88; βασιλείας βασιλεύωνSyh; βασιλεύων 967 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Critical Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 34a.  | a. λατεσσων 88-967; λατεσσαι 967*  
           b. φοβου 88-Syh; τρομον 967 (ex. seq.)  
           c. ειληψε με 88-Syh; με ειληψε 967  
           d. αγιους αυτω Syh-967; om. αυτω 88  
           e. αινω 88-967; αιναω Syh  
           f. ποιησαι και ποιησαι σεμεα Syh-967; om. και ποιησαι 967 (homoiooteleuton)  
           (967 has lacuna after εις οομην, lacuna through last of v. 34b) |
| 34b.  | (967 has lacuna until και προσφοραν)  
           a. εν δοξων (1 et 2) 88; εν δοξα 967  
           b. εκαθορε 88-Syh; εκτισεν 967  
           c. μεγαλουσην 88; μεγαλουσην 967  
           d. αποκατεσταθη 88; απεκατεσταθη 967 |
| 34c.  | a. οικουσιν εν αυταις Syh; οικουσιν 88; κατοικουσιν 967  
           b. υποδειξεν 88-Syh-967*; υποδειξεν 967  
           c. στι εις εστιν 967; om. εις 88-Syh  
           (967 has lacuna from και τα Θαι... until the end of chapter) |

In Ziegler's edition of the LXX of Daniel he reads

with 88 fourteen times, with 88-Syh fourteen times, with 88-967 seven times, with Syh-967 one time, and with 967 alone

fifteen times in chapters I-VI. This means that the reading

of 967 is rejected just over fifty-eight per cent of the time

and accepted just under forty-two per cent of the time. 35

It is now possible to compare the LXX text with that

of the MT on a verse by verse basis. This will show just

how far the LXX text deviates from the Semitic original.
Verse 1: Ετοιµ...ἐπίευ are not in the MT. Instead of Σοροσ the LXX reads Θερονος. The meaning is basically the same in both versions although the Greek version has expanded it and put the introduction in the third person. Verse 2: The Greek of this verse is significantly shorter than the Aramaic, corresponding to the first half of the MT, but leaving out the phrase "as I lay in bed the fancies of my head alarmed me." Verses 3-6: These verses are missing altogether from the LXX. In the MT they tell of the decree to the Babylonian wise men (verse 3), the failure of the wise men (verse 4), Daniel's appearance on the scene (verse 5), and Nebuchadnezzar's appeal to Daniel for aid (verse 6). Verse 7 (EV 10): The first half of the verse in the MT is omitted by the original LXX according to the hexapla (they are given an asterisk in 88 but not in Syh) although the words are witnessed by 967 in the paraphrase εκαθευδον. The rest of the Greek represents the Aramaic quite well except for the last phrase of the LXX, και ουκ ην αλλο ομοιον αυτω, which is not in the MT. Verse 9: The order of the MT is reversed in the next two verses. The description of the fruit is given first (MT9) followed by a description of the tree's height (MT8). Instead of a description of the leaves and the branches of the tree as in the MT the LXX gives the length of the branches (approximately 18,131 feet). There is then a misplacement of "and its fruit was abundant and in it food
for all." This phrase is switched with the phrase about the birds of the air nesting in it. The MT's phrase about beasts finding shade under the tree is simply eliminated by the LXX. **Verse 8:** This verse starts by eliminating the MT's phrase "the tree grew and became strong" for an exact repetition of καὶ ἡ οἰκος αὐτῶν μεγαλη from verse 7 (perhaps a gloss). The next phrase of the MT, describing the top of the tree in the heavens, is expanded in a midrashic way with η κοσμη αυτου ἡμίκενωσ τον ουρανον και το κυτος αυτω εως των νεφαλων πληρουν τα υποκατω του ουρανου, ο ἁλιος και σαλπητην αυτω χακουν και ἐσπεφυν πασαν την γην. 36 The last three words πασαν την γην are among the only ones drawn from the MT (καὶ ἔσπεφυν πασαν την γην).  

**Verse 10:** The Greek text now proceeds in more or less the same order as the MT. The LXX paraphrases σημειωσε with αγγελος.  

**Verse 11:** The next three verses are shortened by the Old Greek translator. The first phrase (καὶ ἐγκυζοντον ἐπεν) is roughly comparable to the MT. The shortening comes in the next group of phrases. Whereas the MT has "cut...hew...beasts...birds...," the LXX simply reads: Εκκοψατε αυτω καταφερετε. After shortening the MT the Greek translator adds a phrase of his own: προσταται γαρ υπο του θρυσσου εκεισις και αχρασω τον αυτο.  

**Verse 12:** This verse is both curtailed and expanded. Nonetheless the basic meaning of the first part of the verse is the same in both versions: ῥα παν μοι ανιστατεντιν την. The whole mid-section of the verse is omitted in the LXX.
The translator goes to the end of the verse and picks up the phrase concerning the heavens which he previously omitted. With this is integrated the first phrase of MT12 ("and let seven times pass over him") is interpreted by the Alexandrian translator in that the word מֵתוּמָא is replaced by the pronoun implicit in γνώμ. This paraphrase matches more closely the repetition of this phrase in the MT at IV.22,29; V.21. 

Verse 14a: This verse is not in the MT at all. It describes Nebuchadnezzar's dream in fuller detail. The threats are made earlier here in that they are repetitions of those made in verses 11 and 12 except for the last one which finds no parallel in the LXX at all. It is dropped from the MT at verse 12 and introduced in the Greek for the first time here. 

Verse 15: The same general meaning is found in both versions of the text. The Greek, however, removes the consternation of the king as well as his
seeking Daniel's aid. In the LXX the narrative is very calm and the direct address of the MT is completely removed: "I summoned Daniel...I recounted fully the dream to him...he suggested...the meaning" (LXX). Also missing here is the recounting of the failure of the other wisemen. This is not surprising because according to the LXX version of the story no other wiseman attempted anything. Verse 4 of the MT which narrates the wisemen's failure is eliminated by the LXX. **Verse 16**: The verse magnifies Daniel's consternation. Eliminated here is Nebuchadnezzar's address to Daniel ("The king said, O Belteshazzar, let not the dream or the interpretation alarm you"). Added is a description of the way in which Daniel answered the king (אַסְפָּהּ נַעֲשֶׂהוּ). The narration continues to be from Nebuchadnezzar's point of view. **Verse 17**: This verse and the next two take the details of the dream one-by-one whereas the MT puts the whole of the vision in verses 17-18 and the interpretation of the whole in verse 19. Verse 17 actually takes its opening phrase from the MT of verse 17 and its second phrase from the first phrase of MT19 (אִם לֹא ... דָּרַעְתָּו ... אֵעֲבַרְתָּו). The first detail is given immediately; tree=king. **Verse 18**: This carries on with interpretation. The birds of the air from MT18 are selected from the details given in the MT to represent the people who serve the king. **Verse 19**: The Greek translator here goes back and removes אֵעֲבַרְתָּו from...
MT17 and interprets it as the arrogance and pride of Nebuchadnezzar as seen especially reflected in his destruction and profanation of the Jerusalem temple. Detail three is, growth of the tree=the king's arrogant sin. In this interpretation of the tree's growth the LXX follows MT19.

Verse 20: Bits from MT20-21 are contained here. The first section of the Old Greek is at least comparable to MT 20a: "וַיְהִי נַעֲרֵי נֹעֲרֵי עִיר הַיּוֹם סֵפָר וּנְשָׁר עֲלֵיהֶם וְיָבֵנָן נַעֲרֵי עִיר."
The person is changed from third to second, however. The middle section of MT20 is omitted in the LXX and the next phrase (מַעֲשָׂה מִיַּדְיָם יָפְתַח הַמַּרְאָה לָעֲלָיָם קָדָם דִּי מִשְׁתֵּר עֲלֵיהֶם מַגִּילה) is equivalent to מַעֲשָׂה מִיַּדְיָם יָפְתַח הַמַּרְאָה לָעֲלָיָם from MT21. Verses 21-22: These verses expand the theme of the imminent and severe judgment of Nebuchadnezzar. It is very difficult to see in what way the idea here comes from the MT. It is most likely a midrashic expansion composed by the LXX translator himself because he considered the judgment theme (especially on pagans) to be an important theme; one deserving of more space than given it by the MT. Some point of contact with the MT may be seen here perhaps in the common theme of "driving" (MT22).

Verse 23: It is hard to believe that the LXX text is not confused here. The first part of the verse gives the comforting statement that the king's throne will be restored when he acknowledges God. This is at least parallel with MT23. The second half of the verse, however, goes back to a prediction
of doom: έως επι τεστούμεναι και ματιούσσουσι σε και έπαθον τα κεκρυμένα επι σε. This is, following Bludau, most probably a second translation or an explanation of verse 22. The third section of the verse (κυρίος γὰρ εν οὐρανῷ καὶ η ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ επὶ πάσῃ τῇ γῇ) is an idea which comes from the last phrase of MT22,23. In MT22 is an almost literal repetition of verse 14. The LXX translator tends to avoid literal repetitions and thus his rendering is different than that of the MT and LXX14. It is just possible that the first part of the current verse should be moved to the beginning of the next where it better fits the context.

Verse 24: The LXX and the MT are comparable in meaning here. Daniel's caution to heed the advice, the first part of MT24, is the last part of LXX24. Verse 25: Here the LXX replaces the MT's statement "all this came upon king Nebuchadnezzar" with the statement that the king kept the words in his heart. Verse 26: This verse carries the meaning of the MT although μετὰ παντοτότητα αὐτοῦ is most likely an expansion on the word "royal." Verse 27: Here, too, the LXX follows the thought of the MT rather closely.

Verse 28: This verse is tripled in size by means of midrash. The unit which this verse initiates runs through verse 30. In the unit judgment is once again spun out before Nebuchadnezzar's eyes before it happens to him. This
device has already been used once in both LXX and the MT in verses 20-23. According to the Old Greek a voice from heaven explains all: a) Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom is taken from him, b) a man rejected in the king's house will be set over Babylon, and c) this man is to be given Nebuchadnezzar's inheritance of power and glory. The reason is then given in a most literal rendering of "until you know that the God of heaven (Most High) rules in the kingdom of men..." (MT14, 22). At the end of the verse everything is yet again summarized: 

Verse 29: Elements are taken from the MT of the current verse and presented in a different order. In the MT the order is as follows: a) he will be driven from the kingdom of men, b) his dwelling will be with the beasts, c) he shall eat grass like an ox, d) seven times shall pass over him, e) until he knows that the Most High rules. In the LXX the order is a) angels will pursue him for about seven years (based on MT section d and LXX21,22,23), b) he will not speak to any man (perhaps based on his dwelling with the beasts, MT section b and also being driven from among men, MT section a, c) he will eat grass like an ox (MT section c). This latter part is expanded by a further phrase: καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γλώσσας τῆς γῆς ἐσταί η νομὴ σου (cf. LXX12). d) Another will have the king's house and kingdom (cf. LXX
28). **Verse 30:** In the MT the prophecy of doom finally falls on Nebuchadnezzar's head. Here, however, the blow is postponed yet again. The content of the LXX in this verse is taken from MT25: Καὶ ἐπὶ Ναβ. Οὐκ ἔσται ἐπὶ σέ Ναβ. It is expanded from the simple statement in the MT. The reference of the verb is changed from narrative past (ἂν) to future (τελεσθείη).  

**Verses 30a, 30b:** The blow falls. In the first person Nebuchadnezzar narrates his fate. These verses can be said to find only their bare bones in MT30. Many of the details are repeated from earlier parts of the story. The structure of the two versions of the text is as follows: MT: a) immediately the word was fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar (this is said in a slightly different way in LXX30), b) he was driven from among men, c) he ate grass like an ox, d) his body was wet with the dew of heaven, e) his hair grew long as eagle's feathers, f) his nails grew long like bird's claws. In the LXX the structure is as follows: (30a) a) he was bound for seven years (not from MT30, but has been given often in the story, e.g. MT/LXX29), b) he was fed grass like an ox (MT section c). This expanded is by another clause: ἐκ τῆς γῆς τοῦτο τὸ ἄρτος τῶν οὐρανῶν. c) There follows a section in the LXX which is probably taken, at least in germ, from MT31. It describes how after seven years Nebuchadnezzar gave himself to prayer concerning his sins. (30b): There follows section
d) wherein the king's hair became long like eagle's feathers (MT section e). In the beginning of verse 30b Nebuchadnezzar further describes his illness although he has just previously stated that after seven years he repented. This may show that 30b is an addition by a later hand. It is similar to LXX23 in that it consists of a second interpretation of the madness. e) His nails became long like lion's claws (cf. MT section f). It is clear that although the basic thought has been picked up from the MT the LXX translator changed "eagle's claws" (טָנַיךְ כִּכְרֵי) to "lion's claws" ( öl ν ὅ χί χι λα ς = perhaps צוֹכֵרֵי כִּכְרֵי). f) His flesh was changed (cf. MT section d, א/icon). The translator picked up on the word "body" here. g) His heart was changed (not in MT30, but see MT31), h) he walked naked with the beasts of the field. This last is not to be found in MT30 either, but is most likely an expansion of "let his lot be with the beasts of the field" (MT12,22,29). i) There follows an expansion which treats Nebuchadnezzar's madness almost as if he were delerious with fever (εἰναι ντιον ηδον, καὶ υπνοιαὶ με εἰληψει καὶ διὰ χρόνον υπνὸς με ελάβει πολὺν καὶ νοσήσας μοι) .

**Verse 30c:** Here, as at the end of LXX30a, seven years have gone by. One gets the feeling that when the phrase "after seven years had elapsed" is given in 30a someone--either the original translator or a later scribe--felt that the madness had not been sufficiently described and so in-
serted 30b. The present verse is a midrashic expansion of the simple statement יְהוָה אלֹהֵינוּ יְדֵו יְשׁוֹעֵנוּ. From the phrase "I lifted my eyes to heaven" the LXX has a) Nebuchadnezzar convicted of sin, b) requesting pardon, c) being instructed by an angel to "serve the holy God of heaven and give glory to the Most High." After all this Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom is returned to him.

Verse 33: For the moment Nebuchadnezzar's hymn in MT31b-32 is omitted by the LXX. The words here are equivalent to the first half of MT33. Verse 34: This hymn of praise bears very little resemblance to that given in MT31b-32. It is rather an assembly of bits from various places in the first six chapters of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar begins by praising the creator of heaven, earth, sea, rivers, and that which is in them. There then follows, "I confess and praise (him) for he is God of Gods and lord of lords, and king of kings." This phrase closely parallels that given by Nebuchadnezzar in II.47 (MT), "truly your god is God of God and lord of kingdoms." The next phrase in the LXX is "he works signs and wonders" which corresponds exactly to VI.28 (MT). Next comes the statement "he changes times and seasons, removing the kingdoms from kings and establishing different ones in their place." This is almost word-for-word from II.21 (MT). The Alexandrian translator has thus, in place
of the original composition of MT31b-32, taken excerpts from
two of Nebuchadnezzar's earlier songs of praise and one
phrase from that of Darius in chapter VI.

**Verse 34a:** The praise of Nebuchadnezzar continues.
The verse contains the king's promise to worship, praise, and
offer sacrifices to the God of Heaven. Mention is again made
here of removing kings (LXX34, MT II.21), of doing signs and
wonders and changing things (i.e. times and seasons, LXX34,
MT VI.28; II.21). The king also mentions God's being able
"to destroy and bring to life" which reminds one of the charge
levelled against Nebuchadnezzar in V.17b: "whom he would he
slew, and whom he would he preserved alive." The king not
only promises piety for himself here, but for his entire
kingdom as king Darius does at the end of chapter VI in the
MT (VI.27). The verse ends with the threat of death to any
who calumnates the God of heaven--even to the point of speak-
ing of him at all. Thus in this verse there is a liturgical
creation which unites elements from chapters II, III, V, and
VI. This may be a clue to the origin of this piece in that
it could have been written as a hymn tying up the whole of
Daniel I-VI into a cogent entity.

**Verse 34b:** In this verse and the one following Nebu-
chadnezzar gives two parallel proclamations. This first is
given in the form of an encyclical letter (ἐπιστολὴν ἐνκυκλιόν) to
everyone in his kingdom, adjuring them to praise God and
honor him with sacrifices. The reason for this is seen to
be God's mighty acts with Nebuchadnezzar: ετ' αυτη την ημερα
εκαθησε με επι του Θεουν μου, και της εξουσιας μου και της βασιλειας μου
εν τη λαφ μου εκρατεσα, και η μεγαλουχη μου απεκατεσταθη μοι. If
there is any point of contact with the MT here it is most
probably with the ideas in III.31-33 (MT, Theodotion III.98-100).

Verse 34c: At the end of chapter IV comes the dis-
placed preface to the story contained in the verses inserted
in the hexapla as III.98-100. The first sentence of the LXX
is fairly close to III.31 (MT). The major change is that
instead of the stock Aramaic phrase "peoples, nations, and tongues," the LXX reads tois ethnei kai...Tais
μναζης και tois katoikous en avois, "nations and regions, and
the inhabitants in them." It is easy to see how the last
phrase came about; katoikew = ἱπερ. The second phrase of
34c takes up the content of III.32 (MT) but expands it. The
actual content of III.32 (MT) is contracted here to ὁποδειξη
μην τας πραξεις, as endoxos metpemou otheos o megos. It is then ex-
panded by the addition of the clause, "he purposed for me
to demonstrate to you and your wisemen that God is one and
his marvels are great, his kingdom is an eternal kingdom,
his authority is from generation to generation." This ad-
dition partakes of elements which are new creations with the
LXX translator and those which are found in III.33 (MT).
independent creation of the LXX translator (in this context) runs through the phrase "...God is one..." Parallels from the Hebrew Old Testament are obvious. From the phrase "...his marvels are great..." one sees a fairly good rendering of III.33 (MT). Montgomery feels that the final phrase of verse 34c concerning the king's sending of the letters into the kingdom belongs to verse 34b. This is not at all certain due to the lack of knowledge concerning the time of the dislocation of this verse. As the verse stands the phrase forms a good conclusion to it and thus to the whole chapter.

Chapter V

In many ways this chapter is the most strangely transmitted in the LXX of Daniel. In all three witnesses the chapter is reduced in size because of the total lack of verses 14-15, 18-22, and 24-25. With Geissen's publication of the Cologne part of 967 a third witness is available for all the sections possessed by the LXX. Offsetting this abbreviated form of the chapter proper there is a preface of some eighty-seven words. The preface gives a summary of the story in a form somewhat closer to that of the MT.

Ziegler was dependent upon Kenyon's part of 967 for his apparatus and so it must be remembered that only twelve verses were fully available to him along with fragments of four other verses and part of the preface. Ziegler, in fact,
says little about chapter V specifically so that one must turn to Geissen for aid concerning 967. The following may be noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Critical Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pref. | a. καὶ ἀπομεγισάνων αὐτοῦ 967-Syh; om. 88 (homoiotel).  
b. τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν ἑδών 88-Syh; om. τῶν ἑδών 967  
c. τοπω 88-Syh; ποτώ 967  
d. εὐαυτῇ τῇ νυκτί 88; εὖ τῇ θεωτῇ νυκτί 967  
e. εἰκόλον 88; εἰκόδοιαν 967  
f. εἰπεραφαί 88; εἰπεραφαί 967  
g. λογοῦς 88; λογοῦ 967  
h. ἑστατὰ 88; ἑσταὶ 967 |
| V. 2  | a. ἐνεγκαί 88-Syh; συνενεγκαί 967  
b. τουσκοποῦ θεοῦ 88; οἰκου τούθ 967  
c. καὶ οἰνοχήσαι 88; οἰνοχήσαι Syh οἰνοχήσειν 967 |
| V. 3  | a. ἐπινον 88; ἐπεινοσαί 967 |
| V. 4  | a. γυλογοῦ 88; γυλογοῦσαν 967 |
| V. 5  | a. εἰκόλον 88; εἰκόλον 967 |
| V. 6  | a. καὶ ὑποδοθαί 88-Syh; om. καὶ ὑποθαί 967  
b. εὐπεσεῖν 88-Syh; εὐπεσέν 967  
c. συνεταίρου 88-Syh; συνεταίροι αὐτοῦ 967 |
| V. 7  | a. καὶ γαρμακοὺς καὶ χαλδαίους 88-Syh; om. γαρμακοὺς καὶ χαλδαίους καὶ... 967  
b. γαρμαχνους 88-Syh; γαρμαχνους 967  
c. γραμμής καὶ εἰσπεραμόντος εἰς θεῷαν ἰδείν... γραμμής 88-Syh γραμμής 967 (homoiotel.)  
d. πᾶς ἀνήρ ος αν 88-Syh; πᾶς ος εαν 967 |
| V. 8  | a. οἱ οπανδοὶ 88-Syh; om. οἱ 967  
b. γαρμαχνοι 88-Syh; γαρμαχνοι 967  
c. οὐκ ηδονατο 88-Syh; οὐκ ἦ ηδοναντο 967  
d. ἀπαγελαί 88; ἀπαγελαί 967 |
| V. 9  | a. τουτου 88 (dittog.); του 967  
b. οἱ δοναται 88-Syh; οὐκ ηδοναντο 967 |
<p>| V. 10 | a. ΔανιΗ 88; ΔανιΗ 967 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Critical Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V. 11 | a. οὐκ ἀπένειμος 88-Syh; add. ἐκεῖνος 967  
b. ὑπερεξήν πάντας τοὺς σώφρους 88-Syh; ὑπερ σώφρους 967 |
| V. 12 | a. σοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως 88-Syh; om. τοῦ 967 |
| V. 13 | a. εἰσεύθη 88-Syh; εἰσεγέρθη 967 |
| V. 14 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 15 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 18 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 19 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 20 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 21 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 22 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 23 | a. επινευεῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς 88-Syh; επενευεῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς οὖν 967 |
| V. 24 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 25 | (Not witnessed in 88-Syh-967) |
| V. 26 | a. ἀπολύει η βασιλεία σου 88-Syh; η βασιλεία σου ἀπολύει 967 |
| V. 29 | a. τοῖς Βαλτασάρ ο βασιλεὺς 88-Syh; add. Βαλτασάρ 967  
b. καὶ ἐξωμικαλήσαρ 88-Syh; add. καὶ ἐξωκεν 967 |
| V. 30 | a. καὶ τοὺς βασιλείους 88-Syh; add. αὐτού 967  
b. ἔξηρεν ταῖς 88-Syh; ἔξηρεν 967 |
| V. 31 | a. Ἀραμαῖος 88-Syh; ἔξεσθης 967  
b. τῶν Μησουρῶν 88-Syhtx; ο βασιλεὺς τῶν Περσῶν Syhmg;  
ο τῶν μησουρῶν βασιλεὺς 967 |
In the verses and fragments of verses available to Ziegler for use in his apparatus (some nineteen variant readings are witnessed in it), 967 is read in just over forty-two per cent of cases and 88 or 88-Syh is read in just under fifty-eight per cent. These are the same approximate percentages as were found for chapter IV. Geissen reads with 967 thirty per cent of the time, with 88-Syh thirty per cent of the time, and makes no choice or considers both readings in error forty per cent of the time. The relationship between the two versions of chapter V can now be discussed in some detail.

Preface: The first sentence of this abstract (through μεγάλην) is related to MT1 as is καὶ ἀπὸ μεγίστανων αὐτοῦ εθέλεσεν ἀνδρὰς διακιλιῶσ. A change is made from MT's one thousand nobles to the two thousand found in the LXX. The interrupting phrase in the first sentence, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εἰκασίασιν τῶν βασιλεῶν αὐτοῦ, has no parallel in either the MT nor the verses of chapter V in the LXX. It is an attempt to provide a date for the story. The second part of the preface (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ... αἰνεῖν) is related to MT2,4 and LXX4. The phrase ἔνωσασθαι ἀνομογένεσι ἀπὸ τοῦ οίνου = MT ΧΩΝ ὕσσωμαι.. ἐκκλησία. The praising of the gods of cast metal and wood goes more closely with MT4, "gods of gold and silver, brass, iron, wood, and stone," than it does with LXX4 which eliminates the list with Τὰ εἰδωλὰ Τὰ
This second phrase is related to LXX4 in that it adds καὶ τῶν θεῶν τῶν αἰώνων ἀγιῶν. This is equivalent to the phrase καὶ τῶν θεῶν τῶν αἰώνων τοίς οὐλοχησάν (LXX4). This phrase is left out in MT4, but inserted in verse 23.

The story as told in the preface then moves directly to the writing hand (MT5). This part starts with the phrase "in that very night" which is similar to ἐπὶ τῆς ὀδού (MT30). Other than this small difference the content here is very much like MT5. A difference here is that the message written by the hand is immediately given: MENE, PHARAS, TEKEL (in that order). Nowhere in the body of chapter V are the actual words of the inscription given. Two interesting facts emerge:

a) the fact that there are only three words here (in agreement with both Theodotion and the Vulgate) as opposed to ἀνάθεμα τῆς ἀρχής in the MT (but in agreement with MT's interpretation in verses 26-28).

b) The order of the words found here is unique.43 One point may be noted here. It has been customary to associate the three words with three Babylonian weights: a mina, a shekel (either 1/60 or 1/100 of a mina), and a paras (either a half mina or a half shekel).44 An objection to this theory was entered by Georg Behrmann in 1894. If these words were names of weights, argues Behrmann, they would be given in either ascending or descending order, but surely not with the smallest in the middle.45 This objection is not necessarily valid on other
grounds and later discovery has somewhat changed the original weight-theory, but it is just possible that the writer of the preface to chapter V felt this same problem and so rearranged his text to put the items in descending order.

The next phrase in the preface (-east έξ ορμηθεν... εσταται) is related to MT26-28. The style is condensed so as to give one word equivalents to the mysterious words (e.g. μανη προιμηται). The order of the interpretation is the same as the original giving of the words. It is possible that the preface was affixed to chapter V just because the chapter proper gave no indication of the mysterious words themselves. 46

Verse 1: This verse is shortened as over against the MT. The elements in MT1 that are missing here are:
a) the thousand nobles (this information is supplied by the preface), b) the fact that Belshazzar drank wine (cf. LXX2, preface). The word מגד is translated by εστιστορίαν which means "a banqueting hall." In the LXX Belshazzar does not initially "hold a feast" (MT), but "constructs a banquet hall."

Verse 2: This is a fairly good rendering of MT2. The difficult phrase מועש משלות is expanded so as to make it clearer; και επινεών, και αναπληρής η καρκίνα στουο... The list of banquet guests ליברברונים is reduced to ליברברונים = ליברברון. This means that the women mentioned in
the MT are left out of consideration. The reason for this is probably because the thought of women taking part in the drinking bout was culturally and theologically repugnant to the LXX translator.\textsuperscript{47} One could suppose, however, that \textit{τῶις εὐπροσ} could technically include these women. \textbf{Verse 3}: The verse is cut to the bare bones. It follows a usual habit of the LXX translator and eliminates repetitions, especially repetitions of lists. The Aramaic text is reduced to three words: \textit{תית} \textit{נעהי ננהי}. It has been pointed out\textsuperscript{48} that the women are left out again, but equally the king and the nobles are all summed up in \textit{ἐπινοεῖν} (\textit{ἐπινοοῦν}). Notice the fairly literal translation of \textit{α} with \textit{ἐν} here instead of \textit{ἀπό} or \textit{ἐκ} as might be expected.\textsuperscript{49} 

\textbf{Verse 4}: Again, this verse is reduced in size by the elimination of the repetitious \textit{Ἀγὼ ἄρσωκ} from MT4. Also the list of the kinds of gods is eliminated here. What is substituted is \textit{τὰ εἰσώλα τὰ χειροποιητά}. As has already been pointed out above, the LXX adds here a phrase which does not appear in the MT of verse 4 but does occur in verse 23. There is not reason to assume that the LXX preserves the original text at this point. \textbf{Verse 5}: This verse translates the MT quite well. The phrase \textit{Ἀγὼ ἄρσωκ} is rendered simply as \textit{χειρος}. In the second to the last phrase the LXX shows a different order. Whereas the MT reads, "...upon the plaster of the wall of the palace of the king, opposite the lamp-
stand," the LXX has "...upon the wall of his house, upon the plaster opposite the light." The LXX also adds εναντίον τού βασιλέως Βαλτέαρ after the phrase on the writing hand. **Verse 6:**

The Old Greek translator starts his rendering in relative agreement with the MT. This agreement runs for the first complete sentence of the Greek (καὶ η ὁράσις...κατεστελμόν). The next sentence finds no parallel in the MT at all with the exception of the phrase καὶ οἱ συνεταῖροι κυκλάματος εκοιμήθησαν which may be a rendering of ἐνώπιον τῆς κυρίας (MT9). As Bludau remarks, this latter phrase certainly does not fit well in its present context.**

**Verse 7:** The verse begins with a phrase equivalent to the MT. In the list of wisemen the LXX has four whereas the MT has only three. It is really difficult to say which is the extra man. Although χαλδαῖος always = "WISE" and γασκράνθος always = "KING" there is no consistent equivalency between Greek and Aramaic for the other two terms. The phrase ἀπαγιλαῖος τὸ συγκράτημα τῆς γραφῆς is an addition over the MT as is the following phrase. In the Greek the wisemen now enter whereas this is saved for verse 8 in the Aramaic. The trouble with the MT is that the king makes his decree before the wisemen are in his presence. This problem is solved in the LXX.

This does not mean that the Greek is to be preferred here,** for a new problem is created in the LXX. The Old Greek repeats the narrative about the entrance of the wisemen in
verse 8 following the MT. The decree of the king itself is slightly different in the two versions of the text. In the Aramaic there are two facets to the wisemen's job: a) to read the writing, b) to interpret it. In the Greek only the latter aspect is thought necessary. The failure of the wisemen is pointed out immediately in the LXX whereas the MT saves this for the next verse. The first two rewards of the MT (the purple robe and gold chain) are rendered quite well by the LXX. The third is rendered, "and he will be given authority over a third portion of the kingdom." In translating so the LXX translator has, perhaps unknown to himself, made an exegetical decision. We are never likely to know, however, what difficulty, if any, he had with this passage. 52

Verse 8: There are two major changes between the LXX and the MT in this verse. First, in reversal of his usual policy, the LXX translator gives a list where the MT has a summary (ἐπαράγοντο, Ἐραμακοῦν, Ἡθρηκτοῖοι / ἀνεῖλεν τὴν ἱδρύμα τῆς γραφῆς ἀπεγγέλλατο). Second, as has been previously noted, the task set for the magi in the MT is both to read and to interpret the writing, while in the LXX only the latter is required; thus: ἔποιησεν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τῷ μεγάλῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸ πανίδρομον τὴν ἱδρύμα τῆς γραφῆς ἀπεγγέλλατο. Verse 9: The two versions are divergent here. In the MT Belshazzar's terror is once again described. Since the LXX translator disliked repetitions (as a general rule) and since he had already described the consternation of the king and his
nobles in verse 6, he did not repeat himself at this point. Instead he sets the stage for the queen's appearance by having Belshazzar summon her into the royal presence. The queen arrives of her own accord in the Aramaic text "on account of the words of the king and his nobles." Since in the LXX the queen appears in verse 9 some disagreement between the versions can also be expected in the following verse. **Verse 10:** In the MT the queen enters, pays respect to the king and then tries to calm him. There is none of this in the LXX. The queen recalls the memory of Daniel to Belshazzar's mind. The subject matter for the Greek verse is drawn from MT10a. The phrase σαραμάλωσιας τοῦ βασιλέα is reminiscent of ἐν αἰρετικῷ πάσην in verse 13 (which does not occur in the LXX at that point), and of II.25 (ἐκ τῆς αἰ- 

Malwosias τινος εἰς τῆς ἱερασίας), and of VI.14 (MT, not in the LXX). **Verse 11:** This verse is shortened in the LXX. In addition, the queen here begins to speak directly to the king (καὶ εἰπε 

Τῷ βασιλεῖ) whereas she has already done this in the Aramaic (MT10). She refers to Daniel as "that man" (ο ἀνθρωπὸς ἐκεῖνος). The items in the MT which the Old Greek leaves out are:
a) "there is in your kingdom a man in whom the spirit of the holy gods dwells," b) "in the days of your father the king..." These two items, the first somewhat tempered, are found in the LXX's next verse. c) "And king Nebuchadnezzar, your father, made him chief of the magicians, enchanters,
Chaldeans, and astrologers." The two versions of the text have a point of contact in the phrase... ἐπιστήμονας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ ὑπερεξῆς... הים והبرجות והכוכבים... The last phrase in the clause above is also reminiscent of MT/LXX 1.20.

**Verse 12:** Elements of both MT11,12 are found here in the Greek text. The first two parts of MT11 which were left out of the LXX above are inserted at this point. In the first ἄλλη ἀλήθεια is toned down to ἀλήθεια αὐτοῦ presumably due to the religious sensibilities of the translator. ἀληθείᾳ... 

The last phrase in the clause above is also reminiscent of MT/LXX 1.20.

**Verse 13:** The first two phrases of the MT are rendered as a whole verse (that is, from ἀληθεία αὐτοῦ to ἀληθεία φθοράς). The last part of the Aramaic which begins Belshazzar's speech to Daniel is eliminated by the LXX. The verse ends with an incomplete thought. **Verses 14-15:** In the MT these verses continue Belshazzar's speech to Daniel. They are not found in the Greek. **Verse 16:** This verse prefixes a term of direct address (Ὁ Δανιῆλ) to the MT material. The LXX omits as repetitive of the idea of LXX12. The Greek thus begins with οὐκ ἐνεπέρασεν... The LXX translator then repeats (against his usual practice) the list of rewards to be given to the successful dream interpreter. The fabric
of the story itself would make it difficult to eliminate the repetition at this point. Daniel had no way, short of divine revelation, to know what the rewards were to be since he was not there when the original announcement was made.

Verse 17: As several scholars have pointed out the opening phrase of MT17 has been eliminated by the LXX most probably to harmonize the account with verse 29 where Daniel does indeed accept the rewards. Montgomery feels that verse 17b is "a later supplement, to give more exactly than is given in vv. 25 ff. the interpretation of the words." Indeed in verses 26-28 no actual words are given at all in the LXX--only meanings are given. It was not the task set the interpreters, according to the Greek text, to read the words, only to interpret them. In MT17b Daniel surely tells Belshazzar that he will interpret the mysterious words whereas the LXX reads Αυτῇ ἡ γραφή ἴσαθη λέγεται, κατελογισθη εξηγηται, καὶ εἰσὶ ἡ γραφὴ πεπληρωμένη καὶ αὐτῇ η συνεκρίσεις αἰωνῶν. In the first phrase the meaning of the words (given in the preface as μανή θέρας Θεκαλ) is given, but in more traditional order of μανή Θεκαλ θερας. The history of transmission of this chapter of the LXX is too mysterious to know whether the words themselves ever stood there. With the penchant of the translator of eschewing repetition he might have put them in originally only to have them eliminated by the person who added the preface and who also disliked repetition. Mont-
The phrase is not to be found in the MT and could mean "the hand which was writing stopped." This would seem to indicate that the hand was writing or at least moving up to this point. An alternative translation could be put; "and so (in this manner) the hand which was writing arose (or began)." In this latter case the Greek could be seen to be a rendering of ἔρχεται τὰ χέρια in MT24. In any case the phrase is out of place here because ἀρέτη at the end of the verse refers to the words in the previous phrase. It could also be argued that καὶ ἀρέτη γενίκεισιν ἀρέτη is out of place. While it is surely striking to Belshazzar that Daniel can relate the happenings at the previous party without having been there, this showing of Daniel's skill as a wiseman and occult figure cannot be counted as the interpretation per se. In the MT the phrase is found just before the interpretation in verse 25. In the LXX this verse is quite confusing and most probably is itself quite confused.

Verses 18-22: The story of the rise and fall of Nebuchadnezzar is eliminated as unnecessary repetition of chapter IV by the LXX translator. Verse 23: Contained in this verse is the story of Belshazzar's folly. The Old Greek follows the MT of the verse fairly closely. The LXX of this verse contains almost literal repetitions from LXX1,2,4. One phrase, οἱ μεγιστάντες σου, is reminiscent of the preface.
The first phrase of the MT (וָלַי אֲלֵי שָׁמֹות הָאֵשׁ) is paraphrased by a retelling of the deeds of Belshazzar: βασιλευς συ εστιατοριαν τοις φιλοις σου και επινες οινον. The wives and concubines are left out of the story again here as they were in verses 2 and 3. The repetitions in the LXX are repetitions in the order and style of the Old Greek itself rather than the MT. The last phrase, "(and) he gave you your kingdom and you neither blessed nor praised him," is an expansion on the previous phrase καὶ τιν θεος τις ἔστη σωκ εἰσέλησε καὶ το πνευμα σου ἐν τη χειρι αυτου. Verses 24-25: These verses are not found in the three witnesses to the LXX text.

Verse 26: The LXX varies very little from the MT here. The word λόγος is interpreted in its more literal sense of "word" and translated as γραφή. The interpretation is all that the Alexandrian translator gives; nowhere does he mention the word λόγος itself. Verses 27: The interpretation of λόγος is strange. It is almost as though the LXX translator replaced βελτίων κατακεχυμένων with a second interpretation of verse 26. "It has been decreed that it will have been brought to a full end." Verse 28: Only βασιλευς is rendered in the LXX (ἡ βασιλεια σου τοις Μηδοις και τοις Περσαῖς ήδονα). Verse 29: The verse carries the meaning of the MT quite well. The further definition of Belshazzar as o βασιλευς is not in the MT. In the Aramaic Belshazzar
gives a command (יָדַע) and Daniel is clothed in purple, etc. In the Greek Belshazzar clothed Daniel personally. No proclamation is made concerning Daniel's authority in the LXX, but a statement that gives the same information is furnished by the narrator (καὶ ζῶσαι εξουσίαν αὐτῷ...).

Verse 30: The LXX says nothing specific about Belshazzar's death. It is very vague in its rendering καὶ τὸ συν-κράτησεν επηλθε Βαλτασάρτῳ βασιλεῖ. Instead of calling Belshazzar the Chaldean king as MT does (אֵלֵנות הַכָּלִדָּא), the LXX speaks once more about the kingdom passing "from the Chaldeans" and being given to the Medes and Persians (cf. MT/LXX28).

Verse 31 (VI.1): This verse belongs with the story in chapter V. It is numbered with chapter VI in 967 following the MT. For convenience of reference the system used by the MT will be used here. In the Old Greek it is not Darius the Mede who receives the kingdom, but (according to 88-Syh) Ἀράχδης τοῦ Μῆδον, or (according to 967) Ἐρᾶχδης. Both of these readings are false. They are attempts to find a historical personage for an unhistorical Darius. The LXX leaves out all mention of the successor's age.

Chapter VI

This chapter is again to be considered an adaptation rather than a translation of the MT. The same story is told in both versions of the text, but with manifold smaller
and larger changes in the LXX. According to Montgomery verses 3, 4, 19, and 22 (LXX) contain doublets. For a study of the relationship between the three major witnesses to the LXX text recourse to Geissen is once again necessary since Kenyon's edition (used by Ziegler) is missing the whole of verses 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 19-28 along with parts of verses 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 16, and 18. This means that according to Kenyon and Ziegler only verses 1-3, 6-7, and 17 are completely witnessed by 967. A detailed comparison of the three witnesses is seen in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Critical Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 3</td>
<td>a. τοῦ βασιλέως 88-Syh; om. τοῦ 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. ἤκαπα εὐδοκεῖν αὐτῷ πραγματείας τοῦ βασιλέως αἰσθήτου 88-Syh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. ἐπαρατε 88; ἐπαραξεν 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. καὶ στρατηγὸς εκατόν εἰκοσι ἑπτά 88-Syh; τῶν στρατάς 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 4</td>
<td>a. εὐδοκεῖτο 88-Syh; εὐδοκεῖτο 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς βασιλείας 88; ἐπὶ πάση τῆ βασιλείας 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 5</td>
<td>a. εἶπαν 88-Syh; εἶπεν emend. m.2 εἶπαν 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. οὐκ ἀκούσαντες 88-Syh; οὐκ ἀκούσαντες 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. εὐφηροῖ 88; εὐφηροῖ 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. δεῖται 88; δεῖτε 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 7</td>
<td>a. ἂν 88; ἂν 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 8</td>
<td>a. om. tot. 88 (homoioiteleuton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. ὁρίσμων Syh; ὁρίσμων corr. 967 lege cor. 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. ἀλλοιωσάντων οὗτοι τῇ δέιται Syh; om. αὐτῶν Ziegler; αλλοιωσάντας καὶ θεῖται 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 10</td>
<td>a. ἐστησε 88-Syh; ἐστησαν 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. ἐπιτεθέν 88; ἐπιτεθέν 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. αὐτοῦ (1st) 88-Syh; αὐτοῦ 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. ἐποιεῖ ἐπὶ Syh-967; om. eti 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Critical Apparatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V. 12 | a. ουτοι οι ανθρωποι 88-Syh; οι ανθρωποι ουτοι 967  
|       | b. ενετυχον 88; ενετυχαν 967  
|       | c. ευχ 88; ευξι 967  
|       | d. ευχηται 88-Syh; ευχηται 967  
|       | e. άλλα 88-Syh; 967 άλλη  
|       | f. παρα σου βασιλευ 88-Syh; παρα του βασιλευ 967  
|       | g. εί δε μη 88-967; και ει δε μη Syh  
| V. 12a | a. ειπον 88; ειπαν 967  
|       | b. προσταμα 88-Syh; πραγμα 967  
|       | c. μή δε 88-(Syh); και μη 967  
|       | d. προσωπων 88; (prae) add. το 967  
|       | e. ελαττωσης 88-Syh; άλλωσης 967  
|       | f. τι 88-967; om. Syh  
|       | g. κολασις 88; κολαση 967  
|       | h. ενεμεινε 88; εμεινεν εν 967  
|       | i. ορισμω 88; ορκισμω 967  
| V. 13 | a. ειπαν 88; ειπεν 967  
| V. 14 | a. εστησεν 88-967; εστησαν Syh  
|       | b. αυτω 88-Syh; αυτων 967  
|       | c. post αυτω add ο βασιλευς 967  
|       | d. του εξελεσθαι 88-Syh; εως του εξελεσθαι 967  
|       | e. των άλλων 88-Syh; ΤΗΣ ΧΕΙΡΗΣ 967  
| V. 16 | a. Δαιμονος ο βασιλευς 88-Syh; ο βασιλευς Δαιμονος 967  
|       | b. post τρις της ημερας add. εν μια ημερα 967  
|       | c. των λεοντων 88-Syh; om. των 967  
|       | d. Θαρει 88; Θαρει 967  
| V. 17 | a. ερημη 88; ερημη 967  
|       | b. επετεθη επι Syh-967; ετεθη εις 88  
|       | c. εν τω δακτυλω 88-Syh; om. εν 967  
|       | d. εαυτου 88; αυτου 967  
|       | e. ανω 88; υπω 967  
|       | f. η ο βασιλευς αυτων ανασπαση εκ του λακκου 88-Syh  
| V. 18 | a. νησις 88; νησις 967  
|       | b. τοτε ο θεος 88-Syh; ο δε δε 967  
|       | c. ποιουμενος 88-Syh; ποιησαμενος 967  
|       | d. παρηνακται αν 88; παρηνακταν 967  
| V. 19 | a. ωρθουσε 88; ωρθεισεν 967  

*Note: The critical apparatus includes variations in readings, witness, and text. Numbers in the text indicate additional readings or notes.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Critical Apparatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 20</td>
<td>a. lege ἑκάλεσεν 967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 21</td>
<td>a. τοῖς Δανιήλ 88-Syh; τοῦ Δανιήλ 967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V. 22 | a. Θεὸς 88-(Syh); κύριος 967  
|       | b. ἀπὸ 88-Syh; ἀπὸ ἀπὸ 967 (dittog.)  
|       | c. εὐαντίον αὐτῶν καὶ εὐαντίον 88-Syh; εὐαντίον 967 (homoioteleuton)  
|       | d. καὶ ἐλησάς 88; ἐλησάς 967* emend. μ2 ἐλησάς 967-Syh |
| V. 23 | a. συνηθέσαν 88-Syh; συνηθή 967  
|       | b. παριγγυλήσαν 88-Syh-967  
|       | παριγγυλήσαν 967* |
| V. 24 | a. ἐφευρέσαν 88; ἐφευρέσαν 967  
|       | b. τα τα στὰ 88 (dittog.); τα στὰ 967  
|       | c. post τα στὰ αὐτῶν add. καὶ Δανιήλ* κατεστάθη επὶ πάσης  
|       | Βασιλείας δαρείου (ex. v. 28) 967 |
| V. 25 | a. γλυκόσας καὶ χυμᾶς 88; χυμᾶς καὶ γλυκόσας Syh-967 |
| V. 26 | a. κενών καὶ ἥν 88-Syh; ἥν καὶ κενών 967 |
| V. 27 | a. δουλεύων 88-967; δουλεύων αὐτῷ Syh  
|       | b. Θεὸς τοῦ Δανιήλ τον Δανιήλ 88-Syh; Θεὸς τον Δανιήλ 967 |
| V. 28 | a. πρὸς το γενός 88-Syhtx; πρὸς το τον πατέρας 967-Syhmg  
|       | b. καὶ Δανιήλ κατεστάθη επὶ τῆς Βασιλείας δαρείου ὑ 88-Syh  
|       | om. 967 (add. in VI.24) |

Out of the thirty-two possible times that Ziegler could have made use of 967 he actually does so just under forty-two per cent of the time. He reads with 88 or with 88-Syh exactly fifty per cent of the time. The former figure is approximately the same as for chapters IV and V, but the latter is some eight per cent below the usual fifty-eight per cent in the previous two chapters. The reason for this is that 967 agrees with 88 or Syh, the former twice and the
latter once, for a total of just over eight per cent. On the other hand, Geissen reads with 967 just over thirty-four per cent of the time, with 88 or 88-Syh just under sixty per cent of the time, and with either 88-967 or Syh-967 just over six per cent of the time.

One can clearly see the fact that chapter VI is not a close rendering of the Aramaic text in a verse-by-verse comparison of the two versions of the text which follows.

Verse 2: The first phrase has no direct equivalent in the MT. Behrmann thought that the LXX goes back to an Aramaic text $\text{בכש}(\text{כבר})\text{שמברכ}$ is the numerical equivalent of sixty-two in MT1. This is possible, but it seems more likely to assume (with Bludau) that the LXX translator was here as elsewhere rendering the Aramaic freely. It seemed strange to this translator that the age of Darius should be mentioned. When he made historical identification of Darius as either Artaxerxes or Xerxes in verse 1, he also made an exegetical decision concerning the reason why the MT gave the conquerer's age; thinking it to be to show that he was distinguished in his later years. The phrase $\varepsilon\nu\delta\varphi\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\gamma\tau\zeta\iota\iota$ is most probably drawn from a mistaken reading of $\text{ודנש} \text{עור}$; reading the first word as an adjective equivalent to $\text{זק},$ and the second as a substantive meaning "old age" ($\text{זק} \text{עור} \text{}.\text{ם}$. This explains also why the LXX has no equivalent to "it was pleasing before (to)...." as $\text{ודנש} \text{עור}$ should be translated.
The number of satraps set up here is not one hundred twenty as in the MT, but one hundred twenty-seven, in agreement with the number of provinces set up by Ahasuerus (Xerxes I) in Esther 1.1 (cf. 8.9). The tradition in Esther 8.9 is also referred to in Daniel III.1 (LXX).

**Verse 3:** The LXX translates only one-half of the MT (וֹשָׁבִים מִגְּדוֹלִים מִבָּאוֹרִים חֲרִישַׁת). The loan word מַלְאָךְ is translated by either ἐνώπιον or simply ἀντί. The second half of the MT is skipped in the Greek text, but perhaps the meaning is added to the beginning of the next verse. **Verse 4:** It is difficult to know whether the first phrase of this verse (ὡς εἰς ἀρχὴν εἴχεσθαι κατὰ βασιλείαν) is taken from MT3b or from the phrase ἀρχὴ τῆς βασιλείας in MT4. In wording it is much closer to the latter. In favor of the latter is the fact that ἀρχὴ does not appear in a corresponding place in the LXX. The meaning of both phrases of the MT is sufficiently well carried by ὡς εἰς ἀρχὴν εἴχεσθαι κατὰ βασιλείαν to justify the elimination of one of them by the LXX translator. If he intended this phrase to carry the meaning of both Aramaic phrases it would also explain the whole phrase's movement to a position between the end of verse 3 and the beginning of verse 4. The second phrase in the LXX (καὶ Δανιὴλ... ἐπραξε) is an expansion of the first phrase of the MT (חֲרִישַׁת).
on ἱστορία is rendered by τόσο. This reverses the kind of conjunction found in the MT from temporal-simple-coordinate to simple coordinate-temporal. ἰόμη is left out of the LXX.

Daniel's ability and the consequent honors bestowed upon him (related by the LXX) is reminiscent of various parts of the book. Καὶ Δανιὴλ ἔγενε ὁμοίως πορφυραῖ is a reflection of the words of V.29... ἐνδοκρῶν Δανιὴλ πορφυραῖ (V.7,16). Καθὼς ἦν ἐνδοκρῶς εἰπήμων καὶ συνέτος καὶ πνεῦμα ἁγίου ἐν αὐτῷ reminds one of V.11 (LXX): οἱ αὐτῶν ἐκεῖνοι ἐπιστήμων ἦν καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ ὁσιάζων πάντας τῶν σωμάτων Βασιλείας and V.12 (LXX): καὶ πνεῦμα ἁγίου ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστι. There is also an indirect reminiscence of 1.20 (LXX). So instead of the LXX being a contraction of the MT as is so often the case, here it is an expansion. The next phrase (τόσο ο βασιλεὺς... βασιλείας αὐτοῦ) is a fairly good translation of the Aramaic. In addition to the change in conjunctions noted above there is the addition of the personal pronoun in the Greek. The difference in an unpointed Aramaic text would be between אַרְאַמָּה (MT) and אַרְאַמָּה. With the otherwise well-attested confusion between final he and aleph the manuscript which the LXX translator had before him might easily have read a he. This however makes the assumption that the translator is interested in a word for word translation which he clearly is not. He could have added the αὐτοῦ simply to make the Greek clearer. The last phrase of the Greek (καὶ τοὺς δύο ανθρώπος... ἐπτα) is not in the Aramaic. Following
Montgomery this last phrase is most probably a gloss. Also probably a gloss which entered the text is καὶ ενδομένως εν ταῖς πραγματείαις του βασιλέως αἰς επιτάξε ἐπραγαίη.

**Verse 5:** This verse begins with a repetition of the last part of LXX 4 (οὗτοι... βασιλείας αὐτοῦ). This phrase is enclosed in square brackets in Ziegler's edition. The words are almost certainly a gloss (or the last line of verse 4 is). The LXX makes only Daniel's two "co-presidents" conspirators against him (in verse 4). In view of the translator's dislike for repetitions, this phrase is too close in both meaning and wording to be rendered both. The result is one Greek phrase that carries the meaning of both the Aramaic ones: εἰς ὑποθήκην ἀμερτίαν (ὑποθήκην ἀμερτίαν) τοῦ Ναζανίου κατατόν Δανιήλ. The last three Greek words probably have their origin in מַעֲנָה. This thought, meaning "from the point of view of the matters of state," is explicated in a somewhat clearer περὶ τῆς καταγραφήσουσιν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν βασιλέα.

**Verse 6:** This verse contains the story of the contents of the decree agreed on by the conspirators. In the Aramaic this does not happen until verse 7. At this point the MT is still giving background information preparatory to the agreement. "We shall not find any ground for complaint against this Daniel unless we find it in connection with the law of his God" (RSV). Καὶ εἴηνεν seems to be taken from the
corresponding verse in the MT, אַדִּירָא הָבוּרָיָא אֱלֹהִי, but it is the only point of contact between the two versions of the text. The phrase Δεῦτε αποθέωμαι, of course, reminiscent of MT 8,13. The punishment in this first reference (in the LXX) is not specific. This differs from the MT (verses 8 and 13) where the punishment is always given as בַּלְּמַנּוּ אַלֵּדוּ. Another difference is that the MT states that no one may worship "any god or man" except Darius. Since the thought of worshipping a mere man was abhorrent to a Jew, the LXX translator left out the word for "man." The result, however, actually becomes more abhorrent: "no man shall honor or pray to any god...except to Darius the king," i.e. Darius is thought of as divine. Nowhere in the MT is such a suggestion made. The purpose clause which follows next in the LXX (ινα γτήσωσι τον Δανιὴλ εναντίον του βασιλέως, και ἐφη ου τον λαόν τον λέοντον) gives the reason for the agreement by the conspirators and introduces the specific punishment they have in mind for Daniel. The clause finds no parallel in the MT. It makes the jealousy of the "co-presidents" explicit whereas in the MT it is implicit. The final sentence of this verse introduces the fact that Daniel prays thrice daily--a fact which does not emerge from the Aramaic until verse 11. In MT 11 it states that Daniel "prayed and praised." This is rendered here in the LXX by προσευχότατε καὶ δείτατε, which are practical synonyms. The phrase κυρίου του θεου αυτου, "the
Lord his God," would seem to indicate that the tetragrammaton was read here. It is just as likely, however, that the LXX translator inserted \( \text{κυρίος} \) in order to make explicit what is implicit in the MT; God = Yahweh.

**Verse 7:** This verse translates the first two-thirds of the MT quite well. What is left out is \( \text{יִּבְשֹׁם} \). It is interesting to note that while a slightly modified form of \( \text{יִּבְשֹׁם} \) is found in the more literally translated chapters (II.4, III.9), it is nowhere found in chapters IV-VI although the MT has the phrase in V.10; and VI.7,22. It could have been theologically offensive to wish eternal or very long life to a mere mortal (and a pagan mortal at that). This could mean that two translators worked on the LXX of Daniel, one for chapters I-III (along with VII-XII) and a second for chapters IV-VI. The omission of the standard greeting "O King, live forever" means that in the LXX the first thing the conspirators say to the king concerns the desired interdict. **Verse 8:** In the LXX the conspirators tell Darius of a vow which has already been taken by them whereas in the MT it is a request for the king to make a decree. The content of the vow is very similar in both versions of the text although the Greek here again eliminates the possible worshipping of a man.

**Verse 9:** This verse is missing altogether from 88, but it can be found in both Syh and 967. The likelihood is
that the verse is original and fell out of 88 by homoiooteleuton. The verse breaks into three phrases, only one of which is based on the MT of the verse.  

The LXX makes the conspirators "honor" the king so that they can get their way with him. Again here the LXX translator paints the jealousy-motivation of the conspirators in bolder strokes than the MT uses. The final two phrases of this verse are nearly literal repetitions of the final two phrases of LXX 6. They are here in reverse order and καθότι is substituted for the γαρ in verse 6 and σωτι is substituted for στι. Given the penchant of the Greek translator for eschewing repetitions, it is perhaps possible that the last two phrases of this verse are glosses, so that only the first phrase is original to the LXX.

Verse 10: The difference between the two versions of the text here is that the MT has two substantives at the end (כַּעַבְרֶנָּה ... כַּעַבְרֶנָּה) while the Greek has two verbs (εστησε καὶ ἐκτύπωσεν). The Greek also has no word corresponding to ἀκάμα (σφραγιμ understood from the previous verse). The LXX translator could have understood אָכַל (פַּלְקָל) as a verb plus a pronominal suffix which latter he left untranslated. Thus, by this interpretation, there would be two verbs "establish and confirm."  

Verse 11: The LXX offers a good translation
of the Aramaic text. The changes amount to minor modifications in order and wording. Instead of having a "document signed" (םֶלֶס כְּתוּב), the LXX has a "deed established" (ὸγισμόν...εστησε). The Old Greek puts the phrase into a relative clause,...ὸγισμόν, ὀν εστησε κατ' αὐτόν. The last two words are not in the MT, but one assumes that they came from a misreading of ἀπό as a preposition meaning "against" rather than as a ἄντων verb plus a misreading of ἴδιος, "his house," meaning by transference (as is common) "himself." This also explains why the LXX has nothing equivalent to "he went to his house." The second phrase (ἐν τῷ ἀντίστροφω ἀυτῷ κατηναντὶ λεγουσαλίμ) shows one minor change. The Aramaic nowhere states that Daniel opened his windows (ץֶהֶרֶד). Instead of "kneeling upon his knees" (יִנְדֹךְ יָכִין) as in the MT the LXX has Daniel falling upon his face. The Greek word-order is also different than the MT and there is only one Greek word translating αὐτῷ.  

Verse 12: The verbs in the first half of this verse are different in the two versions of the text. Instead of the conspirators "coming by agreement" (RSV: ἠσπάζοντο) and "finding" Daniel as in the MT, the LXX has them "watching" him (ἐπιθυμοῦσαν) and "surprising" him (καταλαβοῦσαν). For a rendering of הָלַחְו מַעַרְחָה the LXX turns to the stock phrase ἱστορεῖται τῆς ἡμέρας and adds to it καθ' έκαστη ἡμέραν which seems unnecessary. Finally, the Aramaic verse begins
with the conjunction (denoting sequence or temporality) וְ, while once again the LXX translator uses a simple καί, most probably for variety. **Verse 13:** The verse contains several small changes. Instead of rendering the verb בָּרֵא by πέλαον, the LXX translator has chosen a word with a meaning closer to "to complain, accuse" when he selected εὐνοοῦχανον, "to address, accuse." The phrase יִלְוָה is cut out as excess verbiage. That the statement of the accusers concerns the interdict is obvious from what follows. The recapitulation of the decree is put positively in the MT, "(that) any man who makes petition...shall be cast into the den of lions." The LXX puts it negatively, "(that) no man should make petition...(and) if they should not (obey) they shall be cast into the den of lions." As before the LXX adds αἰτιῶν αἰτωμά and omits any reference to the worshipping of a man. The phrase כל תומ התר ויתע is omitted from the LXX at this point and instead one finds what looks like a second interpretation or an expansion of אֲלֵית בֶּן מִלָּה (καὶ μένει στὴ ο ὄσμος). It is possible that this latter phrase is a gloss. **Verse 13a:** This verse is not to be found in the MT. It does, however, contain some familiar elements. The law of the Medes and Persians, missing in LXX13, is here appealed to. The purpose of the verse is to emphasize the evil motives of the conspirators and to incite as much dislike for
them as possible in the reader. By doing this the LXX translator is assured that his Jewish readers will glory all the more in the downfall of pagan, evil men who have conspired against the epitome of the pious Jew. **Verse 14:** The conspirators here are much bolder than in the corresponding Aramaic verse. They dare to call, with an undoubted touch of sarcasm, Daniel the friend of the king (Δανιήλ τον φίλον σου). The Greek carries the meaning of the Aramaic, but has omitted some phrases. בִּבְרָאִים עֲבוֹדַי אֲדֹנֵי הָאָדָם is cut to בְֵבִרָאִים עֲבוֹדֵי אֲדֹנֵי הָאָדָם. The LXX translator then adds ὧν for emphasis. Instead of calling Daniel δένιον αὐτοῖς ἡ θεότης, the LXX calls him the "friend of you" (the king's friend). The statement that Daniel pays no heed to the king or his interdict (לְאֵין גָּלָל מִלְכָּא כָּפַר אֵלֶּה רִשָּׁת) is considered to be obvious from the fact that Daniel "prays and supplicates three times a day before his God." Consequently the LXX translator leaves the former phrase out. The conspirators state furthermore that εὐφρονεῖν Δανιήλ τον φίλον σου. This is not to be found in the MT.

**Verse 15:** It is most probable that the LXX contains a doublet here. There are what could be considered two renderings of the MT, the second by far closer to it than the first. Καὶ λυπομένοις ο θαυμάσσεις is parallel to ἅρπαις ο θαυμάσσεις... There follows in the LXX a phrase which does not occur in the MT until verse 17 (it is missing there in
the Greek). There two phrases are: (ο βασιλεὺς) εἰς τὸν Δανιήλ ἐπὶ τῶν λακκῶν τῶν λεοντῶν / ἵνα μὴ συναντήσῃ τὸν
βασιλέα Μελαχ, λεοντὶς δεινὸν, κοιτᾶς βιῶν / τὴν ἡμέραν. The second rendering of the MT is much closer to it.  
Τοῖς άυτον βασιλέως σφοδρα ἐλπίζεται τὴν Δανιήλ = (αὐτὸν μελάχαν 
κοιτῶν των λεοντῶν). The last three words of the Greek are most
probably gotten by reading τὰς ἑξήνεις without the introductory
copula and as belonging with what has gone before rather than
with what follows. The LXX renders ἰόμην as εὐφοβήθη, "he
feared (to rescue him)." This translation could have taken
ὁμην as a contraction of ἵνα "to be terrified."67 άυτῶν ἰσχυρὸς
is well rendered by ἐὰν δυσβλέπων ἡλίου. The LXX implies that
Darius intended to wait until after dark to rescue Daniel.  
ὁμήν is left out of the Greek since it has al-
already been said. The LXX translator substitutes ο̣ν τῶν ἰσχυρῶν
τῶν δαρπάζων which may be an original addition to the LXX to add
color, but one might posit that the translator read Ἰο
ἰς in his Semitic Vorlage. This could be the case since
it is not, according to the LXX, the satraps, but only the
co-presidents who were plotting against Daniel. In the MT
it is the satraps who are conspiring and so ο̣ν
may have been in the LXX's Vorlage.

Verse 16: The verse in the MT is a repetition of
verses 7,12, and 13. Showing his usual dislike for literal
repetition, the translator eliminates the whole of the MT of
the verse and added something that is his own creation;
"but he was not able to rescue him from them." Verse 17:
The first section of the MT (לְשָׁם הָעֲלוֹת בַּרְבּוֹ) is well rendered by αναβοήσας δὲ Δαρείος ο βασιλεύς with only the addition of the proper name. Just what the king says is changed somewhat. The statement concerning Daniel's being brought to and cast into the den of lions has already been used (in a way) by the translator in verse 15, so the king's command in the MT is ignored here and the Greek has him say ὁ θεὸς σου, μη σοι λατρεύεις ἐν δελεξως (ἱστής ἡμέρας) αὐτοῦ ἐξελείται σε ἐκ θείρος λεοντών which is equivalent, in the main, to the MT. The phrase "three times a day" is also used by the Greek translator instead of the MT's ἀκράπα, "continually." Another addition is ἐκ θείρος λεοντών. It is worth noting that the Greek uses a future middle indicative verb (ἐξελείται) to translate the imperfect-volitive ἐκβαίνει. The LXX ends the verse by putting a rather cheery word of comfort into Darius' mouth ἐὰν πάνω θαρσεῖ ("keep up your courage until morning").

Verse 18: The order to cast Daniel into the pit is given in LXX15, but he is not thrown in until this point. In the MT the order and its execution are told at once. After this initial phrase the LXX translator gives an almost word for word translation of the Aramaic until the phrase רַבּוֹ דְּבָרֵינוּ. This rather vague suggestion in the MT is expanded in the LXX to give what the original author probably had in mind, but only suggested, "lest Daniel should be
either removed by them (the conspirators) or drawn up from the pit by the king."  

**Verse 19:** The first part of this verse (τὸ...η λήμνης) is a literal rendering of the Aramaic. The difficult word מְלָאכָה is rendered λυτομοίκνος in the LXX. It is most likely that the translator was guessing at the meaning here. It is hard to think that he, without aid of lexical tools (or with primitive ones) would have known the meaning of a word which still puzzles exegetes. If, as Koehler-Baumgartner have posited, the word is a corruption of מְלָאכָה (cf. V.2,3), it is most likely that the LXX translator would have left the word out entirely or paraphrased it. The Old Greek then departs from the MT by eliminating מְלָאכָה and picking up an idea from MT25. He then expands this idea. The basis for the idea is מְלָאכָה וּמְלָאכָה. In the LXX, however, it is not an angel but God himself who is the agent of Daniel's salvation. God's rescue of Daniel takes place after "he (God) took (fore)thought for him" (ο ἐς θεὸς τοῦ Δανιήλ προνοεὶν ποιηθῶν αὐτοῦ απλείπονε τὰ στομάτα τῶν λιοντῶν, καὶ οὐ παραγγελάθην τὸν Δανιήλ).

**Verse 20:** The MT offers what may be a gloss here in בָּשָׂר וּבָשָׂר... The LXX translator renders both words, ωρηθεὶς πρωί (arose early, at dawn). The Old Greek adds the fact that Darius took his satraps with him to the lion's den (καὶ παρελάβε καὶ ἔτην τῶν σατραπῶν). The translator also has Darius
standing on the "mouth of the lion's den."  

**Verse 21:** The LXX has no equivalent to נְגוֹמִי הַמַּרְאָה since it has already been stated that Darius and his satraps were בַּיָּמָיו בְּתַמָּהֶם. The phrase פָּרֹת הָנָּבָא is expanded to "he cried out to Daniel in a great voice, with weeping." It must be admitted that רַגּוֹם הַנַּעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל is redundant, so it is not surprising that the LXX has only דָּנִיֵּל. The LXX omits the title נָבִי הַמַּרְאָה, but adds two further questions to Daniel in addition to the one in the MT; "has your God, whom you serve continually, been able to deliver you from the lions"? These questions are first, the most obvious one, וַתִּשְׁמַע, and second, וַתִּשְׁמַע. There are no equivalents to these in the Aramaic text. The verb αἰρεῖν, "to disable, render useless," is also found without an equivalent in the MT of IV.11.

**Verse 22:** As in VI.7 the phrase "O king live forever" is not found here in the LXX. This means that the verse merely introduces Daniel's speech in the following verse. The point of view in the two versions is also different: וַתִּשְׁמַע וַתִּשְׁמַע לְצַנְבָּא הַנַּעַר Yאֵלָא (that is, o ἡσύχασθαι). **Verse 23:** As is usual, the LXX translator both eliminates some phrases and adds others. The verse begins by having Daniel answer the king's first question, וַתִּשְׁמַע. Since אַלְמָא לְבַשָּׁהֹת ἡ ἡσύχασθαι ἡ ἡμέρα Καυσια μέλα has been used above in verse 19 (in a modified form), the MT is paraphrased here by
The phrase "they have not hurt me" is also used in verse 19 as well as in verse 24 and is so eliminated here as unnecessary. The Aramaic of "because I was found blameless before him, and also before you, O King" is well translated. However, ἦν ἀθάνατος is expanded into οὔτε άγνοια οὔτε ἀκρασία ευράθη εν εὐμοι. Finally, the LXX translator puts a rebuke into Daniel's mouth. This reprimand is given to Darius for having heeded the calumny of "deceiving men." This last phrase is not found explicitly in the MT although "and also before you, O King, I have done no wrong" may well implicitly carry this note of condemnation.

Verse 24: The Greek has little contact with the MT here. Only one phrase (אֶלָּמַלְאַתְּךָ וְשָׁמֵעֵנָּה) is rendered at all. The LXX never does say that Daniel was brought out of the lion's den. It does say that דַּעַתְּךָ וְשָׁמֵעֵנָּה were gathered. It must be assumed either that these דַּעַתְּךָ וְשָׁמֵעֵנָּה are different from οἱ σαράπαι mentioned in verse 20 or that there is a doublet in the LXX at this point. Verses 25: This verse begins in the MT by Darius' command for the execution of the conspirators. This is eliminated by the Greek. A major difference between the LXX and the MT here and all through the chapter is that only two men are involved in the plot against Daniel. The insertion of the word "two" is the only exception to an exact rendering from Aramaic to Greek:
with the exception of the differences in word order. The LXX gives no rendering at all for "and before they reached the bottom of the den..." and clarifies the rather picturesque

with the simple rendering "the lions killed them" (καὶ οἱ λέοντες άπεκτέιναν αὐτοὺς).

**Verse 26:** The LXX gives a good translation of the MT here with only three changes. Instead of דָּרֹיא וְהָיָה the LXX has simply דָּרֹיא, instead of יָרֹא the LXX has רֹאשׁ אֵת אֶחָיו.

What Darius says has been put into the next verse by the Greek and so has no preliminary greeting as the MT does here. The three words אוֹר, שִׁמְי, אֲדֹנָא are rendered by εὐθέος, χύφαις, γλυκάσεις. In Aramaic this list occurs at III.4,7,29,31; V.19; VI.26; and VII.14. At every passage Theodotion translates with λάοι, ψυλά, γλυκάσαλ. The LXX rendering always uses γλυκάσαλ, but varies in its use between λάοι/εὐθεν (λάοι is found only in III.4 and even there in addition to εὐθεν), and ψυλά/χύφαι (the former in III.7,29 and the latter in III.4; VI.26). This could lead to the assumption that εὐθεν, χύφαι, γλυκάσαλ were the original terms of the LXX.

**Verse 27:** The LXX skips over the opening phrase of the MT here as it has so often done before. דָּרֹיא וְהָיָה seemed to be redundant to the Greek translator. Its meaning has already been carried by the statement that Darius וֶשְׁצֹא in the previous verse.
is well rendered into Greek. "For he is the living God and endures forever" is compressed into "for he is the enduring and living God." The simple word יְחִזָּה is expanded to כֵּן הֶכְיָהֵרַנִי. The LXX translator evidently thought that to be unnecessary since he leaves it out.

Verse 28: There is no apparent connection between the LXX and the MT here. Rather, it seems as though the LXX has taken bits from other parts of the book with little modification, just as it did in IV.34-34a (LXX). The first phrase of the LXX contains a promise by Darius to worship Daniel's God for the rest of his days. This is at least vaguely reminiscent of the promise given by Nebuchadnezzar in IV.34 (MT). The second phrase τὰ γὰρ εἰδώλα τὰ χειροποιημένα ποιεῖται σώσαι ὡς ἐλυτρώσωτο τὸ θεὸν τοῦ Δανιήλ τοῦ Δανιήλ is reminiscent of "the gods of the nations do not have in them strength... (to do)... as the God of Heaven did with me," (IV.34a) and τὰ εἰδώλα τὰ χειροποιημένα is reminiscent of V.4, and 23. The last phrase, ὡς ἐλυτρώσωτο... Δανιήλ, reminds one of III.96 (29). Here, as in IV.34-34a, the verse is very possibly a liturgical composition uniting elements from the various parts of the first six chapters of the book. Verse 29: The only contact which the Greek has with the Aramaic here is in the idea of Daniel's prospering under Darius. In the Greek this is phrased "and Daniel was appointed over the kingdom of Darius." This is,
of course, very reminiscent of the thought (and to a lesser degree the language) of II.49; III.97 (30); and V.29. καὶ κυρίῳ Περσῶι παραλαβείς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ is essentially the same phrase as ended chapter V (καὶ Αραβῶν τῶν Μῆςων παραλαβεὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ). The final verse of the stories in Daniel ends with reminiscence of the other stories. This gives the whole six chapters an integrity and a feeling of unity.

In view of the detailed comparison between the MT and the LXX which has been carried out it would be easy to maintain that two different translators worked on the LXX of Daniel. The style of chapters IV-VI is so different than the rest of the chapters that it is difficult to explain them as the work of one man. It is impossible to decide whether the translator was working from a text very much like the MT or one which more closely resembles his work. The majority of cases seem to indicate that he either had a different Vorlage from the MT or used a Vorlage much like the MT in a very free and adaptive way. In chapters I-III particularly, but in IV-VI as well, there are enough literal translations of the MT to make one wonder if the translator did not actually have a text similar to the MT which he reworked freely. An alternative explanation to the vastly different style of the two sections would be that their purposes were different.

It must be readily admitted that there is no concrete
knowledge to prove that the use to which chapters IV-VI (or perhaps III-VI) were put was different from the purpose to which the rest of the chapters were put. Several bits of data could suggest a tentative answer however. It has been seen that at two points in chapters IV-VI there are groups of citations taken from other parts of the book. This collection of citations could be only to tie the stories into a literary unit, but it could also be a gathering together of citations for a liturgical (or at least a worship-oriented) purpose. The best example of this assembly of citations is seen in IV.34-34a. In the MT the corresponding section is a hymn of Nebuchadnezzar. The LXX also contains a hymn, but in a widely expanded, far different form. The LXX hymn gathers elements from chapters II, III, V, and VI. It is possible that this hymn was actually used in worship by the people and that it was written for precisely this purpose. To this kind of liturgical theory can also be added the apocryphal additions to chapter III, part of which are said to be a "song" and part of which are said to be a "prayer"—both of which are clearly worship-oriented elements. Also perhaps important is the small statement made by Montgomery that, "the Gr(eek) Lectionaries appear to contain only these c(hapters)."76

If the translation of chapters IV-VI (at least) was worship-oriented, liturgical, or perhaps even homiletical it
is not surprising that the translation method is not literal. The translator would be more concerned with how the words of the book of Daniel spoke to people of his own day. Even in the present day, the translation methods used by the hymn writers of the metrical Psalms in the church hymnary are not so much concerned with word for word accuracy, but rather with the overall edificatory effect on the worshipper. It should be stressed that the foregoing is but a theory which endeavors to explain the translation method of the LXX translator(s). It must remain only a theory, albeit a very plausible one, among several which could be deduced from the slender evidence available.

THE DATE OF THE LXX TRANSLATION

Very little exact information is known which can be used to date the composition of the LXX of Daniel. As far as actual manuscript evidence is concerned it is now possible to trace the translation back to the early or mid third century AD (with 967). It is possible to go some further back. The New Testament contains some forty citations from Daniel I-VI, most of which match (at least roughly) with Theodotion's text, but one of which surely reflects the LXX text. The passage is Hebrews 11.12 and the passage is III.36 (from the apocryphal additions). The date of the book of Hebrews is most probably in
the latter third of the first Christian century. The citations from Clement of Rome and Josephus may push the date back a few years, but still all these reflect the first century AD.

On the other end of the time-scale, it has been concluded in chapter I of the present study that the date of the final composition and compilation of the book of Daniel is most probably circa 165 BC. Thus the time of the translation of the book into Greek must be after this date but before circa 50 AD so that it would be available for use by Josephus, Clement of Rome, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. As will be seen, however, a date considerably earlier than 50 AD is demanded by further evidence.

I Maccabees uses several expressions from the book of Daniel which are reflective of the LXX. The original composition of I Maccabees is to be fixed somewhere in the last two decades of the second century BC, and its translation into Greek "seems to have been made not long after." The dates are thus reduced from circa 165 BC to circa 100 BC. In the prologue to the Wisdom of Sira (written by the grandson of the original author in circa 117 BC) the categories of Law, Prophets, and Other Books known to the Fathers (τα ἄλλα πατερια θρησκευματα) are discussed. Just what bearing these categories have on the date of the translation of these "other books" into Greek is far from clear, however.
One would assume that some time had to pass between the time of the final compilation of the book of Daniel in circa 165 and, first, its acceptance into the community as scripture, and second, for the need of a Greek translation to be felt. It is hard to imagine a time of less than fifteen to twenty-five years for these processes. This conjecture (and it must remain just so) leads to a translation date of between circa 150 and 140 BC at the earliest and probably some years later than this.

The foregoing assumes tacitly that the translation of Daniel into Greek all took place at one time, but if, as is possible, two translators worked on the book, then the situation becomes far less clear. The relationship between the parts of the LXX of Daniel as regards their translation remains shrouded in impenetrable mystery, and thus in the realm of intelligent speculation. Bevan posits that chapters III-VI (with the apocryphal additions of chapter III) were paraphrased into Greek before the rest of the book and that at a later date another translator added the remaining chapters. The translation was most probably not for the scholars, but for the common public who would hear the book read at worship and would memorize sections of it. These would use the book of Daniel for private and public edification and worship. Thus the judgment of Karl Marti, nearly three-quarters of a century old, still stands: the book of
Daniel was translated into Greek by circa 100 BC.\(^8\)

**THE GENRE OF THE LXX TRANSLATION**

It has been stated above on page 142 that while the Hebrew/Aramaic original of Daniel I-VI may be loosely termed haggadah, it is closer to the truth to say that the stories of Daniel use the methods of haggadah. Does the LXX translation share in the genre of the original? A good, faithful translation should not transfer the idiom of one language into the idiom of another. As has been made abundantly clear, however, the LXX is not a faithful translation, especially in chapters IV-VI. The translator expands and curtails the text to such an extent and in such a manner that it is hard to believe that his purpose was to produce a linguistically accurate rendering. Is, then, the LXX of Daniel more of a haggadah than the Semitic original? In order to discover an answer to this question it is necessary to delve into a brief study of the elements of midrash generally.

According to Wright there are three types of midrash.\(^8\) These three types are: 1) exegetical midrash, 2) homiletical midrash, 3) narrative midrash. These types can deal with the legal sections of the Bible (halakah) or the non-legal sections (haggadah). The first type (exegetical midrash) is a collection of individual rabbinic interpretations arranged in textual order so as to produce a
more or less verse by verse exposition. Examples of this kind of work are the Bereshith Rabbah, the Midrash Tehillim, and parts of the Tannaitic midrashim. The second type (homiletical midrash) presents a more extended discussion of the text than does the first type, but only on specific verses. They are usually artificial homilies whose structure was used in real ones. These "sermon-outlines" collect a mass of traditional material. The third type (narrative midrash) incorporates comment in the process of telling a story. The story must be biblical, but the details of the story are often traditional elements and probably often sheer inventions of the author. Geza Vermes calls this type of midrash "the re-written Bible." Examples of this type of midrash are: Sefer ha-Yashar, Pirke de Eleazar, Midrash Wayyissau, Midrash Petiroth 'Aharon, and Midrash Petiroth Moshe. The dominant characteristic of this type of midrash is the fact that the comment is worked into the narrative itself rather than inserted as a separate piece of work.

Within these three types of midrash there were two kinds of interpretation, the literal (לועגד) and the so-called "creative" (ו Garland). Wright uses two of Israel Heinemann's categories for a discussion of the methods of the latter kind of interpretation; creative historiography and creative philology. By the former is meant a technique
of contemporizing the biblical message by means of creative and imaginative amplification of the available historical facts. By the latter is meant the drawing out of meanings by means of pseudo-grammatical devices (such as athbash).

These meanings would be "hidden" from the normal man. This kind of interpretation is founded on the beliefs that, first, all parts of scripture, even apparent contradictions and errors, have an edificatory value and, second, that all constituent elements of scripture are important as individual entities (i.e. words and letters in addition to verses and chapters). For the day to day life of the people the rabbis were more concerned with edification and spiritual nourishment than they were with the letter of accurate exegesis. They constantly battled to make the Bible relevant to their people.

...The Sitz im Leben of the haggadah... was the preaching which followed the biblical reading in the cultic assemblies on Sabbaths and festivals, and the preaching on important public and private occasions (war, famine, circumcision, weddings, funerals, etc.).

Before a summary of the characteristics of midrash can be given two further statements should be made. First, since haggadah is a rabbinic term, those works which are prior to the rabbinic literature must share the primary characteristics of the rabbinic literature to be considered as haggadah (or indeed midrash). Second, one must dif-
ferentiate between basic characteristics which are vital to the form itself (primary characteristics) and those which are historically acquired (secondary characteristics).

A summary of the primary characteristics of the literary genre of midrash is given by Wright:

A midrash is a work that attempts to make a text of Scripture understandable, useful, and relevant for a later generation. It is the text of Scripture which is the point of departure, and it is for the sake of the text that Midrash exists. The treatment of any given text may be creative (בעד) or non-creative (בעד), but the literature as a whole is predominantly creative in its handling of the biblical material. The interpretation is accomplished sometimes by rewriting the biblical material, sometimes by commenting upon it. In either case the midrash may go as far afield as it wishes provided that at some stage at least there is to be found some connection, implicit or explicit, between the biblical text and the new midrashic composition. At times this connection with the text may be convincing, at times it may be desperate; it is sufficient merely that a connection be there. Frequently the midrashic literature is characterized by a careful analysis of and attention to the biblical text.

Now that the primary characteristics of midrash have been fixed, it remains to see whether the LXX of Daniel I-VI fits into this genre. By the sheer fact that the LXX is at least in theory a translation of scripture it fulfills the requirement that it begin with the text of the Bible. The remarkably loose translation or paraphrase of chapters IV-VI makes one wonder whether the author was not incorporating comment into the text. He did so by his methods, even if it was not his intention to do so. Whether or not he intended
to comment on the text he did so, and the fact that he may not so have intended is irrelevant to the fixing of the genre. Since the author has in the fiber of his paraphrase given comments on a non-legal text (Daniel), one is justified in fixing the genre of the LXX of Daniel as haggadic midrash. It is therefore interesting to observe that whereas the MT only uses the conventions of haggadah (Wright would call it free haggadah), the LXX translation appears to be haggadah itself. But are things as they appear?

The general translation technique, if such it can be called, of chapters IV-VI of the LXX of Daniel are quite consistent with calling these chapters a haggadah of the narrative type. What, however, can be said of chapters I-III and VII-XII? As has been seen, chapters I-III (with the exception of the apocryphal additions to chapter III) present little problem to seeing these chapters as translation rather than haggadah. Although chapters VII-XII fall outside the purview of the present study, according to Bludau, their translation technique is the same as (or similar to) that of the first three chapters, with the exception of the account of the seventy weeks of years in IX.24-27. Concerning this latter passage Bludau says: "The translator seems to have given a contemporary meaning to the prophecy concerning the seventy weeks of years." In general the present author shares Bludau's judgment of chapters I-III and VII-
XII; that is, the translator attempted to give a Semitic original in genuine Greek dress. He sometimes tends to shorten rather circuitous Semitic phraseology, but (especially with the publication of 967) these chapters offer a fairly good and accurate translation of the Hebrew/Aramaic original. There is also very little in these chapters to preclude the possibility that this Hebrew/Aramaic original was something very like the MT freely translated. This free translation is more a characteristic of a targum that it is of haggadah.

To the present point it has been seen that the LXX of Daniel breaks into two rather neat parts. The one part (chapters I-III, VII-XII) is a free translation (targum) and the other part is very paraphrastic (haggadah). The situation is, however, more complicated than this. There are expansive and haggadic bits in the first section (for example, the apocryphal additions to chapter III and the vision of the seventy weeks of years in IX.24-27). More to this, there are verses (or parts of verses) in chapters IV-VI which are translated as accurately as anything in I-III or VII-XII.

The situation is, thus, complex. One is justified in calling chapters IV-VI haggadah. There are other odd pieces in chapters I-III and VII-XII which would also qualify, but there is the mass of these latter chapters which
offer a free translation—but a translation nonetheless—
along with not a few passages in chapter IV-VI which also
give a translation. The whole of the LXX of Daniel, then,
cannot be called either a haggadah or a free translation
(certainly it cannot be called a targum). Can a literary
genre be found which will encompass the whole of the book and
not simply its parts?

THE RELATION IN GENRE BETWEEN THE LXX OF
DANIEL (I-VI) AND THE
GENESIS APOCRYPHON

In 1947 there was found in a cave in the vicinity of
Khirbet Qumran an Aramaic scroll which has come to be known
as the Genesis Apocryphon. This scroll (1QapGn) was
partially published by N. Avigad and Y. Yadin in 1956. Ten years later an edition of the entire scroll along with
a commentary and appendices was published by J. A. Fitzmyer,
followed by a second revised edition of the work in 1971.

For present purposes the work is interesting only for
its literary structure and genre. As is clear from a reading
of the work, the literary structure is complex. It appears
to be an expansion on some of the stories in the early part
of Genesis, written in Aramaic, and closely related to the
type of story found in the Book of Jubilees and Enoch chapter
106. The nature of the work as so outlined should alert
one to the possibility of finding at least a prototype of
haggadah in it.\textsuperscript{110}

Geza Vermes, in chapter 5 of his \textit{Scripture and Tradition}, has definitely proved that the Genesis Apocryphon at least \textit{contains} haggadic midrash. Vermes goes on to identify the genre of the entire work as midrash.\textsuperscript{111} This could be seen as excessive, but his careful study does show that the Genesis Apocryphon shows a definite affinity with later narrative midrash.\textsuperscript{112} To retrace Vermes' steps in full here would entail useless repetition. It may prove useful, however, to summarize Vermes' argument in terms of the primary characteristics of midrash (as has been already outlined) and the Genesis Apocryphon itself.

Midrash must begin with the text of scripture.\textsuperscript{113} This the Genesis Apocryphon certainly does. This is completely obvious from a first reading of it. The fact that the best preserved columns of the Genesis Apocryphon are a paraphrase of the greater parts of Genesis chapters 12,13,14, and a bit of 15 proves this adequately.\textsuperscript{114} Second, midrash must aim to contemporize the biblical text and to make it more edificatory to the present generation.\textsuperscript{115} The details found in the Genesis Apocryphon at least appear to be striving towards this goal. In Vermes' words:

\textit{The author of (the) G(enesis) A(pocryphon) does indeed try, by every means at his disposal, to make the biblical story more attractive, more real, more edifying, and above all more intelligible. Geographic data are inserted to complete}
biblical lacunae\textsuperscript{116} or to identify altered place names.\textsuperscript{117} and various descriptive touches are added to give the story substance. There were, for example, three Egyptian princes, and the name of one of them was Harkenosh. They praised Sarah as though with one mouth.\textsuperscript{118} Abraham was frightened by his dream and Sarah wept because of it. The Patriarch prayed for the deliverance of his wife and his tears flowed. He was sad when his kinsman went away from him.\textsuperscript{119} The summary statements of Genesis are often expanded to explain how the Egyptian princes praised Sarah's beauty, how God afflicted Pharaoh, how Abraham obeyed the divine command to travel through the land, how he was informed of Lot's misfortune, and so on.\textsuperscript{120}

Even from this bare summary it is clear that the primary characteristics of haggadic midrash are found in the Genesis Apocryphon.

M. Black has rightly identified, however, elements in the Genesis Apocryphon which are reminiscent of the Targums, chief among which is the fact that the Apocryphon follows the Hebrew text of Genesis in the manner of a targum.\textsuperscript{121} Other points of contact can be found, such as agreements in details, and to a lesser degree wording (not exact translation) between Pseudo-Jonathan and the Genesis Apocryphon as over against Onkelos.\textsuperscript{122} These factors led Principal Black to conclude early that the Genesis Apocryphon was a primitive or early targum,\textsuperscript{123} although he has later modified his view.\textsuperscript{124} As Fitzmyer comments:

...It is evident that the Genesis Apocryphon, though a literal translation of the Genesis text in places or in isolated phrases, is more frequently a paraphrase of the biblical text. The
phrases which are literally translated are incorporated into its own expanded account. And therefore it cannot be regarded simply as a targum.\textsuperscript{125}

So, although the characteristics of a targum are there to an extent, the Genesis Apocryphon is neither pure targum nor pure midrash.\textsuperscript{126}

Is one left, then, to stress, "the independent nature of this composition"?\textsuperscript{127} Is the Genesis Apocryphon, after all, best described in terms of a one of a kind genre? The striking similarities between it and the LXX of Daniel should be already apparent to the reader. They share the following features: a) both are translations of a biblical text,\textsuperscript{128} b) both contain narrative haggadic midrash, c) both handle the Old Testament text in a more or less verse by verse manner, d) both contain literal or almost literal translations from their Vorlage (the Old Testament books of Genesis and Daniel). Surely these characteristics are primary to a new genre--a genre common to both the Genesis Apocryphon and the Old Greek translation of the book of Daniel.

This suggestion of identity, or at least great similarity in genre between these two works is not meant to imply that they are similar in any other way--such as date or place of origin.\textsuperscript{129} H. L. Ginsberg has suggested that the genre of the Genesis Apocryphon should be called "para-biblical" literature.\textsuperscript{130} If such a genre-name be accepted
for the Genesis Apocryphon, it should probably be accepted for the LXX of Daniel as well. The phrases from Vermes and Fitzmyer cited on pages 290-292 could be cited with application to the LXX of Daniel as well, although there would have to be modification for the specific subject matter of the book itself. 130
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CHAPTER V

RAVINIC EXEGESIS

INTRODUCTION

The last major chapter of the present study deals with selected medieval rabbinic exegeses of portions of Daniel I-VI. Three rabbis have been included here; Rabbi Solomon bar Isaac (Rashi, 1040-1105), Rabbi Abraham ben Meir Ibn Ezra (Ibn Ezra, circa 1092-1167), and Rabbi Joseph Ibn Yachya. The use of the former two commentators requires no explanation or justification beyond saying that they are perhaps the two most famous medieval rabbinic exegetes. The third of the number, Ibn Yachya, requires both a rationale for his use here and a bit of background information. Background on the other two may be obtained in any number of sources, but an excellent up-to-date sketch of the lives of Rashi and Ibn Ezra may be found in the new Encyclopaedia Judaica.

Joseph ben David Ibn Yachya was born around 1494 in Florence, Italy, and died in 1534. He was not an especially prolific writer, producing only a few works, only two of which are extant. These works consist in the Torah Or, a
work on eschatology which was published in Bologna in 1538, and Perush Chamesh Megilloth U-Kethubhim, published at the same place and time and containing the current commentary on Daniel. According to the Encyclopaedia Judaica, volume VIII, column 1210, he had two other works, Derek Hayyim (a commentary on talmudical sayings) and Ner Mizvah (on the commandments). These works were burned in Padua in 1554.

Ibn Yachya is of relatively minor importance when considered in the broad sweep of Jewish exegesis. His work is rare, however, and nothing has been done with it in English to the present author's knowledge. In Montgomery's commentary on Daniel, the standard work on the book, he notes that he has not even seen Ibn Yachya's commentary, and more to this, he misdates him (page 106). He does mention that L'Empereur translated Ibn Yachya's paraphrase on Daniel into Latin in 1663. The present study is based on L'Empereur's edition of Ibn Yachya which presents the Hebrew text in one column and a Latin translation in a facing column. There are, by the way, two copies of this rare book in the stacks of the St. Andrews University Library.

Constantin Van Oppyck called himself L'Empereur, "the emperor." He was a Dutch Christian Hebrew scholar born in 1591. He was professor of Hebrew Language and Literature and Theology at the University of Leiden. He died in 1648. His official title was controversarium Judaicorum professor. He
translated many Jewish works into Latin including commentaries of Abrabanel and Kimchi, and some talmudic tractates. His edition of Ibn Yachya, *Paraphrasis in Danielem*, was published posthumously in 1663 in Amsterdam. In the main, L'Empereur merely renders Ibn Yachya's Hebrew into Latin, but at times he does comment upon Ibn Yachya's translation in the form of critical notes. For further information on L'Empereur, including a bibliography of his works, one can see the article in volume XI of *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (columns 11-12).

The procedure in the current chapter will be to cite the Aramaic text from *נְלַחַת מִלְיָה* (any differences in the text printed with Ibn Yachya's commentary will be noted). This will be followed by two parallel columns for each rabbi. The left hand column will contain the Hebrew comment; in the cases of Rashi and Ibn Ezra this will be transcribed into square script (Ibn Yachya's comments are already in square script in L'Empereur's edition). Facing this column will be the present author's English translation of the Hebrew comment. The aim of the translation has been accuracy rather than elegance and this has at times led to a wooden translation. This translation will then be amplified and explained in a comment.

The order followed will be Rashi, followed by Ibn Ezra, followed by Ibn Yachya. I have also chosen to proceed
by verses rather than give, for example, all of Rashi's comments on II.37-45, followed by all of Ibn Ezra's etc. This will allow for a closer comparison of the comments. The passages selected for exegetical comment here are II.37-45; III.15-18; IV.28-34; V.25-28; and VI.1. All these passages reflect well-known problems in exegesis. I have not tried to select all the problem passages in Daniel I-VI in the interests of some measure of brevity. The passages which are offered, it is hoped, will show the style of the individual commentators. It is interesting to note that sometimes a rabbi seems aware of the fact that the passage has problems in it, and sometimes he seems not to be.

II.37-45

Verse 37: Our sages of blessed memory explained each king of Daniel (as) a king of flesh and blood except for this instance which refers to the Holy One, blessed be he. So the solution of this is (that these words indicate) the God of Heaven.

RASHI:
name of God. Rashi must have read the text as, "(to) you, O King, the king of kings who is the God of Heaven gave..."²

Rashi's reference to "our sages" is a reference to the Talmud, Shebu'oth 35b.

All kings mentioned in Daniel are secular except this which is sacred. (Daniel would not have called Nebuchadnezzar King of Kings; the verse is therefore interpreted thus: "Thou O King (Nebuchadnezzar), unto whom the King of Kings, the God of Heaven hath given, etc.)³

Calling God "king" is a common practice in the Old Testament and Judaism. God is called king in the Old Testament, e.g. in I Samuel 12.12; Psalms 98.6; 145.1; Isaiah 6.5; 43.15; Jeremiah 46.18; 48.15; and 51.57. God is called "king" in the Mishnah in Aboth 4.22 and other places.⁴ The specific title מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ or מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ is found only once in Hebrew in Ezekiel 26.7 and the reference is to Nebuchadnezzar. The title is a frequently used Persian royal title,⁵ but was used as early as the eighteenth dynasty in Egypt and in Assyria as early as the thirteenth century BC.⁶ Apart from the present example the only example of the phrase "king of kings" in the Old Testament is in the Aramaic portion of Ezra 7.12: מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ. This obviously refers to Artaxerxes. Therefore, the other two references in the Old Testament to "king of kings" are to human figures.⁷ There does not appear to be any specific biblical reason for the tradition which Rashi hands down here. The Talmud is, however, clear
about this verse.\footnote{8}

IBN EZRA:

... as in "the mighty shall become tinder." And the Gaon has said "a weak kingdom."

To illustrate the Aramaic word אenary Ibn Ezra gives a usage of the cognate Hebrew word פליא from Isaiah 1.31. "The Gaon" is most probably Saadia Gaon who evidently wrote a complete commentary on Daniel some time in the ninth or tenth century. His commentary on Daniel is extant only in manuscript form and that is fragmentary. The commentary in which purports to be by הבני מלני חאב is a pseudepigraph dating, according to Montgomery and others, from the twelfth century AD.\footnote{9}

IBN YACHYA:

You, O King, are the king of the rest of the kings (to) whom the God of Heaven gave kingship and strength and power and glory. And you have not attained all these things by your own strength. Behold, it is called "kingdom" because he governs over the villages of one urban area, and it is called "strength" (because) he rules over the cities of one province, and it is called "power" (because he rules over provinces and districts and many climes,
and lastly it is called "glory" (importance) (because) he reigns over the whole world, and this (is) because there is no power greater than his. And God have all these things (to) Nebuchadnezzar.

Ibn Yachya starts his comment by giving a good rendering of the Aramaic text into Hebrew. He rightly interprets מַלְכָּו מִלְכִּי and makes the meaning very clear with the use of the word יֵאָשׁ "rest, remainder." He also eliminates אֲדֹנִי, the term of direct address, which led Rashi to interpret the phrase differently.\(^{10}\) His translation of the Aramaic terms מַלְכָּו, מַכְבֵּא, מַפְטִיק, and אֲדֹנִי are with the exception of the final one by means of the Hebrew cognates. The last word אֱלֹהֵי is translated by כָּלִיל which is a perfectly legitimate translation which means, of course, "importance, honor, respect, dignity."\(^ {11}\) It is at least possible that the reason why he did not use the Hebrew cognate for אֲדֹנִי (אֱלֹהֵי ) was that he used the imperfect aspect of אֲדֹנִי as a verb four times throughout the following comment. The word אֱלֹהֵי is either to be pointed as a niphal (אֲדוֹנִי'), "it is called," or a qal (אֲדוֹנִי'), "he calls (it)."

Ibn Yachya finds a reason behind the use of each term in the description of God's gift to Nebuchadnezzar. He
accentuates the fact that all these things are God's gifts by the insertion of the phrase אֱלֹהִים לְכָלֵ֑ךָ. L'Empereur has translated the obscure מֵהַלְוָ֣יִת by "(idque) ex eo quod," "on that account," which is the way it has been rendered above. כְּלִי is a variant form of כְּלֵי. Note the spelling of Nebuchadnezzar (בֶּנְùכַדנֶצֶר). By far the more common spellings are בֶּנְùכַדנֶצֶר or בֶּנְùכַדנֶצַר. The biblical spellings vary as well. It is possible that Ibn Yachya's text unintentionally metathesized the aleph and the sadhe in the setting up of the printer's type, although if this is the case, the error was also made at verse 45 of this same chapter.

Verse 38:

אֶתְכֶֽלָּךְ אִיּוּרֵל בְּנִי עַרְשֵׁי מָהַיָּה בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב שָׁפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; וַהֲקָמָֽהְתָּם אֶתְכֶֽלָּךְ הַלְוָֽיִת אֲשֶׁר גָּזָהָם בַּאֹתַהּ לְפִי נֶבֶךָ דַּנֶצֶר; וַיַּעַרְשֶׁהָ נִיבְּעֵרָה הַכְּלִי וַיְהִי אַלָּבֶֽל: וַיֶּחְלֶק אֶתְכֶֽלָּךְ בְּכָלָֽם׃

RASHI:

and he gave authority to you over all of them, (so) that if one commanded that horses should not whinney, and against birds that they should not fly; (sc. it would be so) for as it is said, "and I have given the beasts of the field to serve him" (Jeremiah 27). The image's golden head which you have seen is you! For your kingdom is strong and presently you endure, and it (i.e. your kingdom) is very important.

The abbreviation of head with לְכָלֵ֑ךָ may be used to identify it immediately with the Hebrew equivalent. The
quotation from Jeremiah 27 is actually from verse 6b. The difference between the quotation given above and the MT is slight: אַמָּה אֶת הַיָּהָה הַבּוֹתֵץ נַעֲבַרָה. The preposition plus pronominal suffix (ת) along with ב are omitted by Rashi for smoothness in the reading of the quotation. It is interesting to note that Rashi chose both to read and to write the Qere כִּי מַכְלִית. The long genitival construction כִּי מַכְלִית avoids the use of a construct string by means of הִנֵּה inserted between the second and third members of the construction. Rashi makes the meaning of the verse more vivid by inserting the phrase about the order against horses' neighing and birds flying.

**Ibn Ezra:**

בַּתּוֹת שֶׁל רִי רִיִּים כִּי מָזוּר as in "dwelling in the tents of the wicked."

Ibn Ezra also reads and writes the Qere בַּתּוֹת שֶׁל רִי רִיִּים in his text, although the Kethibh is written in the biblical text of both Rashi and Ibn Ezra. The quotation, taken from Psalm 84.11 (EV 84.10), is meant to show the usage of the word יָרָד by the usage of the cognate Hebrew participle.

**Ibn Yachya:**

(Israel, אַמָּה אֶת הַיָּהָה הַבּוֹתֵץ נַעֲבַרָה as in "And in every place where the sons of men, beasts of the field and the birds of the heavens should dwell,
he has set you in authority and has given them into your hand (i.e. power). You are the head (made) from gold.

Ibn Yachya simply renders the Aramaic into Hebrew. has been translated above as a passive. It is most likely that it is a third person plural circumlocutory passive (an impersonal passive construction). Instead of a construct-genitive relationship, he uses a of content and an anarthrous noun. The same general thought could have been expressed by the construct-genitive relationship, but the idea of material is brought out more definitely here by the use of the .

Verse 39: 

RASHI: and after you (and) after the kingdom of Belshazzar your son, a kingdom shall arise which shall remove the administration from your descendants. (This kingdom shall be) lower than and inferior to your kingdom. : inferior and lower; just as the silver is lower than and more base than the gold. Now you saw that the chest which came (literally: was) after the head was (made) of silver; just so the kingdom of the Medes and the Persians will come (literally: be) after the kingdom of Babylon (and will be) baser than Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom.
Again note how Rashi writes the Qere forms of words in his commentary (i.e. תֵּלָיָה, אָנוּכָּה). It is assumed that his biblical text had the Kethibb written as do modern texts. In his commentary he wanted a "corrected form," and so used the Qere. It is obvious that Rashi has the end of chapter V in mind here. He refers to Belshazzar and also to the Medes and the Persians. In the first part of his commentary on this verse Rashi simply gives an amplified Hebrew paraphrase of the Aramaic text (אֲלָכָּרָה...אֲלָכָּר). He then proceeds to explain the different metals as kingdoms, much as Daniel himself does, but Rashi ties the kingdoms to specific historical ones which Daniel does not do, except for the first kingdom. So the first kingdom, represented by gold, is the Babylonian empire of Nebuchadnezzar and his supposed descendents. The second kingdom, represented by silver, is the combined kingdom of Medo-Persia. Combining two kingdoms into one here eliminates the historical difficulty of finding a separate Median empire following the Babylonian. It also has the advantage of setting up the possibility for bringing the fourth kingdom into the modern world, and thus showing Daniel's chronology to be correct. Since the kingdom of the Messiah had not yet come, Rashi and his contem-
poraries were still living in the fourth kingdom.

Rashi never tells us, however, in what manner the Medo-Persian empire is to be inferior to the Babylonian. He simply sets up a two fold analogy: "Just as (a) the chest came after the head, and (b) was made of silver, so the Medo-Persian empire (the chest) will come after the Babylonian (the head), and will be inferior to it, as silver is inferior (assumedly meaning less valuable) than gold," כומת הכסףväו למשהו בברבר.

The third kingdom, represented by bronze or brass, is the kingdom of Alexander the Great. The quality of bronze which is picked out as the reason it is chosen to represent Alexander’s empire is כהון. This is an Aramaic masculine substantive in the emphatic state, from an absolute כהון meaning "strong, hard."¹⁷ This word is found in the Targums at Ezekiel 23.31 (32) and Amos 2.9 (it is also found in the Hebrew text of Amos).¹⁸ A difference must be drawn here between the כהון of the bronze and the נוע of the iron in the next verse. The various dictionaries define כהון as "immune, resistant, mighty, strong, powerful, withstanding."¹⁹ The word נוע is defined as "stiff, hard, difficult, strong, heavy, severe, serious, fierce, wicked, melancholy, incomprehensible, cruel, hard-hearted, stubborn, obstinate, obdurate, injurious, harmful, violent."²⁰ Even with this raw series of verbal equivalents the differences
between the two words begins to emerge. Words take on specific meanings in specific contexts. The context of here is determined by and . One must therefore think of in terms of "brass" and "ruling." It becomes clear in relation to these words that in the present verse means something like "durable" enough to withstand the pressures of ruling. This is far different from which must be seen in the context of verse 40 and will be commented on at the appropriate time.

IBN EZRA:

and after you will arise an inferior kingdom; as in "the lower targum. is written because the ground is lower than everything. The great Saadia Gaon said (and all the (other) commentators depend on him) that the gold was the kingdom of Babylon--Nebuchadnezzar and his son Evil Merodach and his grandson Belshazzar. And with him (i.e. Belshazzar) the Chaldean kingdom was cut off. For it is written, "In that very night Belshazzar the king was slain and Darius the Mede received the kingdom." Now (this) information is accurate, for Scripture says, "and the nations served him and his son and his grandson," and furthermore it is written, "and they became slaves to him and his sons," who were Evil-Merodach and his son Belshazzar. For a son's son may be called a son, (analogously to the way which is found in the passage) "(unto) Reuel their father," whereas Hobab is (also called) the father-in-law of Moses."
And it is written: "And it came to pass in the thirty-seventh year of the exile of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, (that) Evil Merodach, king of Babylon, lifted up..." And behold he reigned (literally: was) between the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and the reign of Belshazzar. And the silver is the kingdom of the Medes and the Persians, and let me say (OR: I shall expound) (that) there is a great error in the narration of them (OR: in the numbering of (the years of) them). And the bronze, this is the kingdom of Greece (Jawan) and its beginning was Alexander the Macedonian as Daniel will explain in his prophecies. And the Gaon has said that the fourth kingdom is the kingdom of Aram. "And behold it will be strong,' and this is the kingdom of Ishmael, and there is no reference to it in the book of Daniel, but it was greater in length and breadth than any of the above mentioned kingdoms. And he (i.e. Saadia) says that the kingdom of Aram was like iron, and the clay is the kingdom of Ishmael. And again he says in his treatise, "do not be surprised because of the fact of the similarity of the Ishmaelite kingdom to clay for, behold, it is not inferior to the above mentioned kingdoms (for) this is (merely) the way that he (i.e. Daniel) enumerates the order of its (i.e. the image's) members. For at first he sees the gold and afterwards he sees the silver and afterwards he sees the bronze and after (this) the iron and finally the clay limbs (OR: members). Now these are random (miscellaneous, unimportant) matters,
for there is not (actually) an appropriate order for the arrangement of it (i.e. the image). But the evidence that Daniel gives concerning the kingdom of Persia is (that it is) "inferior to you, just as silver is inferior to gold." And the truth is that the clay is part of the kingdom iron, which he says explicitly concerning the toes of iron and the toes of clay: "part of the kingdom will be strong," but the clay shall be brittle. And behold, it is a single kingdom. So how can the Ishamelite kingdom be associated with the kingdom of Aram since the Ishmaelites did not rule over it and (since) their religious customs are different? And after this matter (is settled) there is still a mystery; how (comes it) that Daniel does not mention the Ishmaelite kingdom and why are there not five kingdoms? And now I shall explain: Know that Alexander, who was king of Jawan (Greece), was the one who slew Darius the Persian as Daniel will explain. He was also the king of Aram. Now Aram is in reality Kittim as Joseph ben Gorion related in his book and (as it is found) in Daniel: "and ships from Kittim shall come against him." And it is obvious that it is as I shall explain; also (see) the Targum: "and ships from the might of Kittim shall be sent from Rome." And behold Kittim is the son of Jawan ("Elisha, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim"). If this is the case, the bronze kingdom is the kingdom of Jawan and the kingdom of Aram is the kingdom of Jawan.
If this (in turn) is the case, the iron is the Ishmaelite kingdom. For just as the kingdom of Persia destroyed the entire Chaldean kingdom, so even the kingdom of Jawan destroyed the entire Persian kingdom. But the Ishmaelite kingdom, which is iron, was not able to overcome the kingdom of Jawan, but only destroyed part of that kingdom. And behold to this day there are places where the Ishmaelites will overcome the kingdom of Aram and places where the Ishmaelites are being overcome. Therefore it says, "part of the kingdom will be brittle and part of it will be strong;" and afterwards it says, "in the days of those kings." The sense of the two kingdoms: the kingdom of Aram is the kingdom of Jawan and the kingdom of the Ishmaelites. And behold, they are two kingdoms in the present day. And the fourth kingdom, this is the kingdom of the Ishmaelites who have spread out over the world so that they have turned all Persians and Medes and Shebites and Sabeans and Egyptians and Africans and many people of India and the majority of the people of Ethiopia to their religious law.

This is undoubtedly the most detailed comment, and in many ways the most confusing, of any of the three Rabbis. Important abbreviations in the piece are: 'נ" = 7 with the numerical value = 1711: (line 29); 'לעמש = 7: (line 33); 'לערכ = 7: (line 86); 'לער = 7: (line 88). The first difficulty arises in identifying תבות. This document is referred to in the commentary of Pseudo-Saadia as
well. Evidently it explains נב as יול because nothing is lower than the ground. Another possibility is that Ibn Ezra here uses this example of a targum which is inferior to the standard Targums (Onkelos, Jonathan) and so simply called "lower." This is an analogy to the way in which the second kingdom will be inferior to the first. There is no possible dependence of Ibn Ezra on Pseudo-Saadia because in the next lines he cites a section from the genuine commentary of Saadia Gaon. It is likely that Pseudo-Saadia as well as and Ibn Ezra are dependent on an independent source. Lines 4 and following refer to the commentary of Saadia Gaon. It is very confusing to try and sort out Ibn Ezra's statements from those of Saadia, but it is necessary to do so because Ibn Ezra disagrees with Saadia at this point in the text.

Lines 4-11 evidently cite Saadia's commentary. Here Saadia identifies the gold with the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, his son Evil Merodach and his grandson Belshazzar. It is very likely that Saadia was here taking the three Babylonian kings mentioned in the Old Testament to be the only three, and more to this, to be in one dynasty. It is true that Evil Merodach (Amel-Marduk) was the son of Nebuchadnezzar. He reigned for only two years and was killed by Neriglissar, Nebuchadnezzar's son-in-law, who reigned circa 559-556. He was succeeded for one year by Labashi-Marduk,
Nebuchadnezzar's grandson. When Nabonidus, the last neo-
Babylonian monarch, began to reign in 555, he began a whole
new dynasty, unrelated to that of Nebuchadnezzar (at least
directly). He was also the only member of that dynasty to sit on the throne, although he did have a son, Belshazzar, who may have acted in his place for a time. 22 Whatever the actual relationship of Nabonidus' house to that of Nebuchad-
nezzar, it is clear that Belshazzar was not the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. In the fifth chapter of the book of Daniel Nebuchadnezzar is called Belshazzar's father. This relationship, as drawn from Daniel, is the basis for a further com-
ment beginning in line 16 concerning an analogous kind of structure found concerning Reuel and Hobab, the father-in-
law of Moses. In Exodus 2.18, the passage cited by Ibn Ezra in line 17, Reuel is called Moses' father, but in Numbers 10.29 and Judges 4.11 (where he is called Hobab); and in Exodus 3.1; 4.18; 18.1 ff. (where he is called Jethro) this individual is called the father-in-law of Moses. Moreover, in Numbers 10.29 Reuel is the father of Hobab. Since both of these men could be called the father or father-in-law of Moses, it is very possible that a grandson (Belshazzar) could be called a son. In any case, Saadia (and it is presumed Ibn Ezra) accepted Belshazzar as the last king of Babylon on the basis of Daniel V. He reinforces this belief by two proof-texts, one from Daniel V.30 and the other from VI.1a.
It is difficult to know the historical source of Saadia's knowledge that Evil Merodach was the son of Nebuchadnezzar. This information is not in the Bible, but by Saadia's day any number of sources could have been used and it is relatively fruitless to try to determine which of them it could be.23

The citation from Saadia goes on in lines 19-21 where he gives a rough quotation from II Kings 25.27 and Jeremiah 52.31. This was evidently done with the aim of further proving that Evil Merodach was a king and of fixing his reign within a broad chronological scheme. There are several deviations from the MT in Saadia's Bible-quotation. In the first place Saadia cites only selected bits of the biblical text. He leaves out any mention of the month and the day of Evil Merodach's action. Also eliminated is "in the year that he became king," and any mention of lifting the Judean king's head, that is, setting him free. This can be seen very clearly in a comparison of the biblical passages (which are very near to one another) with Saadia's citation of them.

II Kings 25.27/Jeremiah 52.31:  
Saadia (according to Ibn Ezra):  
Saadia:  
II Kings/Jeremiah:  
Saadia:  
II Kings/Jeremiah:  
Saadia:  
II Kings/Jeremiah:  
Saadia:
The fact that Saadia cites only a part of the biblical verse can be easiest explained as a shorthand; giving all that is necessary for the establishment of the salient facts. If one, on the other hand, wishes to read this material as a complete sentence, one could point אשה as השה (a niphal) "be lifted up," i.e. assume the throne. The partial quotation really gives very little difficulty. What is more significant is that, assuming that Ibn Ezra is correctly citing Saadia here, there is a different Judean king mentioned, Jehoiakim rather than Jehoiachin, in Saadia. II Kings 24.6 plainly states that Jehoiakim died at a date which would be long before Evil Merodach was even on the throne (וֹשֵׁבֶת הָיָה מְרוֹדָךְ עַל הָעֵתִיב), that is 598 BC. Evil Merodach came to the throne in about 560 BC. The only possible reason for this change of name is that while Jehoiakim is named in Daniel (chapter I), Jehoiachin never is. Rashi makes a correction from Jehoiakim to Jehoiachin in his commentary to VI.1. One can only assume that Ibn Ezra is following Saadia here as normative. It is possible that there is a printing error in מחלי at this point as well. It is incredible to assume that Ibn Ezra would not have commented upon so blatant an error as misciting a biblical source.

According to Saadia the second kingdom, represented by silver is the combined kingdom of Medo-Persia (so Rashi
also) and the third or bronze kingdom is the kingdom of Jawan whose originator was Alexander the Great. The fourth kingdom is the kingdom of Aram. It is best to leave Aram vague rather than identifying it directly with Rome at the present time. In line 46 Saadia actually says:

Ibn Ezra then terminates his citation of Saadia Gaon to take issue with him. His first attack is upon Saadia's statement that the matter of the relationship of order of the image's parts to inferiority isinas. Ibn Ezra easily dispatches this argument by a citation from verse 39:26 He then makes a value judgment, "just as silver is inferior to gold" (lines 48-49). His second point of contention with Saadia is the latter's contention that they are two separate kingdoms, the iron being Aram and the clay being Ishmael. Ibn Ezra contends that the clay is part of the iron kingdom which he supports with a loose citation from
verse 42: He then asks a rhetorical question: "How can Aram be associated with Ishmael since their customs, etc., are very different?" Furthermore, if the iron and clay are separate why are there not five kingdoms (instead of four)? Ibn Ezra here, one assumes, means four kingdoms before that "stone cut without hands" becomes a fifth kingdom.

The third kingdom Ibn Ezra identifies with Alexander the Great. Through a rather complex series of associations Ibn Ezra identifies Aram and Jawan as the same thing. This contradicts Saadia who sees the fourth kingdom as Aram, and the third kingdom as Jawan. Ibn Ezra combines Aram and Jawan into one kingdom so as to have room for the Ishmaelites as the fourth kingdom. Now Jawan is the same as Kittim. Aram and Jawan are equivalent. Therefore Aram is also equivalent to Kittim. To support this theory Ibn Ezra cites, first Daniel XI.20 and then the Targum (Onkelos) to Numbers 24.24. In addition he cites the history of Joseph ben Gorion. An examination of these sources will be helpful.

According to Schloessinger the history of ben Gorion was a supposed chronicle of the Jews from the release from the Babylonian captivity in 539 BC until the destruction of Jerusalem by Rome in 70 AD. This book was most probably written sometime in the tenth century by a Jew living in southern Italy. The work is also known as the history of
Yosippon, Josephus Gorionides and pseudo-Josephus. Ibn Ezra also cites Joseph ben Gorion in his commentary on Psalms 105.5 and Rashi alludes to him in his comment to Daniel VI.29. The work was most probably expanded at many points by many different hands, but was widely read and believed to be accurate in the Middle Ages.28

As far as the actual citation from Daniel is concerned; it is most likely a reminiscence of Numbers 24.24, גarness Kittim. In this section of the text of Daniel it is most likely that the Romans are meant. "The allusion (to ships from Kittim) is pregnant, for we read on in Balaam: 'they shall humble Ashur (i.e. Syria), and shall humble Eber (Abar-naharaim), and he (Antiochus!) shall be unto destruction.'"29 The fact that Kittim = Rome here is made plain by the Targum. This reference to the תרגומונת is to the Targum Onkelos of Numbers 24.24.30 The manner of citation from the Targum here requires discussion.

"Ships from the quarter of Kittim" (אַזֶּים מִכָּתִים) is from the MT of Numbers 24.24. The verb שָׂם is neither from the MT nor Onkelos, although שָׂם is similar in tense to a variant reading in the Targum, רָאָס הָעַר.31 The text of the Targum, according to Sperber, is to be read רָאָס הָעַר, an ithpael imperfect plural from רָאָס "to be assembled together." The variant reading is a perfect of the same root plus the relative particle. Now the MT has no verb at this
point and so Ibn Ezra either supplied one and gave it an Aramaic form or found the verb in the Targum itself. If Ibn Ezra did not have הָרֵעַ in his text, it is most probable that he read a perfect plural without the relative particle. The last two words in line 72 are drawn from the Targum to Numbers 24.24, although not from the same text used by Sperber. A two-word reading is, however, found in three old texts dating from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, but since Ibn Ezra himself reads two words here that reading can be considered to be at least three centuries older than 1490. The Targum does not read "ships" as the MT does, but rather יְָד "forces." It appears that Ibn Ezra has combined the readings of the MT and the Targum with some other source (that is, for הָרֵעַ) as a proof-text for his case that Kittim is equal to Aram (Rome).

The next step in Ibn Ezra's argument is to show that Kittim is the son of Jawan which he does by citing Genesis 10.4 where the sons of Jawan are named as Elisha, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim. Not only does Genesis 10.4 name Kittim as the son of Jawan, but he is named in third place. This latter argument may not be of great importance here, but it is interesting to note that Jawan is the third kingdom.

Ibn Ezra has now established to his own satisfaction that the bronze kingdom consists of Greece (Jawan) and Rome (Aram). He states, first, that Alexander was the king of
Greece (line 64)--an undisputed fact. He then goes on to make a surprising statement; that he was also the king of Aram (lines 66-67). He attempts to prove this by connecting Aram with Kittim using ben Gorion, Daniel XI.30 and the Targum to Numbers 24.24. He also indirectly equates Aram with Rome by his appeal to the Targum. He then finds that according to Genesis 10.4 Kittim (i.e. Aram, Rome) is the third son of Jawan (Greece). Therefore, Kittim (Aram, Rome) is related to Jawan (Greece) and Alexander can be said to be the king of both. All this Ibn Ezra does to combine Greece and Rome into the third kingdom, much as Media and Persia are combined into the second.

According to Ibn Ezra the fourth kingdom is the Ishmaelite Empire; the third and fourth kingdoms are co-existent. The Arabs were not able to obliterate the whole of Graeco-Roman culture. Some places in the world saw the Arabs as dominant while others saw the remnants of the Graeco-Roman Empire as superior.36 This intermingling and competition of the third and the fourth kingdoms is what Daniel means by the statement "part of the kingdom will be brittle and part will be strong."37 This citation from II. 42 is loose. The order of אכיבת and אָּלָם is reversed, the later Aramaic form ייתנ replaces אָלָם, and the לָלֵג-לִי is placed together (לָלֵג לִי) and repeated instead of having לָלֵג in the second line as the MT does. The fact that the third
and fourth kingdoms are contemporaneous is proved by the phrase in II.44, cited precisely here, יָנוּרָיִם נְיָוָיִם, "in the days of those kings" (plural not singular and referring to the emperors of the third and fourth kingdoms).

Lines 89-91 (יחננאל ...) are some of the most confusing lines in the comment. Ibn Ezra seems here to identify Aram with the combined empires of Jawan and Ishmael. This would mean that Aram, which along with Greece has been identified with the Ishmaelite Empire, is also to be identified with the fourth kingdom.

This is all very confusing, but it is probable that lines 89 ff. are to be interpreted as follows. The third kingdom is the combined Graeco-Roman culture—alive currently in the Holy Roman Empire. The fourth kingdom is the Islamic Empire, which was widespread in Ibn Ezra's day as lines 94-97 show. According to him the Arabs had taken over all Iran (Persians and Medes), Africa (by this he most probably means northern Africa), as well as parts of India. This is, of course, not to mention the Arabian Peninsula and the traditional Arab homelands.

**IBN YACHYA:**

And after you shall arise a second kingdom inferior to you, and a third kingdom (shall arise) after it (made) from bronze, which (kingdom) shall rule over all the earth.
There is no direct comment given here. Ibn Yachya is merely translating Aramaic into Hebrew. One thing deserves mention. He is treating the abstract noun נָבַל as a masculine noun whereas it is most places considered to be a feminine. This is seen in the fact that he uses a masculine adjective (םֶשֶה) and a masculine pronominal suffix (י-) to refer to the kingdom. A possible reason for this is that Ibn Yachya was thinking of the concept of kingship. Kingship in the case of the book of Daniel resides in a man.

Both Ibn Yachya and Rashi use the adjective to describe this kingdom. It is also worth noting that L'Empereur's biblical text prints the Qere not the Kethibh קִנֵּיתא.

Verse 40:

RASHI:

וסֶכֶן בִּבְשֵׁי יָכְנֵיתא נָבַל כְּכֹל דַּלְעָל בְּכָל- ספרי ד: 

It is hard like iron; as you saw the legs (which are in fourth place with regard to the head, next to the chest and belly), and they were made of iron. מֶשֶה וּקִנֵּיתא כְּכֹל דַּלְעָל בְּכָל- ספרי ד: "and crushes"; and there is much (concerning this) in the Gemara: "kettle forgers" (Kethuboth 77a), "crushed testicles" (Hullin 93a). ולפי ד: all these varieties of metals (which) you saw in the image. וּקִנֵּיתא כְּכֹל דַּלְעָל בְּכָל- ספרי ד: it will shatter (them) and break (them) into bits.
"נְפָשִׁים" is a simple abbreviation for the plural, or possibly for the dual, נְפָשָׁה, "the legs." נּוֹי abbreviates אַלּוֹבָּא, "in the Gemara." This verse has several difficulties involved in the commentary. The first is that the occurrence of the word "iron" in line 2 is in Aramaic and not in Hebrew as one would expect in a Hebrew commentary. This may indicate that the phrase is found somewhere in the Gemara of the Talmud and is thus a quotation here. The use of the plural numeral דְּכָעָה must indicate the ordinal "fourth." The most likely reason for the plural (the singular is דְּכָעָה) is that there is more than one place or thing under discussion here; that is, the head is first place, the chest is second place, etc. By pointing out this sequence Rashi at least implies that there is a chronological order to the kingdoms. The words הש"ה are rather unfortunately defined so that the Aramaic word הש"ה is defined by the Hebrew הש"ה which is the cognate of the first Aramaic word. According to J. Slotki, the Aramaic word הש"ה is used in later times to indicate a smith's hammer. This is shown clearly by Rashi's drawing the words "kettle forgers" (i.e. "kettle smiths") from the Talmud. He also draws forth another meaning from the Talmud; that of "crushed." הש"ה, then, for Rashi means "to stamp, beat, press, crush." פֵּרֵד is a haphel participle in Aramaic and a hiphil participle in Hebrew. In either language the meaning is "to pound, grind, pulverize,
crush, destroy."⁴¹ יַד means "to beat down, flatten, trample on." At one place Rashi says that׆דר means "to pound, grind, pulverize, crush" ( פֶּרֶ'י) and adjacent to this he says it means "to beat down, flatten, trample on" ( יַד). This most probably shows that he considered the words יַד,׆דר, and פֶּרֶ'י to be without a great difference in meaning. They could all be said to belong to the word group "to beat or crush" within a more general semantic field or "to destroy."

Much as it was important to look at the bronze in relation to its context of "durability" ( פֶּרֶ'י) in the previous verse, so it is important to look at the iron in the light of a functional description and a context. The context here is פֶּרֶ'י, "stiff, hard, difficult, etc.,"⁴² and the words which describe the function of the iron are פֶּרֶ'י,׆דר, יַד ( פֶּרֶ'י). It is clear that while both פֶּרֶ'י and פֶּרֶ'י indicate a type of strength, this strength differs with the primary function assigned to it. For the iron kingdom it would seem that the primary function is strength as regards striking and crushing opponents, and so perhaps "hardness (with regard to metals), severity, or cruelty (as regards a human kingdom)."

Rashi has now set up all four kingdoms. The first is Babylon, the second is Medo-Persia, the third is Greece, and the fourth, although not specifically identified
historically yet, is Rome. If one assumes that the commentary on Daniel was written some time around the last quarter of the eleventh century, Rashi had somewhere between nine and ten centuries of Jewish tradition behind him which set up the four kingdoms this way, the first apparently being 4 Ezra (2 Esdras) and Josephus.

**IBN EZRA:**

Since he had commented so extensively upon the identification of the kingdoms, etc., in his comment to verse 39, Ibn Ezra evidently felt no need to make comment on the present verse.

**IBN YACHYA:**

And after it a fourth kingdom (shall arise) which shall be strong like iron, and just as iron destroys and breaks and cuts off everything, so it will break up and smash all the rest of those who exist from the previous kingdoms.

For the words meaning "to crush, etc.," Ibn Yachya uses פְּלִים, פְּלָפָל, בּוּר, etc. It is difficult to tell at certain points which Hebrew word is meant to render which Aramaic one. This is because Ibn Yachya paraphrases the Aramaic. It seems as if he translates כִּכֶּר at one place (the first occurrence) with כִּכֶּר whereas in the second occurrence of the word בּוּר is used. The words כִּכֶּר
and מַצָּבָה are both fairly common words in Biblical Hebrew. מַצָּבָה, which at one point renders כָּבוֹד and at another point renders שָׁמָּה, means "to break in pieces, break asunder, shatter, destroy." The fact that Ibn Yachya uses מַצָּבָה to render both כָּבוֹד and שָׁמָּה, and that שָׁמָּה is seemingly rendered by two different words within a space of a few lines would lead one to believe that, like Rashi, he is working with practical synonyms at this point. It is worth noting that according to Ibn Yachya all remains of kingdoms one to three are destroyed at the foundation of kingdom number four.

Verse 41: מַצָּבָה, Potter's clay; and there is much in the Gemara concerning vessels of the potter. לא כל מה מַצָּבָה: It will be a divided kingdom, two of its kings will be both strong and weak, as will be explained below (in the passage), "part of the kingship (OR: kingdom) will be strong." Also, the weak one will prevail over the others by means of his friend's strength so (that) they will be in awe of him. Now this (is what is meant by) "some of the strength of iron will be in (OR: with) it (OR: him)," (that is), some of the quality of iron is in the weak king.
Rashi's rendering of the second phrase gives a fairly literal rendering of בָּשַׁלְתְכֶלּרְאָה, but goes on to draw out the phrase's meaning. He explains that two kings will have strong and weak characteristics. He verifies this interpretation with a citation from verse 42. The two kings (or possibly kingdoms), one weak and the other strong, is Rashi's interpretation of the mixture of iron with clay.

There is an abbreviation in the text, "שֲּׁלִּים," "by means of, through." Rashi's comment on verse 41 here obviates in his mind the need for any comment to be made on the following verse.

IBN EZRA:

Ibn Ezra interprets the Aramaic words "potter's clay" by their Hebrew equivalents. The comment does not refer to the interpretation of אֶבֶּלֶּתְכֶלְאָה, but rather to the whole first part of the verse (זֶבַחְו...תְבֶּלְאָה). The Aramaic word נַכְבָּתְא is a feminine-singular-determined (emphatic) noun from כַּבָּב which is rendered by the Hebrew...
word נָכֹ, "strength." If one looks in the lexicon one finds that at least traditionally the two words mean much the same thing. In Aramaic וְלַעֲדַז usually means "plant," which meaning is reflected in the translations of the LXX and Theodotion (יוֹקָה), along with Aquila and Symmachus (יוֹרְוּ). The Vulgate has plantario, which is equivalent to יָרַוּ. The Peshitta presents יָרֵוּ, which is simply a transliteration of the Aramaic characters into Syriac ones. According to Montgomery the movement of thought is as follows: "stick>stock>stocky." He translates: "it (the whole) will have (partake) of the strength (stockiness) of iron." This could easily account for the use of the word נָכֹ here. Some older grammarians and commentators have drawn וְלַעֲדַז and בֵּי (II.8) from the root בֵּי which means "to make certain" in VIII.19. It could be that the roots בֵּי (Hebrew: "take one's stand") and גֵּא (Hebrew: "to take one's stand") are related in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew. In any case the translation given by Ibn Ezra (and to a lesser extent by Rashi) is the traditional definition of נָכֹ. The participle בֵּי Ibn Ezra has defined to mean the same as the cognate Hebrew word in the quotation from Psalm 106.35, בֵּי. It is probable that Ibn Ezra expected that the participle here would be taken as a passive/reflexive as it is in Psalm 106.35, but also as further
specified as having been mixed שֵׁפָרָה as well.

The only other point to note is that Ibn Ezra here has the Kethibh פֶּן מִלְבָּד printed in his text, at least in תַּחַת. This is different to Ibn Yachya who has the Qere, מְבִיא, in his text.54

IBN YACHYA:

And as you saw the feet and the toes partly of potter's clay and partly of iron; this is to imply that it will be a divided kingdom and some of the stoutness of the iron will be in the clay, just as you saw the iron mix with the clay.

One cannot usually tell a difference in pointing (or vocalization) between Ibn Yachya's biblical text and BHK.7. The only difference here is that Ibn Yachya prints no Kethibh/Qere on חָמֵר. It is not known to the present author where the biblical text which L'Empereur used originated. What is clear is that there is no massoretic apparatus. The simplest solution to this problem here is to print the Qere in the text. This would mean that there is a religious attitude towards the consonants of the text which would allow one to print the Qere in the text instead of considering the consonants sacred and placing the variant reading in the margin.

The comment or paraphrase of Ibn Yachya is fairly
close to its Aramaic original. The phrase מָשָׁה is meant as a clarifier, but it really adds little. The rather difficult אַבְדָּה is rendered by מִשָּה, "stoutness" which is wholly in line with modern commentators. L'Empereur mistranslates here by rendering with nitidus, -a, -um, "gleam, polished quality." The abbreviations חֶלֶבֶן and כָּלֶבֶן are simply plurals חֶלֶבֶן and כָּלֶבֶן.

Verse 42: אַבְדָּה כַּלֶבֶן: They are the Ishmaelite princes and the kings in the East and in the West.

Here Ibn Ezra specifically identifies the toes of the image which neither Rashi nor Ibn Yachya do at this particular point. The toes are not only represented by the Ishmaelite princes, but also by a rather vague group of kings who rule in the East and West. It is very difficult to say just whom specifically Ibn Ezra is trying to identify by this nomenclature.

IBN YACHYA:

אַבְדָּה כַּלֶבֶן: And the toes of the feet (are) partly of clay and partly of iron; (this is) to indicate that some of the kingdom will be strong like iron and part of it (will be) broken and weak like clay.

(RASHI DOES NOT COMMENT ON THIS VERSE)
Again here Ibn Yachya offers a reliable Hebrew Paraphrase of the Aramaic text. He reverses the order from "partly iron, partly clay," to "partly clay, partly iron" for no obvious reason. In the biblical text accompanying his paraphrase the first instance of מְלֵךְ is written in the Kethibh form whereas the second instance has מְלֵךְ. This difference is most likely due to carelessness. With this exception all the other occurrences print the Qere מְלֵךְ.

Verse 43:

RASHI:

They will marry with the rest of the nations, but they will not make peace with them, or truly and wholly unite with them, and their laws are different from the laws of the rest of the nations. Surely this is so! (OR: Is this not so?) For iron and clay are not easily cohesive.

Rashi uses the hithpael of מְלֵךְ meaning "to become related by marriage" to both translate and interpret which simply means "to mingle." He expands the biblical text to give the explanation about the difference in laws. Included in this word "law" (Law) is a word which includes religion and general customs in addition to the more normal
meaning lex. The word originally came from Persian.
Rashi has attempted no identification of the clay and has
still not mentioned the equation of the iron with the Ro-
man Empire. He takes the words רְאוֹם, which probably
should be read as ראה for רְאִית, meaning "as," as אָל
"behold" plus אָל "when, as." What he means by אָלָה is
perhaps "in other words" or "is this not like the expression
for the iron and clay..." Rashi is, in other words, pointing
to the meaning of the line רְאוֹם in the bib-
litical text.

**IBN EZRA:**

דִּרְחָמוֹת טְועֵמָה מְעָרֶכֶנִים שָׁכְלוֹם
לֹא קָחֻת בֵּנוֹת גוּם כֶּסֶת פְּרֶסֶים
לֹא קָחֻת בֵּנוֹת קְרֵיכָה מְעָרֶכֶנִים
הַשָּׁבָטיִים לֹא קָחֻת בֵּנוֹת מְעָרֶכֶנִים
בָּשֲׁלַחְיוֹתֶם אֲגַלְוָאִים מְעָרֶכֶנִים
כִּי בִּנְכָּה שָׁמֶשׁ נָאָבָם רָאוֹם
מְכָר בֵּבֶר הֶזֶּה הָדֶשֶׁה
סָמְכִיָּה לֵיָא הָמָרָא שְׁבָכָא
אָלִיךְ נַכְלָא

The sense of נַכְלָא is that the daughters of the na-
tions take all of them as spouses. Just as the Persian
men take Babylonian women as wives, and the Sheban men take
Egyptian women as wives, al-
though they are dissimilar to
one another in their composi-
tion or their dress or their
food or their customs. Also
(tHERE IS) a difference in their
Teaching (literally: law); so
much more the sons of Ham who
are on the southwest side, on
the side towards the sea which
is called Ocean.

The abbreviations here are: מְעָרֶכֶנִים = מְעָרֶכֶנִים. The most important word in lines 1-4 is רְאוֹם.
This word is, of course, a participle meaning "to take." The
word has three different terminations here. In the first
case it is a feminine plural and in the last two instances
they are masculine plurals. In the first clause (ד'-,_ERR) the construct-genitive must be the subject because it, like the participle, is feminine plural. The correct translation is literally, "...that all of them (subject follows) the daughters of the nations take."

The next question is the specific reference of the word נִּפְּל here. The word can mean "to buy." If one chooses this meaning one must understand מִּמֶּלֶךְ and translate "(that) from all of them the daughters of the nations buy." This slides over a very important factor, that is, the gender of ד' and נִּפְּל (masculine) and מִּמֶּלֶךְ (feminine). It can hardly be an accident that these pairs are masculine and feminine; male Persians and Shebans, female Babylonians and Egyptians. The word נִּפְּל here must have the meaning "to take as spouse" as it does in Genesis 20.2,3. Ibn Ezra understands מִּמֶּלֶךְ to be marriage (as do Rashi and almost all modern commentators). 62

A remaining question is the identity of the נִּפְּל. Sheba was at least traditionally located in southwestern Arabia around Yemen, although there is conflicting evidence which places it in Africa. Genesis 10.7 (also I Chronicles 1.9) makes a differentiation between Seba and Sheba, both of whom through Cush are descended through Ham. On the other hand, Sheba is a descendent of Shem in Genesis 10.28 (I Chronicles 1.22). Furthermore, there is a reference in
Genesis 25.3 (I Chronicles 1.32) to the fact that Sheba is the grandson of Abraham. According to G. W. van Beek this means that Sheba/Seba (which according to him are identical) are related to both the people of the fertile crescent and to those of Africa. The people designated as Shebans are south Arabians.\(^63\) It is interesting to note that if Seba and Sheba are really identical Seba is connected with Egypt in Isaiah 43.4. Indeed Genesis 10.6-7 has both Seba and Sheba as descendents of Egypt. The fact that as far as Ibn Ezra was concerned these people are from the southwestern part of Arabia may be seen in the phrase ...\(^63\) and the fact that the Sabean state fell into Islamic hands in 628 AD and was still so at his time.\(^64\)

The word διανοια is a transliteration of the Greek Ωκεανος which came to mean the "outer sea" as opposed to the Mediterranean (inner) sea.\(^65\) Southwest Arabia is on the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden, the latter of which could be construed to be a part of the Indian Ocean and thus διανοια.\(^66\)

What Ibn Ezra is saying could be summed up as follows: "Mixing after the seed of men" indicates mixed marriages between ethnic or racial groups. Although these groups will be related maritally they will be diffuse as concerns their customs and laws. The illustrations of the point are drawn from the mixed marriages between Persians and Babylonians, along with Shebans and Egyptians.
And as you saw the iron mixing with the clay; (this is) to indicate that they shall be mixing after the seed of men, but will not cling one to another, just as iron does not mix with clay.

There are two differences between Ibn Yachya's biblical text and that of both BHK.7 and י'ד. The latter read ריח. The text printed alongside of Ibn Yachya's commentary reads the Qere י which on the first word and adds the pure long vowel indicator to the second. The first change has already been encountered. It was thought best to print the Qere since there was no massoretic apparatus in Ibn Yachya's text. The latter addition was as a mater lectionis to aid in the reading of the unpointed text. Other than these differences, both of which are of a minor textual nature, the Hebrew is a solid paraphrase of the Aramaic text. Ibn Yachya correctly understands י"ע as מושב.68

Verse 44: רashi:

לפי רashi מקם ויקרא כב נק' עליהrello הפי בתרי א""ל ומנבש עליהrello הפי

Rashi: ולפי רashi מקם ויקרא כב נק' עליהrello הפי בתרי א""ל ומנבש עליהrello הפי

And in the days of those kings (that is) while the Roman Empire is still standing. ויבי ישראל: The Holy One, blessed be he, (shall establish) an everlasting kingdom.
(which) shall never be destroyed. And this (literally: it) is the kingdom of the king Messiah. It will shatter and exterminate all these kingdoms.

Here Rashi makes at least a tenuous connection between the iron kingdom and the Roman Empire. "The days of those kings" is understood as the time when the Roman Empire is still standing. It is hard to decide on the basis of this evidence just what Rashi considers to be the Roman Empire. It is assumed that he has some schema for projecting the Roman Empire into his day, perhaps using the vehicle of the Holy Roman Empire which was, of course, in existence in his time. The fifth kingdom Rashi interprets as the messianic kingdom. In the next verse the Aramaic text of Daniel names this kingdom as equivalent to the stone "cut without hands." The Aramaic text has the kingdom being established by God and thus his kingdom. Nowhere is a messianic figure mentioned.

IBN EZRA:

The kingdom of the Messiah. It will never be abandoned nor will it ever be left alone. And the sense of ́ד אתב יי is, not by strength and not by might, but of its own accord in the end-time.

The first thing to remember is that this verse is the interpretation of verse 34, which tells of the stone
Ibn Ezra's comment elucidates verse 34 as much as it does the present verse. He gives three comments on the verse. The first is under the rubric of "in the days of (those kings)." The words which give the clue to the comment here are not רֵעֵב בְּבֵית, but רֵעֵב בְּבֵית. From the facts that God sets up the kingdom and that it is to be an impregnable one Ibn Ezra deduces that it must be the messianic kingdom. The verbs לָמוּ עַל וְלָמוּ עַל are interpreted by two niphals בֵּית and בֵּית. The Aramaic words mean "destroyed, forsaken (left alone)." It is almost as if Ibn Ezra ignored the plain meaning of לָמוּ עַל "to be destroyed," and translated לָמוּ עַל by two Hebrew synonyms. This is permissible, however, since Ibn Ezra is commenting not translating. The third comment uses the verse from the word לָמוּ עַל to the end as its basis. The comment does not explicate לָמוּ עַל at all, but rather gives the meaning of "not made by hands" in verses 34 and 45. The final word in line 4 is מִצֶּרֶא which is literally rendered as "from her bone." מִצֶּרֶא can be used as the reflexive pronoun, as in Aboth 1.15: אָם אֵלךְ אִנִּי סֵלֶל וּכְזֶרֶא לֵאָּמֶר יְעַמְּרֵי אָלִין, "if I am not for myself who is for me? And being for my own self what am I?" The word with a pronominal suffix and a prefixed לִ is listed by Alcalay as meaning "of one's own accord, by itself." The reason why the feminine suffix is used is, of course, because מִ is a feminine noun.
And in the days of those kings the God of Heaven will establish a kingdom which will never be destroyed and a kingdom which shall never be forsaken to another people besides itself. It will crush and cut off all these kingdoms and it will stand forever.

Ibn Yachya gives a Hebrew paraphrase of the Aramaic biblical text with little significant change.

Verse 45:

Just as you saw a stone broken off from the mountain which shattered the entire image. This is the interpretation: that the fifth kingdom exterminates and crushes all (the rest) of them.

Rashi gives an excellent Hebrew rendering of קֵפֶרַל רֵי חָשֵׁית by כָּל בַּבָּל רֵי חָשֵׁית. He then proceeds to give a nithpael as equivalent to an ithpeel. The nithpael of כָּפֶר means "to be released" rather than "to be cut" as כָּפֶר does and so is a bit less specific term. Rashi refers to כָּל as the whole
rather than to the specific parts whereas the Aramaic text names these parts. He has already given an interpretation of everything specifically with the exception of the clay. He does not mention the parts again, although he could have done so here since the elements are listed in a rather strange order: iron, bronze, clay, silver, gold. Note that Rashi reads instead of as in the MT. This is merely a dialectical difference between Biblical Aramaic and later Aramaic. "This kingdom of yours" refers to Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. This form of direct address after so long a speech seems a bit unattached and vague.

**IBN EZRA:**

\[
\text{ינאיב חלמכן, ככול הולות: The dream is true and its interpretation is trustworthy.}
\]

Ibn Ezra has already explained the phrase "cut without hands" in his comment to verse 44. He comments here only on the last four words. עַבְרָי and אָדָם he translates by their immediate Hebrew equivalents. On עַבְרָי see the comment on יָדָךְ in verse 41. יָדָךְ is a haphel masculine singular passive participle from יָדָךְ. This participle means "trustworthy" both here and in VI.5. The Hebrew יָדָךְ is from the same root and can be pointed as a participle. The niphal participle can have much the same meaning as the Aramaic haphel participle does. See, for example, Proverbs 25.13. The word יָדָךְ is a niphal from יָדָךְ "to be firm."
This niphal can mean "certain, true, trustworthy." Ibn Ezra has simply rendered the Aramaic's two relatively rare forms into common Hebrew expressions.

IBN YACHYA:

Just as you saw that a stone was hewn of its own accord (and not with human hands) from the mountain and cut down the iron and brass and clay and silver and gold--so this is because the last kingdom which is likened to this stone which shall cut down all of those who survive from the remainder of the kingdoms which are likened to gold and silver, etc. For I have decided that in this dream the Great God has made known to the king that which shall take place after this. The dream is true for (OR: and) it is right and does not lie, also the interpretation is reliable and enduring. So it is legitimate to perceive that the second kingdom after Nebuchadnezzar and his sons was the kingdom of the Medes and the Persians, and the third kingdom was the kingdom of Greece which took its origin from Alexander the Macedonian who overcame his brothers. And the fourth kingdom, this is the kingdom of Rome which was divided into two parts; part of it consists in the Christians and part of it consists in the Islamic Empire. And behold! (as) the iron was mixed with the clay many Arabs stand under Christian domination. And furthermore those who would not be under their domination (still) enter into their city with merchandise to sell and to buy.
And just so (there are) Christians (who) stand under Ishmaelite domination; and behold, today in Constantinople (there are) 1500 heads of households, namely rich Christian merchants from Florence, Venice, and Genoa and the rest of the parts of the earth give mutual respect and good company (i.e. to the Arabs). But on the other hand, they do not become related maritally to one another, just as iron and clay do not mix, binding together essentially. And the last kingdom is (that of) the King Messiah, who shall not rule by the strength of the hands of man, but rather by sheer divine might; and it shall be established forever and always.

The last kingdom is (that of) the King Messiah, who shall not rule by the strength of the hands of man, but rather by sheer divine might; and it shall be established forever and always.

with the ordinal numerical value of "third" and equal to 3 with the ordinal numerical value of "fourth" and equal to 4 with the numerical value of 400, plus 1 with the numerical value of 100. Ibn Yachya restricts his comments on the whole passage to the end of the unit here in verse 45. The passage begins as a fairly accurate, if expanded, paraphrase. The expansions on the Aramaic text (which text is dealt with in lines 1-12) are found in ... (line 4) to ... in line 7, ... (lines 8-9), and ... (lines 11-12). He translates the Aramaic פַּלְלָה by a niphal פַּלָל, and the Aramaic עֲמָר
by the niphal יֵדֶע. This is just reverse to the way in which Rashi translates the words.

In the remaining lines (13-38) Ibn Yachya gives his commentary and explication of the five kingdoms. The first kingdom is that of Nebuchadnezzar and his sons. יִשְׂרָאֵל is well translated by L'Empereur's quocirca scire convenit. יד is often translated as "as" in a fortior reasoning. The second kingdom is the kingdom of the Medes and the Persians. The third kingdom is that of Alexander the Great (cf. L'Empereur's Graecia). The spelling of Alexander as יְהוֹשָׁע may either be an error of metathesis or it could represent a variant pronunciation. It is interesting to note that Arabic spells and pronounces the name in the way it is spelled here. The fourth kingdom Ibn Yachya sees as Rome. Rome is divided into two parts, according to the present comment, a Christian part and an Islamic part. Ibn Yachya, thus is extending the Roman Empire into his own day. The two great religio-political forces in Ibn Yachya's world were the Christians and the Arabs. Sometimes the Christians were in more advantageous and dominant position and sometimes the Arabs were. Ibn Yachya sees the mixing process described in verse 43 as one of trade relationships. Both Rashi and Ibn Ezra see verse 43 as descriptive of a marriage relationship. Ibn Yachya, on the other hand, definitely states that the two factions do not intermarry. The refusal
to intermarry may have been the rule, but it is practically impossible to assert that it did not happen. Nevertheless Ibn Yachya states that the reason why the two sides are not cohesive is (lines 32-33). Therefore the two factions of this extended Roman Empire are not mixed together in a way conducive to any kind of permanent bond, (lines 33-34).

In the above kind of arrangement it is difficult to tell which faction represents the iron and which the clay. The only statement on this subject is quite vague, (lines 21-23). This statement makes it possible to assume that the Christians are iron and the Arabs clay, but lines 26-31 would seem to indicate that it is the Arabs who are the iron and the Christians clay. The best remedy for the confusion is to state that the roles of iron and clay alternate depending upon which faction is dominant in a particular place and time.

The statement in lines 27-31 ( ) is difficult to understand. The most likely solution, however, is the one given in the translation above. is a masculine plural noun from , "merchant," plus the preposition in its constitutive or perhaps its partitive sense; i.e. indicates the constituents of the group of fifteen hundred heads of households. It has been paraphrased above as "namely," but could as easily be translated
as "(made up) of (from)." The point is that Christian merchants are present in a Moslem city and have set up housekeeping there. Constantinople at Ibn Yachya's time was the capital of the Moslem Ottoman Empire. The city had fallen into Arab hands in 1453, some forty-one years before Ibn Yachya's birth, and was at the time of his later life undergoing a vast rebuilding program under the leadership of Sultan Sulerman the Magnificent (1520-1566). After the conquest of the city in 1453 a number of people, including Jews, Christians, and Moslems were relocated in Constantinople. Most of these people were traders and merchants, which would allow for the fifteen hundred heads of households which Ibn Yachya mentions. L'Empereur takes the word נֵרָכָה as mercator, but it is difficult to see the sense in which he translates the Hebrew here. He does, however, definitely take the fifteen hundred patresfamilias to be Christians.

The fifth kingdom is the messianic age which will last forever. Although Ibn Yachya does not say that it involves a Jewish resurgence, as the people of God it is likely and certainly implied by the lack of any statement about the Jewish mercantile presence in Constantinople which was evidently considerable. L'Empereur sets forth the common modern interpretation of the fourth kingdom on pages 52 and 53 where he disagrees with Ibn Yachya and says: "Verum
quartum hoc non Romanum esse, sed quod temporibus Seleucidarum viguit..."

III.15-18

Verse 15: הלך אל ניצתך... וְנִהְבְּכֶנָּה בֶּן יַעֲקֹב נִצְצֵב בְּפָנַי. רashi: Now behold, you are ready to accept this over you against your will! נִיּוּל לְאֵשָׁבְעִי: And if you do not bow yourselves down you will be cast aside.

le: into the midst of.

מה הילא: and what is the name of the god who will save you from my hand?

It is questionable how Rashi takes the first מ (line 2, מֵבֶן). The meaning could be the same as the Aramaic מ, "if," (Hebrew מָא) and the sentence would then read the same as the MT, "now if you are ready...etc." Alcalay gives "if" as one of the meanings of מ, but Jastrow knows of no such meaning in Hebrew. More to this, the present author is unable to find a single example of מ meaning "if" with a pronominal suffix in either Biblical or Mishnaic Hebrew. According to Brown, Driver, and Briggs there is one case of meaning "if" in Biblical Hebrew; that of Jeremiah 2.10, מָא אֶלָּא בְּכַלֵּי. The word מ itself occurs some one hundred times in the Old Testament. There are two examples of מ.
in the Old Testament, both carrying the meaning "behold (you)," i.e. from תָּהְנָה. This leads one to believe that the translation of וְכִי should be "behold you...etc.," in line 2 as well. This is confirmed beyond reasonable doubt when in line 4 Rashi translates the Aramaic יָאָשֵׁר by יָאִמְךָךְ. Both constructions mean "and if not." It would be strange to use יָאָשֵׁר meaning "if" in one clause and then in the next, when the meaning is very clear, to switch to יָאִמְךָךְ. If "behold" is the correct translation here it means that Rashi mistranslated. The reason is most probably consistency. He mistranslates יָאָשֵׁר so in verse 17 for doctrinal reasons and here for uniformity.

IBN EZRA:

כִּי, רָאַתָּה חַבְּלָה שַׁעֲמָה עַטְרֵיהֶם. וְוכִי לָזֶּה מַעֲרֹר יַאֲוֵל לֹא יַעֲלֵהֶם בְּשָׁבַר מַעֲרֹר לְבָדִי.

Ibn Ezra has translated יָאָשֵׁר by תָּהְנָה much as Rashi did. The phrase יָאָשֵׁר means "to do honor to." The "them" (דוֹלְכַּבֵּי) which are spoken of here are the Babylonian gods of Nebuchadnezzar, including the giant image. The reason why the plural "they" is used may be seen in the Kethibh יָאָשֵׁר in verse 12. According to the text, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego are accused of not worshipping "thy gods." Although Ibn Ezra has mistranslated יָאָשֵׁר as "behold" he gets some of the flavor of "if" by including in his comment the
next clause introduced by the particle "perhaps." Ibn Ezra here states that Daniel is a very important person in Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom and that because of the friendship of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego with Daniel, the lives of the former might be spared.

IBN YACHYA:

And therefore I shall give you advice that before me when you hear any of the musical instruments (that) you shall bow yourselves down to the image, for if you do not bow yourselves down, you shall be thrown into the midst of the furnace of fire and I shall see who is the god who will save you from my hand.

Ibn Yachya starts off by rendering "now" (a temporal demonstrative adverb) by "then", an adverb meaning "according to such conditions, that being so," or simply "therefore." The temporal quality of the Aramaic does not find full expression in the Hebrew paraphrase. The phrase is completely paraphrased. The subject is changed from second masculine plural to first common singular with a second masculine plural indirect object (i.e. from "If you are ready" to "I shall give you advice"). More to this the interrogative nature of the Aramaic is changed to a statement. This is most probably because the positive consequence of bowing down is left unsaid in the biblical text, but is probably something like "well and good." The Ara-
main text does rather hang in the air because of this unsaid consequence. This has been remedied in the Hebrew although in making the sentence flow more smoothly Ibn Yachya has altered the syntax. From the word רְכַּבָּה in line 1 to the word שִׁיר in line 4 the paraphrase is good although it is abbreviated. The longer בָּאָרְבָּרִים תְּפַשְׁתִּי is shortened by the Hebrew infinitive construct יִשְׁתַּחֵץ plus ל plus pronominal suffix (understood as a temporal clause). The names of the musical instruments which are repeated three times in the MT (verses 5, 7, and 15) are named by Ibn Yachya only once, that being in verse 5. In this abbreviation of the text Ibn Yachya does the same thing as the LXX. The words שֵׁם and לֵבָנ are both translated by the Hebrew word חַלְתַּנְתִי which is most likely a hishtaphel form from a root חָלַן meaning "to bow down." It is also possible that it is a hithpael form of a root חַלְתִּי meaning the same thing.

It is interesting to note that Ibn Yachya subordinates the consequences of not bowing down rather than coordinating them as the MT does. He does this by translating וְיִנָּהַל by וְיַחְדָּשׁ. It is important that Ibn Yachya recognizes that יַחְדָּשׁ means "if" here and so translates it. The only other major difference is the addition of a first person singular imperfect from הָיָה "to see," which adds a personal tone to the speech of Nebuchadnezzar at its conclusion as well as at its beginning, i.e. "I shall give you
advice...I shall see..." It is surprising to find that none
of the rabbis studied here make any reference to the passage
in Isaiah 43:13 where the speaker is God.

Verse 16:

RASHI:

Why is his name mentioned only here? They said to
him: "If you (ask us) to accept over us your statute (re-
quiring us) to pay tribute and rates and taxes (then) you are
king over us, if (on the other hand, you ask us) to deny the
Holy One, blessed be he, then, O Nebuchadnezzar, you are the
basest of men and vilest of people." We are not concerned to take counsel
what to respond concerning this, for the answer is determined
(already) and we can give it
without hesitation (literally: it is fluent in our mouths).

Abbreviations: 88 87

This comment shows Rashi's concise, al-
most laconic style very adequately. He uses no more words
than become absolutely necessary to convey his meaning. By
one assumes that Rashi means that Nebuchadnezzar's
name is mentioned in direct address only here. The contrast
is drawn between the demands which a monarch can legitimately
make on his subjects and those which he cannot. If he asks
people to pay taxes, then he is doing no more than a monarch
is entitled to do; but if, as is the case in the biblical
story, a monarch asks people to deny their god(s) by statute, then he has overstepped the bounds of kingly authority. He has become one who causes others to sin and as such the lowest and vilest of offenders. A reply which would be יָד can, among other places, be found in Exodus 20.3-6, which could be on the lips of any faithful Israelite in seconds. Brown, Driver, and Briggs note that the verb יָד is not found in the Targums, although it is found in the Syriac New Testament at Luke 9.62 and Ephesians 4.29 among other places. Since יָשָׁה is not a familiar word Rashi translates it with a Hebrew word that is similar in both spelling and meaning, יָשָׁה "to be anxious, fear," but also "to apprehend, take into consideration."

IBN EZRA:

Ibn Ezra here comments on verses 16-18 (in the main) by paraphrasing and commenting at one time. He rightly translates by יָשָׁה אל אֲרֵיכִיּו. From יָד in line 2 until the end of the comment with the exception of the first four words of line 3 Ibn Ezra gives his paraphrase of verses 17 and 18.
Those four words in line 3 cite a line from Psalm 141.7. The purpose of the quotation is to show a usage in Hebrew of the cognate participle to the Aramaic יִנְהֹז in verse 17. These words should be treated as parenthetical to the sense of the rest of the comment. Verse 17, as will be seen in due course, is a very different verse. It includes some kind of doubt as to God's power or his ability to save. Ibn Ezra has recognized that contingency, but has transferred it from the realm of God's power to the realm of God's will.

"God will save us if it pleases him to do so." From the last word in line 4 to the end picks up the meaning of verse 18. Ibn Ezra ends his comment with an incomplete thought. He evidently intended the reader to pick up the Aramaic verse and carry it to the conclusion.

**IBN YACHYA:**

And they replied to him, "We do not take thought to answer concerning this," that is, according to the statute an answer to the words of Nebuchadnezzar from them was unnecessary, only the act of prostration (was required). Therefore they said, "We do not take thought in the matter, because of the fact that we transgress the moral law to answer in a place where an answer is not necessary (OR: required).

Note the abbreviation ס in the text which probably stands for גלעד לזרע. It is not clear from the printing.
whether יִנָּה, יִנָּה, or יִנָּה is to be read. The present translation uses what seemed to be the most appropriate meaning in the context. L'Empereur translates with hoc sibi volunt. Ibn Yachya, like Rashi before him, uses the term שָׁהֵן to translate the less familiar Aramaic word פֶּרֶשׁ. Ibn Yachya says that the reason why the youths do not have to consider answering is that the statute which was promulgated by Nebuchadnezzar was:

When you hear the sound of the horn, pipe, lyre, trigon, hard, bagpipe, and every kind of music, you are to fall down and worship the golden image that King Nebuchadnezzar has set up.

The statute did not require people to answer, but rather to prostrate themselves and that alone. The youths either say or think that they would be going beyond what was laid out in the statute if they were to answer. In this case any charge of flippancy against the three confessors is countered, although Ibn Yachya makes no attempt to explain why Nebuchadnezzar should be called by name in this verse. In the biblical text which accompanies Ibn Yachya's paraphrase Nebuchadnezzar's name is spelled כַּלְכֶלְכָл of the text is spelled כַּלְכֶלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָלְכָл while in the comment or paraphrase proper it is spelled כַּלְכֶלְכָלְכָл. The reason for this is probably that the text and the comment did not originally belong together.

Verse 17:
INTRODUCTION:

Theologically speaking this is one of the most difficult verses in Daniel. The difficulty comes in translating the first half of the verse. In light of this difficulty it is interesting that Rashi does not deal with the problem at all. It is important to discover just what the problem of this verse is so that the treatment of it by the three rabbis can become clearer.

The crux of the problem is the translation of the two words 'יִפְגֶּשׁ/נ and the syntactic connection of these words with the rest of the sentence. The problem is shown at a glance by looking at the Revised Standard Version. In the text one finds: "If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace; and he will deliver us out of your hand, O King." The margin has two alternate readings: (1) "Behold, our God whom we serve, etc.," (2) "If our God is able to deliver us, he will deliver us from the burning fiery furnace and out of your hand, O King."

The Authorized Version is the same as the RSV text. The New English Bible reads "If there is a God who is able to save us from the blazing furnace, it is our God whom we serve, and he will save us from your power, O King." The Revised Version reads the same as both AV and RSV. The Jerusalem Bible has essentially the same translation as the second alternative from the RSV margin.
The word יִלּוּ is related to the Hebrew ו'. It is found in more or less analogous form in most of the Aramaic dialects. The word is found seventeen times in the Old Testament, fifteen times in Daniel and twice in Ezra. Whatever the origin of the term in Biblical Aramaic it can either mean "there is," or with יִלּוּ "there is not" (equivalent to Hebrew ו'). The term can take pronominal suffixes and act as a copula. This usage was originally for emphasis. Examples of the former usage can be seen in וַיִּלְכוּ וְלַמְצִית וַיִּמָּס III.12; יִלְךָ אֲגַז נַבָּר II.30. Examples of the copular use with pronominal suffix and participle are found in לֹא לְמָאִית לַגְּחָל לַחֲפֶר עַד III.18; לֹא לְמָאִית לִפְרֵיי לָא יִמִּס III.14; and לֹא לְמָאִית לָא הִזְרָע III.11.

Two clear usages emerge, the one denoting existence which is (with the possible exception of the present verse) found unattached to either a participle or a pronominal suffix. The other usage, used perhaps for emphasis, as part of a compound tense can be seen as a way of inflecting a participle as to person.

There are three examples of clauses which contain יִלּוּ and begin with the particle וַיֵּלֶד, "if, whether," in the Old Testament (Daniel III.15,17; Ezra 5.17). Of these three two are without suffix and participle (III.17; Ezra 5.17b) and one is with these elements (III.15). Let us first examine Ezra 5.17.
The phrase above is the salient one of the verse and the present concern focuses on only its beginning words. The AV and the RV translate "whether it is so," and Rosenthal translates it "it is (a fact) that." Rosenthal discusses the phrase under the heading of Subordinating Conjunctions. The word יניא fulfills the function of the subordinating conjunction in the present context. What יניא then means here is "it is so" (or "a fact"). The entire protasis of the verse is given in the words יניא. C. C. Torrey wants to read III.17 in this same sense. On the surface this is a cogent suggestion for III.17 and Ezra 5.17 constitute the two instances in Biblical Aramaic where יניא occurs without a pronominal suffix or participle and with an introductory יד. Should not the two be translated in like manner? The second instance of יניא in connection with יד is in III.15. This occurrence is linked to a pronominal suffix and what is most probably a verbally derived adjective, יניא, and יניא itself acts as a copula, "if you are ( יד תיינא) ready (ויניא)." The difference in form between the bare יניא in III.17 and יניא here makes the two verses incomparable.

III.17 is in many ways unique. The יניא construction occurs in a verse which begins with יד followed by an unsuffixed יניא. More to this, however, there is a participle later in the sentence to which יניא could be attached (ויניא).
The translation of the sentence, if לארשי and ויהי be linked, is: "If our God whom we serve is able to deliver us, he will deliver us from the furnace of blazing fire and from your hand, O King." The problem with this reading is two-fold. First, there is a theological problem that arises from indicating doubt about the ability of God to effect a rescue of the three confessors. Second, there is a syntactic problem that in all other occurrences of the construction לארשי plus participle, the two words occur together. In the verse under consideration the phrase לארשי intervenes between the participle and לארשי. Either the verse is to be translated differently or the construction which occurs here is unique in Biblical Aramaic.

The present author is able to find but one example in the Aramaic Papyri of the word לארשי used with a participle in which the two words are separated. This is a very strange construction in Aḥikar 159 where לארשי follows a participle (either ויהי or ויהי) and is separated from it by a noun. One could say that the participle and לארשי can be separated, although from the available data this is not common. It must be added that there are twenty-one sure instances (and four conjectural ones) in the Aramaic Papyri where לארשי designates "existence," i.e. "there is (not)." Some of these occurrences are equivalent to Hebrew posses-
sion in point of time using ו or ℓ plus ה with pronominal suffixes.

The question that is of paramount importance is, of course, how יְהִי is to be understood in III.17. The versions have unanimously understood the Aramaic יְהִי to be equivalent to a Hebrew היה, "behold," or an Aramaic ו, "for."

This is most likely for theological reasons. Charles believes that the MT is corrupt here, and he prefers to follow the versions. He reconstructs the original Aramaic of the first part of the verse as follows: יְהִי אֵין רָאָתָה מָלֵא שְׁאָל, which follows Theodotion almost exactly (ἐστὶν γὰρ Θεὸς, ὁ ησυχὸς λατρεωμεν δυνατὸς). 111

As both Charles and Prince point out in their commentaries, the massoretic punctuation indicates a reading of, "if our God, whom we are worshipping, exists, he is able... etc." 112 If the reading posited above by Bevan, Montgomery, and others be discarded because of its theological offensiveness, how much quicker is this to be thrown away. It is unthinkable on the lips of faithful Jews. However, either reading is philologically possible. The problem of the connection with the participle is not insurmountable, 113 but theologically both readings are offensive. Surely this theological offensiveness explains the deviation of the versions and following them the early commentators. This is as good a supposition, perhaps better, than Charles' view of a
different Aramaic text. But even if Charles' solution is not followed he is right in suggesting that, "...3.17 should explain 3.16 while answering 3.15."  

Do either of the above outlined attempts at translation (both of which recognize the lexical fact of \( if \), as equal to "if") explain verse 16 and answer verse 15? Charles thinks that in order to explain verse 16, verse 17 should begin with "for" (Vulgate, enim, LXX, Theodotion). It is certainly to be admitted that beginning an explanation with "for" is much smoother than beginning one with "if." The fact remains that Aramaic \( if \) means "if," and there is not a shred of textual evidence (exclusive of the versions) which supports an emendation to "if" as Charles suggests. In a sense the statement of the three confessors, stating that they do not have to give answer to the king is explained by verse 17. If our God...is able to save us... he will (or, if our God exists...he will save us). There is no need to answer because the outcome will show that the young men are right.

Of the two translations posited above, the solution of Montgomery, Bevan, and others surely answers the question put in verse 15: "Who is the god who shall deliver you from my hands?" The young men are answering, placing their trust in the ability of their God to deliver them from disaster. If it is true that God can deliver them from the king's
power (as they believe he can), then he will do so and there is no need to defend their actions before the king. In the end result the translation of the NEB is not far off the mark: "If there is a God who is able to save us from the blazing furnace, it is our God whom we serve, and he will save us from your power, O King."115

RASHI:

כדיל לשהבעתנו. כドיל לשהבעתנו: Able to save us from all trouble.
להאילדה משל ארה: מ אלוהי
בראה. יד של כל מהבוי
מל הנכש ואד של כל אד: He will save (us) from the furnace and from your hand.

Rashi comments on the second half of this verse. He says absolutely nothing about the difficulty in the verse. The two phrases which he has chosen to explain he does little more than paraphrase. It is important that both of these instances affirm positively that God is able to save. This Rashi does to counteract the fact that the verse throws doubt as to this ability. The reason why Rashi refrains from direct comment here is surely the theological offense of translating ה as "if" and the sure knowledge that this is what ה meant. Rashi escapes anything which would even border on unorthodoxy not by escaping into midrashic exegesis, but by silence. It was seen in the last chapter that the LXX escaped the theological problem here by paraphrase. Rashi escaped it by simply saying nothing.
And this is the reason that our will is tranquil (i.e. we are content) not to listen to you in this matter: God will save us from your hand or he will not. Behold it is true that the God whom we serve has the ability to save us from the furnace and burning fire, and from your hand, that is, from all your kinds of judgments, he is able to save.

Abbreviation: מַעַרְכֵּת . Note the difference between the text of Ibn Yachya and BHK. The former prints מַעַרְכֵּת while the latter has אֶלֶּהוּ. It is difficult to tell whether or not this is to be read as more than a spelling error on the part of the compiler of Ibn Yachya's text (perhaps L'Empereur). Since it has already been seen that Ibn Yachya knew that Aramaic מ is means "if" (verse 15), it is interesting that he here translates it ההנה, "behold." In translating so Ibn Yachya agrees with the Vulgate's translation although there is, of course, no question of dependence here. The "if-clause" is exegeted to mean that "either God will save us or he will not, it depends upon his will." Line 3 commences Ibn Yachya's rendering of the Aramaic verse into Hebrew. It is a fairly accurate translation except for the first few words. The reason for this change in the translation of מ between the
present verse and verse 15 is obviously that Ibn Yachya found the possible suggestion of God's inability to save or even questioning his very existence highly repugnant. It seems that Ibn Yachya here combines two different interpretations of this very difficult verse. One of these rightly interprets \( \text{if} \) as "if," but makes the first clause a statement about God's will rather than about his ability. The other seems to be the method used by the versions, that is, taking \( \text{if} \) as "behold" and making an "if-clause" into an affirmation.

Verse 18:

RASHI:

And if he should not be pleased to save our bodies, be it known to you...

The point that Rashi makes here is that the \( \text{if} \) indicates God's will to save or not to save, not his ability to do so. By this statement Rashi implies that verse 17 is also discussing God's will and not his ability. This solution has been followed by some modern exegetes. C. F. Keil stated over a century ago that "(v. 17) shows the ethical ability i.e., the ability limited by the divine holiness and righteousness, not the omnipotence of God as such." After the statement on God's will Rashi simply gives the reader an Aramaic quotation from the verse which, assumedly, means...
simply that he wishes the reader to read the rest of the
verse as it stands without the need of comment. Ibn Ezra
does much the same thing in his comment on verse 16 except
that there Ibn Ezra translates יִשְׂרוּלִיְיוֹת, into Hebrew.
(IBN EZRA DOES NOT COMMENT ON THIS VERSE)

IBN YACHYA:

And behold, although he may not
save (us), know for yourself
that we will not serve your gods
and we will not prostrate our­selves to the image which you
have set up.

The translation into Hebrew is not inaccurate even
though Ibn Yachya translates יִשְׂרוּלִיְיוֹת by יִישְׂרָאֵל. The same feeling is
given as in the Aramaic original; that God's saving them is
not the precondition of their obeying Nebuchadnezzar's
order. They will not obey that order even if God chooses to
let them die. This is a great statement of faith in God even
in Ibn Yachya's somewhat diluted translation. The יִשְׂרוּלִיְיוֹת is an
ethical dative and יִשְׂרָאֵל is to be parsed as second person,
masculine, singular, perfect from יִשְׂרָאֵל, with the o connecting
vowel written by means of a vowel letter, i.e. יִשְׂרָאֵל.118

Verse 28:

RASHI:

Your kingdom has departed from you.
The translation of עֵדַע by עָלַע is an apt one. Basically עָלַע has the meaning of "to turn away." It takes on the meaning of "to come to an end" in Biblical Hebrew passages such as Amos 6.7 and Isaiah 11.13. The context of Rashi's comment allows this kind of meaning here as well.

The word עָלַע "to pass on, by, away" is found in Biblical Hebrew as a rare word occurring once in Job 28.8 and once in Proverbs 25.20. Biblical Aramaic has the word occurring nine times with the meaning "to pass on, away" (peal), "to take away, remove" (haphel). One finds עִדָּה as a frequent translation of the Hebrew עָלַע in the Targums.

IBN EZRA:

עִדָּה: It has departed and disappeared from upon you. And I do not have the knowledge to know whether the seven times are days, weeks, months or years; but there is not enough time for it to be days or weeks, according to what is written, "until his hairs grew long like eagle feathers." Now the Gaon has said that they are months or, in his opinion, years, just as "the time, two times and a half a time" (are years). One does not know whether Nebuchadnezzar changed into a male or a female beast for nothing is written except that his dwelling was with the beasts and he ate grass like them. And the sense of "and the heart of a beast" is that he was a madman. This is the same as the perception of the soul.
And behold when the wisdom of the soul turned aside (OR: came to an end) his heart turned and remained the heart of a beast. And the evidence which he gives in the end concerning all this (is), "I lifted up my eyes to heaven and my reason returned to me." Now I have seen a member of our company, true of spirit, (who) told me that he was on a certain island called Sardinia and behold a certain gentile went our and absconded from his fathers; for he had lost his mind and gone mad, and he lived (literally: was) with the animals (literally: deer) many years and he went on his hands and feet like them. Now behold the king went to hunt provisions and he took many animals. And the gentile who was considered as mad was taken for an animal and his fathers came and they recognized him and spoke to him, but he did not answer. And they put bread to eat and wine to drink before him, but he did not want them. Then they gave him grasses with the animals and he ate it. And at midnight he escaped to the deer of the field.

Ibn Ezra translates וַיִּנְתֶּפֶל by the Hebrew רוח just as Rashi did. To the comments already made concerning this translation just above may be added that by the mishnaic period the cognate Hebrew verb was used only in the hophal conjugation. The most likely reason why neither Ibn Ezra nor Rashi simply used the Hebrew cognate verb וַיִּנְתֶּפֶל to translate the Aramaic is that the former was always a rare word...
in Hebrew. A rare word needs clarification and it would be easier to use a more common word right off rather than a rare word with a detailed explanation.

Ibn Ezra confesses that he does not know the precise meaning of קָנָה. Generally, of course, the word simply means "time." He refers to the Gaon, presumably Saadia, who thought that is more likely that years are meant. The opinion of Ibn Ezra is that Nebuchadnezzar's form was not changed, only his mind. 123 In discussing this point he explains the phrase והב חלוה from verse 13 as referring to the fact that Nebuchadnezzar became a madman. 124 There then follows the somewhat obscure clauses in lines 14-16: והב חלוה והב חלוה והב חלוה. It is perhaps best explained by reference to the three-fold soul doctrine of medieval Jewish philosophy. One of the three, the rational soul, was held to be responsible for discursive knowledge, both practical and theoretical. The other two souls were the vegetative which was held responsible for nourishment, growth, and generation; and the animal, responsible "for a type of instinctive intelligence known as estimation, as well as for locomotion and sensory perception." 125 It could be argued that what Nebuchadnezzar turned from (וְלֹא) was his rational soul. This would leave him with only his animal and vegetative souls and put him on a level with the animals. In the present case the words אָזֵן and נָדַע are practical
It should be repeated that in all this Ibn Ezra is attempting a psychological explanation of the king's madness rather than a merely physical one.

In this psychological explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's illness Ibn Ezra was following the tradition of the Midrash Esther Rabbah I.8. In its final written form the Midrash Esther Rabbah is a product of the fifth or sixth centuries AD and is an exegetical midrash. There are other midrashic sources, however, which disagree with Esther Rabbah and Ibn Ezra and state that Nebuchadnezzar's madness was physical; that he actually took on the form of a beast: "As far down as his navel he had the appearance of an ox, the lower part of his body resembled that of a lion." There then follows an illustration of the kind of madness from which Nebuchadnezzar suffered. Ibn Ezra had heard from a trustworthy colleague of a similar case wherein a man lost his mind and wandered about with animals; eating and drinking like them. The modern psychological term for the king's malady is boanthropy, in which the patient thinks himself to be a bull or a cow. Following Ibn Ezra's example of giving an illustrative example is the modern case of deviant behavior related by R. K. Harrison in his Introduction to the Old Testament. As far as the translation of יֶבֶן is concerned, the lexica and dictionaries give either "deer," or "ram" as the translation. I have chosen the more
Ibn Ezra has mentioned several other verses in his comment to verse 28 and so does not include any comment at all on verses 29-33 (at least directly). He most probably felt that these verses had been sufficiently explained by this and previous comments. There is a good deal of repetition in verses 29 ff.

IBN YACHYA:

While the utterance was still going out from the king's mouth, a voice fell from the heavens saying, "To you it is said, 0 Nebuchadnezzar, the kingdom has been taken from you.

Other than the spelling of Nebuchadnezzar's name as two words Ibn Yachya's biblical text is free from difficulties. He translates אשת ליסו literally by רבנן. Ibn Yachya adds a verb to what is in the Aramaic a nominal clause. The verb אב is natural enough to use. The same phrase רבנן אב is found in Esther 7.8 (of the king and Haman).

Notice that the verb ימ stands first in its clause in the commentary while it stands last in its clause in the Aramaic text. This simply reflects normal (classical) Hebrew word order as opposed to, if not normal, then very common Aramaic word order.

The Hebrew text starts direct discourse immediately after the verb ימ, but Ibn Yachya, recognizing that this is unclear, adds ידוע to introduce the direct discourse. The
may be here translated by quotation marks, "To you it is said...etc." 131 is in both Aramaic and Hebrew a masculine plural participle used impersonally, "it is said." As J. G. Williams has pointed out, this construction is used often, "...where an intrusion of either higher or supernatural powers is apparent." 132 To borrow Stinespring's term concerning the Biblical Aramaic infinitive with a passive meaning, this participial construction can also be called the "hidden third-person-plural indefinite." 133 One supposes the analogy posited by Stinespring to be adequate here as well; "Since the third-person-plural active indefinite of the finite verb forms was a common way of expressing the passive voice in Biblical Aramaic...this method was also used by the infinitive, the only difference being that the infinitive by nature cannot be inflected for person and number and therefore the fact that the form is third person in thought is only implicit and does not appear to the eye." 134 The case of the participle is not quite so difficult as that for the infinitive because the participle can be inflected for gender and number. This means that the "third-person impersonal" nature of the participle is not quite as hidden nor dependent on the context as that of the infinitive. Montgomery recognizes the passive or impersonal use of the participle when in IV.22 he comments that is an "impers(onal) use of the 3d pers(on) pl(ural)." 135
In Biblical Hebrew the construction is seen in such passages as Jeremiah 38.23; Isaiah 32.12; and Nehemiah 6.

More importantly the construction is found in post-biblical times. For example, see Aboth 4.7, ḫוּפָה, or 4.8, יִשְׁלִיט, "they punish him openly," they grant him the faculty (to learn). Ibn Yachya's construction here is probably best taken as the impersonal "they say" (man sagt) or simply "it is said." L'Empereur takes it as "they say," dicunt.

The Aramaic verb יִלְלָה is an active verb (a peal). It is possible that Koehler-Baumgartner is right when it states that the form here means "weggehen = genommen werden," in other words, a passive sense given to an active verb. "Your kingship has gone out from you" = "Your kingship is taken away from you." Ibn Yachya certainly understands יִלְלָה as a passive. The form יִלְלָה is either a hophal or a pual. If it is the former it is from the root יָלַל which means "to be estranged, alienated; to deny; to hand over (to a stranger)." The problem here is that no hophal form for this verb is attested in BDB, KB, Jastrow, or Alcalay, with the required meaning. If, as is more likely, the verb is a pual it is from a root יָלַל meaning "to trouble, do an injury, deal harshly; (another meaning) to estrange oneself." It is likely that the two roots are semantically related. Whichever is chosen the important thing to note is
that the form in Ibn Yachya's commentary is a passive form.

Verse 29:

RASHI: 

Rashi has simply traded an Aramaic word for a Hebrew synonym. He has been careful to find a word which is plural like the Aramaic original. is always plural. It simply means "sending off, expulsion." The two words may be in a construct-genitive relationship here.

IBN YACHYA:

And they shall drive (you) from the dwelling place of men and with the beasts of the field your dwelling shall be. And they will cause you to eat grass like oxen and seven times will pass over you until you become aware that the Most High is powerful in the kingdom of men and he gives it to whomever he will. And (it is) not as you thought--you who built Babylon by your own power for the glory and splendor of your kingdom.

There is very little upon which to comment in lines 1-6. It can be seen that Ibn Yachya takes as an impersonal "they drive" or "they will drive." Since Ibn Yachya translates with an imperfect, the latter translation is more likely. The rest of the Aramaic verse is translated quite literally into Hebrew. The literalness of the trans-
lation is seen in the refusal to translate "רעים as עבש, by translated as "רעים. Ibn Yachya uses the same root to discuss רעים as Rashi did above (לעיל). Ibn Yachya does add a comment to his Hebrew translation. This comment commences in line 6 with the words וברעה השב타 and refers to Nebuchadnezzar's statement in verse 27. The lesson of the story is made clear by the comment. "God has built your kingdom not you!"

feathers" in later Hebrew. The word is used in a context of hair growing long like something which an eagle possesses. Rashi simply makes explicit what is implicit in the MT. In this he was doing nothing new since the LXX had supplied the word πτερός at verse 30b. Since Rashi wrote his comments the AV, RV, RSV, and the Jerusalem Bible have all supplied the word "feathers" and the NEB has supplied the word "hair." Note the difference in רֶשֶׁם and צֶרֶם.

Rashi has used cognate words for both, but the initial  י of the former pair goes back to a proto-Semitic *י (ד, ژ) whereas the initial  כ of the second pair is a pure proto-Semitic  כ.

IBN YACHYA:

And at that time the word (speech) left off and it happened to Nebuchadnezzar, and he was expelled from human habitation and he ate grass like oxen and his body was washed with the dew of heaven until his hair grew long like the feathers and the plumage of eagles, and his nails (became) like a bird's claws. For his human mind was lost and he was turned into a wild beast. He loved the food of animals and his habitation was with them. (This was) because he had desired to make his dwelling in the dwelling of the Most High Ruler and to clothe in garments made from pride. (For it is written,) "the LORD reigns, he wears glory,"
and to him belongs judgment of the haughty, (for) his kingdom is to be an eternal and perpetual kingdom.

This translation is richly mixed with comment. The translation is fairly literal through the end of line 6. The only addition in these lines is, "and feathers," in line 4, and "like the claws of" in line 6. The first of these words simply clarifies the word רגלי which most usually means "hair" rather than feathers. The "hair of a bird" consists in feathers. is merely a word inserted to make the text easier to read. In the Aramaic one has to translate קณา as "like those of birds," whereas Ibn Yachya makes "those of" explicit, "his nails became like claws of the birds." Lines 7 and following are comments. The first comment reflects what was stated in the original version of the sentence on the king in IV.13 (למלך ויבשה שלנ קבוע ללב יתיעב), but has not been repeated in the Aramaic in either verse 22 or here. This phrase is given in the repetition of this judgment cited by Daniel in V.21 (ולמעב עץ חיים וצוי). Ibn Yachya includes the phrase here presumably because he wants to make sure that "all this came upon king Nebuchadnezzar" (verse 25). The word בַּל in line 8 indicates that the king actually wanted to eat with the animals. The word לְבָנָה is to be construed as an accusative of place. It is possible that the expected form לְבַנָּא was not
used "to avoid the combination of ... 3ר3,147 and because of the closely following 3ס. It is likely that יָכָל in line 8 is to be pointed יָכָה, a masculine noun meaning "food."148 The noun is in the construct state with יָכָל in the genitive case. The meaning of יָכָל is then "he liked the food of the animals." The fact that Nebuchadnezzar's dwelling is with the beasts is stated for the first time in the biblical text at verse 20, הָעָמִיתוֹ בְּכָא אָנַי בֵּית. The Aramaic text does not include the phrase here, but did have the salient facts stated in the last verse.149 Ibn Yachya repeats the phrase here for the same reason he repeated the phrase just above.

Line 9, starting with the words רַשָׁאִית gives the reason why the king was demoted from the human realm into that of the animals. רַשָׁאִית means "because of" or "for the reason that,"150 which is how L'Empereur translates it (quia). The charge against Nebuchadnezzar here is basically the same as against Belshazzar in V.23, "you have lifted yourself up against the Lord of Heaven." The charge is one of arrogance and "donning God's glorious garments." The words יָנַּתֵל נֶאֶנֶּה is a citation from Psalm 93.1a. In this Psalm God's glory or majesty (יִנְאָם) is spoken of as his garment. Nebuchadnezzar attempted to put on that garment (verse 27). Ibn Yachya writes 'ח which = מָשָּנָן which in turn = חָוָה in the MT of the Psalm. Lines 13-14 simply state that God is the judge of
the haughty and that God's kingdom (or kingship) lasts for eternity. The first idea is a common one in the Old Testament, found in IV.34; V.20, and the second is found, for example in II.44; III.33; IV.33. The contrast is between the king who thought himself to be great and God who is great and abases the inflated ego.

Verse 31: על קבצת הנשיא עליי שמעתי, וברכת לי ושמענה שונך על המלכות של אלי

RASHI: At the end of the days which they have fixed for him; at the end of 7 years. I lifted up. And my knowledge returned to me. And I blessed the Most High.

The abbreviation ד is the numerical representation of the word עָֽשָׂה. Again Rashi comments on specific clauses rather than the verse as a whole. The word עָֽשָׂה is an example of a third-person plural verb being used in lieu of a passive one. The proper translation is "at the end of the days which were fixed for him." Rashi has interpreted the phrase עָֽשָׂה as "seven years"; whereas the term עָֽשָׂה actually means "time." The interpretation as "year" in IV.13,20, 22,29, and 31 as well as of עָֽשָׂה as "three and a half years" is almost universal in modern times. Note that the object of the numeral usually comes after it in post-Biblical Hebrew. Note that Rashi correctly translates the
And at the end of the days I Nebuchadnezzar lifted my eyes to the heavens, and my reason returned to me. And I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honored the One who lives forever, whose dominion is an eternal and perpetual dominion and whose kingship is with generation and generation—although generations may be consumed and killed he alone continues in his perpetuity.

This is a fairly literal translation into Hebrew of the Aramaic verse. There is a comment appended to this translation starting with the word וְאָזֶה at the end of line 6 and continuing until the end. The translation which stretches from the last word in line 3 through line 6 is a problem and can be taken in at least two ways. One alternative is to take שָבָחָתי with the preceding phrase (וַהֲלֹהֵי הַעוֹלָמִים) and with the following phrase (אֶלָּא אֲשֶׁר מָשַׁחְתָּהוּ עָלֵי), thus rendering, "(and) I praised the one who lives forever and I honored (the one) whose dominion is an eternal and perpetual dominion." The other alternative is to construe both verbs with מָהֲלוֹתִים, and the clause introduced by אֲשֶׁר as either a relative or explicative clause. This would give the reading "(and) I praised and honored the one who lives forever, whose dominion is an eternal and perpetual dominion." This latter alternative seems the more imperfect by a perfect וֹזֶה.
likely since it represents "there" and since the Aramaic is translated according to the latter pattern. Ibn Yachya shows himself to be aware that יָרְשֵׁה is here best translated by a perfect by using the verb הבש.\footnote{Mesudath Dawidh takes the imperfect, on the other hand, to mean that when Nebuchadnezzar lifted his eyes to heaven he was praying that God might cause his reason to return (בושי), which prayer is answered in verse 33.\footnote{Ibn Yachya's final comment simply strengthens the statement made in the rest of the verse and may be paraphrased, "though generations come and go God is eternal."}

Verse 32: יָרְשֵׁה יַעֲצָא מִּקֵּל תּוֹא בֵּית יָהֳא יַכְּשֵׁב בִּי הָלְכֵי בְּגֹּפְּלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אִישׁ רָשָׁע.

RASHI: Our sages have said, "those sun-motes are called 'la'" (they are) under the category of the dust of the light in the sun. In this passage, יָרְשֵׁה is explained as a sun-mote. And he does according to his wish among the host of heaven. אַל אַף מִיתָם יִמְסֵר בֹּדֶם: And there is no one who can impinge upon his power.

Rashi explains the phrase כִּלָּה בֵּיתוֹ by a dubious means. He cites a phrase from Yoma 20b referring to the word אל (or הָלְכֵי). In this passage, יָרְשֵׁה is explained as a sun-mote.

The entire citation is as follows: והא יָרְשֵׁה יָאִישׁ לֵא שָׁם הָוִיָּנוּ וְהָא יָרְשֵׁה יָאִישׁ לֵא שָׁם הָוִיָּנוּ. There is most probably no connection in anything besides spelling and
pronunciation between אָלֹנִי "sun-mote" and אָל "no, not, nothing." The point Rashi is making is valid however. The inhabitants of the earth are as sunmotes (or nothing) before God. The illustration is valid in meaning if not in etymology.

The rest of the current comment consists in a straightforward Hebrew translation of the biblical text. The Aramaic word for "will" is a peal infinitive plus a pronominal suffix from the root הֶבַך "to wish." This infinitive is used substantively. It is rendered by ד"ל which is an accurate enough Hebrew translation. The Aramaic word סנ can mean either "strength" or "army, host" as can the Hebrew cognate. Given this, it is difficult to know why Rashi chose אְלֹהֵי to represent סנ except that אְלֹהֵי is a common Old Testament idiom whereas סנ is not commonly found. Note that the particle אל is here rightly understood as equivalent to ב.

IBN YACHYA:

אֵלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, הַאֲרָם כַּעַסְיָא, חֲשֵׁב שָׁנָה, נֶעְשָׁה בְּאֶשֶּׁר, נֶעְשָׁה בְּאֶשֶּׁר שָׁמֵאָל לִפְנֵי וָיִשְׂרָאֵל. And all the inhabitants of the earth are considered as nothing; and he does (OR: will do) according to his will among the heavenly host and earthly inhabitants; and there is found no impinger upon his power who can say to him, "what is it you are doing?"

The verse is translated into Hebrew quite accurately.
The tenses of the verbs are different however. יִקְרָא is translated by an imperfect חָשֵׁב. The imperfect tense simply shows incomplete action and so is at least somewhat related to the participle which shows continuous action. The imperfect is further justified in the present context by the rather hypothetical nature of the clause, which can be paraphrased as, "he will do whatever pleases him." The imperfect may thus be used at this point as a subjunctive to show the unsurety of just what it is that God will do. The participle חָשֵׁב is most probably to be taken as a substantival one, "an impinger," which, although it is not a form-for-form translation from the Aramaic, nevertheless carries the meaning of the original quite well.

Verse 33:

At that time. יִקְרָא: I returned to my glorious kingship. יִשָּׁי: The appearance of my face. יִשָּׁי: Any my counselors and my princes sought me and found pleasure that I should return. יִשָּׁי: I was established. יִשָּׁי: And more glory than at first was added to me. Our masters said, "that he rode upon a lion to whose head he had tied a snake."
This verse has some very difficult parts. The most difficult part is to deduce the correct meaning of יִשָּׁנָהוּ הַשָּׁנָהוּ. There have been many interpretations offered. The versions have dealt with it in a variety of ways. Theodotion has γάθον while the LXX ἀνεδοθη; the Vulgate has perveni, and the Peshitta has omitted the phrase, either by homoiooteleuton (so Montgomery) or because of the problem of meaning which is contained in the phrase. Except for the Peshitta, the versions have done basically the same thing which Rashi has done; to read הָיְלָה as a verb (Rashi has רָשָׁה). Through the normal transmutation of consonants between Aramaic and Hebrew הָיְלָה was taken as cognate to יָנָה, "to return," and thus יָנָה "I returned." As Montgomery explains:

...This word = the Aramaic יָנָה which later appears spelled with a נ. Our word being thus identified with הָיְלָה, the נ was understood as representing the E(astern) Aram(aic) termination of the 1st singular in יָנָה; so יָנָה יָאָל 11.1, was treated by Th., Vg. 158

Thus the current exegesis of this phrase can be said to be as ancient as the versions. As Montgomery further points out, this assumption makes the reading much easier since a verb keeps the balance between the clauses. 159

Other, more modern solutions, have been offered, but none really solves the problem any better than Rashi and the early versions did. Behrmann, among others, simply accepts
Rashi’s exegesis, Marti and Bentzen omit the phrase with the Peshitta. Montgomery himself reads instead of and takes to be appositives. Israel Eitan does something similar in the end result, although he takes as an Aramaic instance of the emphatic particle la, verily, truly, to common in Arabic and far from rare in Hebrew. He then follows Montgomery’s solution, mine understanding returned to me, and even the glory of my kingdom, my majesty and my splendor, returned unto me. This is possible, not to say probable. Keil points to being taken at this point just as it is in verse 29. The difference here is that Nebuchadnezzar really has something which is because he recognizes the God of heaven as the giver of his kingdom, reason, etc. According to this supposition the meaning of here would be for the purpose of, concerning,” or simply for.” The translation of the Revised Standard Version would then be correct: And for (the purpose of) the glory of my kingdom, my majesty and splendor returned to me...etc.” This is as good an explanation as any. The word is a noun with a pronominal suffix, and the subjects and are construed separately because they have a verb in the singular between them (eson). Consequently, while Rashi’s exegesis of this phrase is rejected it does remain possible and shows that there was a line of tradition from the versions onwards which took this
interpretation. The fact that Rashi construes 'ילל as a perfect verb shows that he takes the whole verse as completed action, most probably past action. He does not offer any direct comment on the imperfects רבד and רביע, but indirectly shows his understanding of them by translating רביע by a past frequentative (המ plus participle); that is, not a simple perfect, but a continuous action in past time.¹⁶⁸

One wonders where Rashi got his addition בושי מַאשַּׁן. It is a large coincidence if the imperfect בושי was not at least suggested by the Aramaic cognate בושי in this verse. It must remain a mystery whether בושי came from some external source or his own exegesis of the passage. The Aramaic verb הֱסֹךְ is from a hophal from מַעַשׂ. Rashi translates it with a fairly close Hebrew homonym מַעַל which is a hophal from מַעַל. Rashi has done his utmost to assure that the words sound alike, (to a lesser extent) look alike, and mean similar things. The Aramaic verb in line 7 is פֶּסַח( a hophal from פֶּסַח), and the Hebrew is simply the nithpael of the cognate verb.¹⁶⁹

From the word יבּ in line 7 on to the end of the comment one actually has a summary of a passage from Sabbath 150a. Instead of showing where Rashi summarizes, it will be more convenient to cite the passage in full and see the differences.
It will become at once apparent that Rashi has put a Hebrew translation of the Aramaic citation before he continues with his citation from the Talmud.

**IBN YACHYA:**

At that time my reason returned to me and I went back to my glorious kingdom and the color and light of my face came back to me and my princes and officials sought me and I was installed over my kingdom and more glory was added to me.

Ibn Yachya has translated 'יֵהֵן exactly as Rashi did, in fact he may be using Rashi as his source for both his rendering of בְּיִהְרָלַת וַחֲנָנִית as וַחֲנָנִית and בְּיִהְרָלַת וַחֲנָנִית as וַחֲנָנִית. Ibn Yachya also understands the imperfect יָרָד as a perfect (he translates once with בֹּשָׂר and once with נָעַר). The phrase 'יֵהֵן is a kind of epexegetical statement which clarifies יָרָד in this context. יֵהֵן is an adjective which means "repaired, amended, corrected, perfected," in combination with the copula in a periphrasis for a perfect passive (the Aramaic is hophal perfect). It is further interesting to note that while both Rashi and Ibn Yachya use בְּיִהְרָלַת וַחֲנָנִית to translate יָרָד, Rashi uses בַּלִּי to express "to" (as does Aramaic), whereas Ibn Yachya uses בַּלִּי. In Biblical Hebrew there
are many cases of the verb יְּסָרַע with ל, and also with מָעַל, but none which the present author could find with מָעַל.

Verse 34:

RASHI:

And his ways are justice. And those walking in pride he is able to abase.

This verse is very straightforward in its translation. Both ל and מָעַל are used as substantives meaning "the one who..." in this verse. Keil notes that מָעַל is the Aramaic equivalent to the Hebrew מָעַל. The word מָעַל is the normal targumic translation of Hebrew מָעַל and so it is only natural that Rashi should reverse the process here with the common Hebrew word.

IBN EZRA:

As in "when they abased you, you shall say, proud."

The citation here given is from Job 22.29—a passage much discussed among exegetes. Many scholars amend the text to read מָעַל וְלָשׁוֹן הָעַבְרָה,"He (God) abases the proud" (RSV). The Jewish Publication Society Version has translated, "When they case thee down, thou shalt say, 'there is lifting up.'" For the present purpose, however, the translation problem is secondary. The reason why Ibn Ezra chose Job 22.
29 for an example is that the spelling of "pride" (יהז) is the same as in the text of Daniel IV.34. Ibn Ezra has simply demonstrated the usage of the identically spelled Hebrew cognate from elsewhere in the Old Testament.

IBN YACHYA:

Therefore now I praise, extol, and honor the king of heaven, all of whose deeds are true and whose ways are just; and those who walk in pride he is able to humble.

The translation here is very exact, almost form for form. The differences are very minor. Nebuchadnezzar's name is left out of Ibn Yachya's translation most probably because it was considered superfluous to the meaning of the sentence. The other difference is that Ibn Yachya has added a third person masculine plural pronominal suffix to the final infinitive.

V.25-28

Verse 25: 

RASHI:

That is to say, etc., the interpretation of which is God has numbered the days of your kingdom. He has reckoned the end, for the kingdom of your father and his seed is at an end and he has revealed that it is already finished.
The comment of Rashi here is actually on verses 25 and 26. He spells out the structure of these two verses, rightly stating that אֲנַיָּדִים, etc. is the interpretation of the first two words of the inscription (which the Aramaic text itself also makes clear). The purpose of the comment upon אָלֶף is to make much of the perfect tense. God has already brought about the fall of the Babylonian empire. He has reckoned the time of the end and brought that end about. The deed is already done, at least in God's intent. It is probable that this intent of God is the sphere in which Rashi means to indicate that the action is perfected since it is obvious from the story that at this point the end is imminent, but not actually accomplished. In any case, the difference is slight because verse 30 states that the end of the kingdom occurred אָלֶף. Rashi is not concerned at this point with the problem which has perplexed modern and ancient scholars alike; whether there are three or four words in the original inscription and what these words were. 177

IBN EZRA:

בָּכֶתַּב: מַכִּין כָּל-בַּבְרָר שִׁפַּוּר יִתְשׁוּבָה-שַׁהָרָה כְּמִלְתָּן וּפֵרָתָן שֶׁבֶּי בָּרָד נִמְצָא הַמַּעֲדֵל גְּלִימוּת שֶׁבֶּי בָּרָד אִיבָּרָתָן שֶׁבֶּי בָּרָד

כֹּשֶׁם: He inscribed, just as (is found in the passage), "the inscription in the book." אָלֶף: Each thing which will be narrated he will determine, and furthermore the word פֶּרַע (indicates) two (usages of) פֶּרַע, the first is פֶּרַע, the breaking up of his kingdom and their kareth;
the second יָלִיל indicates the one who cuts, the Medes and the Persians, therefore it says, "it is given to the Medes and Persians."

This comment, although under verse 25, contains the comment on the whole passage. The reference to the inscription in the book in lines 1 and 2 is a reference to Daniel X.21. In that verse the word הָלַע is found. It is apparently the only usage of the root *רָמ in Biblical Hebrew and Ibn Ezra uses it to illustrate the meaning of the Aramaic here. The meaning of the Hebrew at X.21 is "inscribed," and Ibn Ezra says that the Aramaic at the current verse means the same.

Ibn Ezra notes the two-fold play on words for כֶּרֶס (as Rashi does in his comment on verse 28 below). The first כֶּרֶס, the כֹּרֶס, the "breaking up" of the Babylonian empire, and the second is the agent of that breaking up, the Medo-Persian empire. In line 6 Ibn Ezra refers to the "break-up" of the kingship and כֹּרֶס. I have chosen to simply transliterate the word as "their kareth." Kareth basically means "extirpation." It consists of a punishment at the hands of heaven mentioned in the Bible as the penalty for a considerable number of sins committed deliberately such as: idolatry, desecration of the Sabbath, the eating of leaven on the Passover, incest and adultery; and some forbidden foods.

Kareth means premature death, although at what precise age was a matter of debate. Thirty-six sins punishable by
kareth are mentioned in the Mishnah. It is difficult to say which of the thirty-six sins brought about the ל橈ו of the Babylonian empire since it is likely that many, if not all thirty-six, were committed. Surely Belshazzar committed the sin of idolatry in using the temple vessels for an orgy and praising the "gods of gold and silver, bronze, iron, wood, and stone." This alone, without any further search would be justification for ל橈ו.

IBN YACHYA:

And this is the writing which was inscribed: פִּנְפְּנִי יַעֲשֶׂה בִּין מֵעַלְפּוֹ הָאָרֶץ. This was the reading of the writing.

Ibn Yachya here, and in the rest of the passage, has given a simple Hebrew translation of the Aramaic verse. He has used יִשּׁי here which is a conscious attempt on his part to imitate the classical Hebrew idiom. The most common word to have chosen to translate י!? would have been ל. Added after the Hebrew is a statement that the writing was read as מֵעַלְפּוֹ הָאָרֶץ. It is difficult to know just what Ibn Yachya meant by this comment. It is possible that he meant to contradict those who said that the words on the wall were written in a strange script or in a strange order, or possibly, those who wanted to state that there were only three words מֵעַלְפּוֹ הָאָרֶץ written. It is more likely that Ibn Yachya is contrasting what was written on the wall with
its interpretation (which is coming in verses 26-28), and thus emphasizing the distinction between יכ and ישוע which the Aramaic text sets up.

Verse 26: יכ בּוֹהֵן קָנֶה עֲבֵר עָבְרֵה אֵלֶּהָ לַעֲבֵרֵה הָיוֹתֵה

(NEITHER RASHI NOR IBN EZRA COMMENT UPON THIS VERSE).

IBN YACHYA:

And its interpretation is this: אַלּוֹ הַמִּלְחָמָה, that is, God has numbered the time of your kingship and finished it.

Ibn Yachya merely translates the Aramaic into Hebrew. The conjunction which is prefixed to יכ is best taken as epexegetical ("that is"). He adds the word יכ "time" to make explicit and clear what the Aramaic leaves unsaid, although Ibn Yachya's interpretation is undoubtedly correct. The LXX here inserts the word προορίζω, thus making the same addition as Ibn Yachya does. The suffix on the final verb (לְזָכַרְוֶה) is feminine in the Aramaic and masculine in the Hebrew. Ibn Yachya has treated לְזָכַרְוֶה as a masculine noun before (e.g. at II.39,40). The reason here is probably that he thought of the word לְזָכַרְוֶה not as an abstract term, but related to a specific man, and so masculine ad sensum.

Verse 27: יכ וַיֹּאמֶר הָאֵל לְזָכַרְוֶה הַמִּלְחָמָה מִגְרוֹם, פֶּרֶץ

RASHI:

And the interpretation of which is,
"you have been weighed in his presence in the scales and you and you have been found deficient from all points of view.

Rashi simply offers a paraphrase of the Aramaic. He adds רצוי, referring to God, making it clearer that the judge of the Babylonian empire is God. Another addition consists in the last two words, זכרנו, which mean literally, "from any side." Belshazzar and his kingdom are deficient in all directions. If Rashi knows anything of the theory (re)discovered in modern times and now commonly accepted that the words in the inscription referred to differing weights; a mina, a shekel, and a half-mina (or half-shekel) he surely does not divulge such knowledge here.

IBN YACHYA:

That is, you have been weighed in the balances and found to be deficient.

One must assume that Ibn Yachya wrote the Aramaic in a doubly defective manner. This is wholly possible for BHK.7 gives הניה in its text and אָ产业发展, אָ产业发展, and אָ产业发展 as variants. The last variant comes into BHK.7 from the apparatus of the text printed in Strack's Grammar. 188 Translating in this manner here and in verses 26 and 28 goes against L'Empereur who has translated verse 26 as "Mene computavit et numeravit...," whereas, had he taken the phrase the way it has been outlined above he would have most prob-
ably had "Mene mena, i.e. numeravit...etc."

Verse 28:

RASHI:

Verse 25:

In other words, רָשִׁעי proclaims two נָאוּ הָלִי. The first is הנָאוּ הָלִי, "your kingdom is divided," and the second is that it has been given to the Medes and the Persians.

Rashi, by implication, here notes the problem of finding נָאוּ הָלִי in verse 25 and נָאוּ הָלִי here. This problem had bothered scholars through the years and various attempts have been made at a resolution. Rashi simply states that the reason why נָאוּ הָלִי is found in verse 25 is that the root נוֹךְ could mean that he takes it as a dual form at least in meaning as did Clermont-Ganneau in 1886 and Bentzen in 1952.

Most modern scholars have recognized this double paranomasia on נָאוּ הָלִי here. A citation from S. R. Driver must suffice, he states that נוֹךְ or נָאוּ הָלִי "points allusively to a double interpretation: 'Thy kingdom is divided (pérîs), and given to the Medes and Persians' (Aramaic pāras)."

Rashi, of course, goes on to affirm that the reason for נוֹךְ in verse 25 is the dual paranomasia. Hans Bauer proposed just the opposite when he posited that the original text of
the inscription was הָיָה הָכָה הַמֶּלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, the two-fold repetition of the first and last elements balancing each other. This original was changed by "a foolish scribe" to י'יה. 

The two fold paranomasia of the last word grew out of the repetition of it. The objections to this theory are two, first, why then did not this "foolish scribe" change the repetition of לא to לא? Second, with E. G. Kraenling, it is fair to ask whether the two-fold play on words could not come out of לא as easily as על על? It is interesting to note that Kraenling agrees with Rashi (although he does not state this). He states that the "twofold paranomasia of verse 28 might readily be due to a plural parsin in verse 25." 

**IBN YACHYA:**

כִּרְכָּה פְּרִיסָה והשְׁבוּךְ: That is, your kingdom has been broken up and given to the Medes and the Persians.

Ibn Yachya translates the verb הָכָה by the niphal of הבש "to break up." This agrees with both Rashi and Ibn Ezra. It is interesting that while Ibn Yachya has treated רבים as a masculine noun in the previous verse, he here treats it as a feminine, which can be seen in the fact that both הבש and הָכָה are feminine niphals. The present author must confess that Ibn Yachya's alternation between masculine and feminine genders for this word is confusing and seemingly arbitrary.
Verse 1: 

Rashi:

Why are his years counted? To tell you that in the day that Nebuchadnezzar entered the temple in the days of Jehoiakim (it should be read Jehoiachin) his adversary Darius was born. From the exile of Jeconiah until this point was 62 years. It has been said that they went into exile in the days of Jehoiachin (i.e.) in the seventh (year) after the subjugation of Jehoiakim, this being the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar. There were left to Nebuchadnezzar thirty-seven (years) for behold he reigned 45 years; along with twenty-three years of Evil-Merodach as it is written by our sages of blessed memory in Tractate Megillah, 2 (years) they were subject to Belshazzar—behold, 62 years!

The explanation given here to the very difficult problem of Darius the Mede's age is that he was born on the very day of Jerusalem's fall. Rashi says that at the time of Jerusalem's destruction the seed of Babylon's own destruction first sprouted. The 62 years is the period from the deportation of Jehoiachin to the fall of Babylon. Jeconiah (line 7) is, of course, a biblical synonym for Jehoiachin. The words תְּחָכְשָׁנָה ("until this point," line 7) actually indicate "until the point of" Belshazzar's death and the fall.
of Babylon.

Rashi's chronology here is hard to establish, but it is fairly sure that he was working with a different set of dates than those with which modern scholars work. The first problem is that from the exile of Jeconiah (Jehoiachin) in 598 until the end of the exile in 539 is 70 years not 62. What is evidently being discussed by Rashi is the deportation of the people, which according to Rashi happened in the seventh year after the subjugation and death of Jehoiakim, which is the same as the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. The problem is that the seventh year after the death of Jehoiakim would be around 591 (he was besieged in 598) and the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar is 598. Nebuchadnezzar reigned from 605 until 562 which is 43 years and not 45 as Rashi suggests. Evil-Merodach's supposed reign of 23 years should, of course, be divided among himself (two years, 562-560), Neriglissar (four years, 560-556), and Nabonidus (seventeen years, 556-539), which totals 23. Belshazzar was most probably not ever considered to be the king, but adding his supposed two years one does get a total of seventy, from which according to Rashi must be subtracted eight years ("in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar") which gives sixty-two years. Rashi did not invent the idea that there were only three kings of the neo-Babylonian Empire. The Bible mentions only three and the Talmud (Megillah 11b)
assumes that these are the only three:

Eight and thirty-seven make forty-five for Nebuchadnezzar. The twenty-three of Evil Merodach we know from tradition. These with two of his own make seventy.¹⁹⁸

Rashi is also following the Talmud for the fact that the seventh year after the subjugation of Jehoiakim was the same as the eighth of Nebuchadnezzar:

"...And they went into exile...," (that is to say) in the seventh year after the subjugation of Jehoiakim, they underwent the exile of Jecopjah, this being the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar.¹⁹⁹

Josephus gives another chronology, giving 43 years to Nebuchadnezzar, 18 to Evil-Merodach, 40 to Neriglissar, nine months to Labosordacus, and 17 years to Baltasar who was known to the Babylonians as Naboandelius.²⁰⁰ This gives a total time-span of 119 years (roughly) from the accession of Nebuchadnezzar until the fall of Babylon. Using modern dates this means that according to Josephus the neo-Babylonian Empire stretched from 605 until 486. This is obviously wrong. It is evident that Rashi is more accurate in his chronology than Josephus. It is also evident that there was confusion about neo-Babylonian chronology as early as the time of Josephus and the talmudic traditions.

Nonetheless, Rashi's tradition rests on the Talmud and so may be said to rest on ancient Jewish tradition. If some person thought that this was the age of Darius the Mede at the fall of Babylon and that the reason was, as has been
set out above, it might easily explain why the author of this story chose to insert the age at this seemingly strange point in the narrative. If this is the case the actual accuracy of the tradition becomes irrelevant. If the author thought the tradition to be accurate this is as good a reason for the insertion of the age of Darius the Mede as any modern scholar has suggested.

IBN EZRA:

וְרָאִים: Know that this is Darius the Mede, it is not Darius the Persian in the second year of whose reign the house (of God) was rebuilt. And behold, in the opinion of the ancients, which I shall expound, Daniel erred in his reckoning. Behold they said that in the seventh year (of Ahasuerus) that Esther was brought and in the eighth year Darius was born her son. Now behold, that means that he would become king at age five and in the second year of his reign the house (of God) was rebuilt. Behold it is written, "Jehoash was seven years old when he began to reign;" and close to this (is) the number of (the years of) Josiah. But behold it is written concerning him that Darius was an old man of 62 years when he began to reign over the Chaldeans. Now, it is certain that Cyrus captured Babylon, as it is written in the book of Isaiah. It is also written that Cyrus was king of Babylon. And after him Ahasuerus became king and after Ahasuerus, in the opinion of our sages, Darius the Persian who was the son of Esther became king.
Now although it is written, "in the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, by birth a Mede," this is not Ahasuerus who took Esther, but a different one, rather, he was the father of the older Darius, who was the first king over the kingdoms of the Medes and the Persians, who ruled the Chaldeans as Babylon was captured and the Chaldean kingdom put to an end before the death of Belshazzar. Now it is unnecessary to belabor (the point) for the matter is obvious and there is no doubt about it. In the books of the Persian kings (it is found) that Darius, this one being the older one, was the father-in-law of Cyrus. And the two of them captured Babylon; Cyrus being king of the Persians and this Darius being king of the Medes. And it is written, "Behold I am stirring up the Medes against them," and behold, Cyrus placed his father-in-law over the kingdom of the Chaldeans, that is, Cyrus made him king. For Cyrus said, "All the kingdoms of the earth God gave into my hand." And behold, they both reigned simultaneously, therefore when the Chaldeans fell, Israel went up from Babylon with Zerubbabel as Cyrus, the great king, had commanded. Therefore it is written, "And they became servants to him and to his sons until the founding of the Persian empire." And the exegesis of Ibn Ezra draws a distinction between Darius the Mede...
and Darius the Persian. The Persian Darius was the son of Ahasuerus and Esther, the Mede Darius the son of a different Ahasuerus and an unnamed mother. By saying this, Ibn Ezra eliminates the problems of chronology since Darius the Persian was only five years old when he came to the throne and Darius the Mede was an old man at a time previous to the time of the death of Ahasuerus (the Persian), at the fall of Babylon. The fact of the possibility of a young boy king is shown by citing the cases of Jehoash and Josiah, both of whom were very young when they began to reign. The fact that Daniel erred in the reckoning is to be found in Megillah 12a:

Raba said: Daniel also made a mistake in his calculation, as it is written, "In the first year of his reign, I Daniel meditated in the books." From the use of the words "I meditated" we can infer that he (at first) made a mistake.

That Esther was the mother of Darius the Persian can be extrapolated from Sanhedrin 74a. It is interesting that this is denied by the Zohar.

Ibn Ezra recognizes the historical problem of the biblical text in line 13 when he states that it is certain that Cyrus was the conqueror of Babylon and that he became king of Babylon. The portion of Isaiah to which Ibn Ezra refers in line 14 is most probably 44.24-45.13 which names Cyrus (44.28; 45.1) as God's shepherd and annointed one. The task at hand is clearly the subjugation and destruction
of Babylonia, although this is never explicitly stated. The passage referred to in line 15, הַבָּלָּנֹ֣יהוֹן, is Ezra 5.13 (which is in Aramaic).

In lines 18 and following Ibn Ezra states that Darius the Mede had a different father from Darius the Persian, although the name of both fathers was the same. He then appeals to אַתָּלְאֵֽד which state that Darius was the father-in-law of Cyrus. Josephus declares that Cyrus and Darius were kinsmen. Ginzberg states that Darius, the king of Media, was the father-in-law of Cyrus, but gives no reference to Jewish literature, and at a later point refers to Abravanel's commentary to Isaiah 45. Evidently Ibn Ezra was standing upon what he considered to be sound historical sources when he stated that there was a marriage relationship between the families of Cyrus and Darius the Mede.

According to Josephus Darius the Mede was the son of Astyages while Daniel and Ibn Ezra call him the son of Ahasuerus, so it is unlikely that Ibn Ezra depends on Josephus. Xenophon and Herodotus do not recognize Darius the Mede and so it is hardly likely that Ibn Ezra was using these sources for the derivation of the information on the relation between Darius and Cyrus. Wherever Ibn Ezra derived his information here he assumed that Darius the Mede was a real, historical person who reigned at the same time that Cyrus had power. He states that Cyrus was the real
power and that Cyrus made Darius king. This probably means that Ibn Ezra interpreted along lines meaning that, "...Darius did not conquer it (Babylon), but received it from the conqueror" (Cyrus). 210

All that Ibn Ezra says is that "Cyrus made him king" (line 32), but by also stating that Darius was the father-in-law of Cyrus he intimates at least part of what Jerome writes concerning Darius the Mede (concerning a certain arrangement made between Cyrus and his uncle Darius):

...I mean that Darius was sixty-two years old, and that, according to what we read, the kingdom of the Medes was more sizeable than that of the Persians, and being Cyrus's uncle, he naturally had a prior claim, and ought to be accounted as successor to the rule in Babylon. 211

Both Ibn Ezra and Jerome refer to Isaiah 13.17, "Behold I am stirring the Medes up against them." A major difference is that Jerome does not interpret $\text{received (from Cyrus),}$" but rather as "succeeded to" (the Vulgate reads successit in regnum). 212

Since, according to Ibn Ezra, Darius the Mede and Cyrus were historical contemporaries it is legitimate to call Cyrus the king of Babylon as Ezra 5.13 does. It is interesting to note that while Rashi spends no time identifying Darius or any historical facts about him, Ibn Ezra shows no interest in Darius' age. It is actually strange that Ibn Ezra does not mention the age question here. It is at least
possible that Ibn Ezra knew of the tradition explicated by Rashi, and that he considered it to be sufficiently well-known and accurate to omit mention of it. It is also, of course, possible that he considered the age of Darius the Mede to be an indifferent matter.

The translation and exegesis of lines 40-43 is very uncertain. What is most likely to be understood is that the first "he" (שָׁמַל עַל־הָבַל שָׁוֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) in lines 40-41 is Cyrus and that the second one (כִּי הִיה סִלְלְבָּה בְּבָטַח) in lines 41-42 is Darius the Mede. His concern here is to show that it is legitimate to call Cyrus the king of Babylon as Ezra did. The Jews went back to their land almost immediately according to Ibn Ezra's implication. This means that Darius did not reign much longer than a year and perhaps less. He did have a first year because of the testimony of Daniel IX.1; XI.1, however. Rashi takes the view in his commentary to VI.21 that Darius "did not reign but a year," citing the historian Joseph ben Gorion as an authority for the fact that Darius the Mede was slain in battle (והורח בְּמַלְצָה). Ibn YACHYA:

And Darius the Mede received that kingdom when he was sixty-two years old.

This is a mere Hebrew translation of the verse in as neutral terms as possible. The changes from the Aramaic are
two and both are minor. First, Ibn Yachya adds the demonstrative רֹאשׁ, "that" to the word הָנִיעֻס (חַיֹּל). It could be said that the emphatic state in Aramaic is already demonstrative and so Ibn Yachya only makes more explicit what is implicit in the biblical text. 215 Second, he eliminates the particle (in his translation replacing it with (plus לִבְנָה. This shows that he most probably understood the ( as referring to "the time when" as it does in IV.16, (וֹא הָנִיעַס, "for a bit." 216 Ibn Yachya apparently had no problems with the verse and saw it as straightforward historical narration.

CONCLUSION

As one comes to the end of this chapter and with it the end of the current study of Daniel I-VI, it seems wise to add a brief summary on the work of the rabbis which has just been sampled. The other chapters have been more-or-less self-contained and have summaries included within them. The two well-known rabbis, Rashi and Ibn Ezra, are similar in that they usually offer full comments on the biblical text rather than a simple Hebrew translation as is the usual habit of Ibn Yachya. Rashi has the far simpler style both to translate and to understand when compared with Ibn Ezra. This simplicity is sometimes a problem in that Rashi writes only what is absolutely necessary to convey his meaning. This leads to lacunae which have to be made up
when translating into English. A glance at the translations given above will adequately show this laconic style. Ibn Ezra writes very involved sentences. He does not always clearly differentiate between subjects, as his comment on VI.1 shows clearly. Towards the end of this comment (lines 40-43) Ibn Ezra names two "he's" and it is not clear to whom he is referring. He also tends to write more detailed comments (see his comments on II.39 and VI.1).

Although his style is simpler and his comments are less involved Rashi's commentary is valuable because it reflects Jewish tradition. One suspects that Ibn Ezra is more independent of tradition in his exegesis. This is most easily seen in the fact that Rashi cites the Talmud quite frequently (e.g. II.37,40; IV.33). Ibn Ezra tends to be more apt to cite current philosophical thoughts, as he most probably does in his comment to IV.28, lines 14-16.

Ibn Yachya is really not directly comparable with the other two because he is not primarily a commentary, but a paraphrase of Daniel into Medieval Hebrew. There is also a distance of about four hundred years between Rashi and Ibn Ezra on the one hand and Ibn Yachya on the other. Once in a while Ibn Yachya does do more than a paraphrase. An example is II.45 where he sets out his interpretation for the passage II.37-45. His exegesis is contained in his translation or paraphrase in most instances. He writes in
a fairly clear manner. He seems to show a greater familiarity with Rashi's work than he does with Ibn Ezra's, although dependence upon the former cannot be shown. He does take an independent line of interpretation concerning the four kingdoms in chapter II. His interpretation of the strong and weak parts of the last kingdom shows a creativity in exegesis which is refreshing even today.

There is no demonstrable connection between the rabbis which have been studied here and the LXX which was studied in the last chapter. Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Ibn Yachya appear to have read a text which is very much like the MT and which shows none of the divergences that mark the LXX. In their comments the rabbis seem most often to read the Qere and ignore the Kethibh. Most times the biblical text that accompanies Ibn Yachya's paraphrase has the Qere printed in it. The reason for this has been suggested at more than one point above.

A final comment concerns the importance of these rabbinic works. They form a vital link in the history of exegesis; a link which is often left undone because of the difficulty in understanding what these men have to say. The primary interest in these exegetes will always be historical. Their exegesis is most often important to show what particular men thought at specific times. This is to be contrasted with exegesis which can be accepted by persons in the modern
world as illuminating the original context of a biblical passage. It is not often that the rabbis offer acceptable exegesis for modern man. The critical canons of modern exegesis do not allow for working with the text in the manner in which the rabbis sometimes do. An exception to this might be found in Rashi's explanation of Darius' age at VI.1.

It is not exegesis which stands forever but scripture. Each age demands its own commentators and commentaries. These rabbis did a remarkable job of taking the biblical text seriously and producing some sober exegesis. This was at a time when many of their Christian counterparts were indulging in wild allegorical flights of fancy and calling their work exegesis. The work of Rashi and Ibn Ezra must never be ignored in the history of exegesis of a book like Daniel. A critical English edition of the complete commentaries of these men on the book of Daniel would be a difficult but worthwhile future project either for the current author or some other to undertake.
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207. Antiquities, X.11.

208. LJ, IV, pp. 343,353; VI, p. 439.

209. See Rashi on VI.29.


212. The text which Jerome read was most probably Theodotion. This text reads παισελαγε, which can be used to mean "succeeding by inheritance"; LS, p. 1315a.

213. סנסמך דרוי שיבין חתם.
214. J. ben Gorion lived in the tenth century AD. Ibn Ezra cites him in his comment on II.39, see there for comment. For an interesting tradition that it was Darius rather than Cyrus who gave the decree for the Jews to return, see LJ, VI, 439-440.

215. Indeed, the Hebrew definite article (as well as the Aramaic emphatic state) may possibly come from a fragment of the demonstrative being attached to the noun; see GK, sec. 35L.
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