

Appendix C

TEXTS AND VERSIONS

I. THE HEBREW-ARAMAIC COMPOSITION

One unique feature of the Book of Daniel is that the book is written in more than one language. About half of the book (1:1–2:4a; 8:1–12:13) is written in Hebrew, while the remainder (2:4b–7:28) is written in Aramaic (the *KJV* refers to this as "Syriack").

Hebrew was the language of God's covenant people, whereas Aramaic was the *lingua franca* of the Gentile world in Daniel's day. Accordingly, Aramaic is used when the book focuses on gentile powers, and Hebrew is used when the book focuses on God's covenant people Israel and their future.

Regarding the Aramaic of Daniel, Harrison notes:

. . . Official Aramaic was employed increasingly by Assyrian government officials between 1100 and 600 B.C., becoming the language of diplomacy in the Persian period, even though royal inscriptions were still being inscribed in Old Persian at that time.¹

There is nothing about the Aramaic in Daniel that would suggest that the text was not composed in the time of Daniel (i.e., 6th cent. BC). Harrison adds, "When the vocabulary of Daniel is examined, nine-tenths of it can be attested immediately from West Semitic inscriptions, or papyri from the 5th cent. B.C. or earlier."² Hebrew terms and expressions in Daniel are also characteristic of the 6th century BC, and do not suggest a late date for the book.³

II. THE QUESTION OF AN ARAMAIC ORIGINAL

Some of the critical commentaries will often discuss the possibility of chapters 1 and 7–12 having been originally written in Aramaic and only later translated into Hebrew. However, the lack of Aramaic copies of these chapters throws great suspicion on such a suggestion. For an introductory discussion, see Collins (*Daniel*, 12-13).

III. FOREIGN LOANWORDS

In addition to the Hebrew and Aramaic sections of the book, there are a number of foreign *loanwords* in the book:

A. Akkadian loanwords (not surprising in light of Daniel's life in Babylon)

¹ Harrison, "Daniel, Book of," in *ISBE*, 1:860.

² *Ibid.*

³ Some Hebrew terms were thought to be evidence of late linguistic usage: (1) Driver once regarded *malḵût* ("royal power," "reign") as such. This was "actually used in all periods of the Hebrew language, and represent a noun pattern found in Akkadian as early as the 18th cent. B.C." (Harrison, 860). (2) *ʾāmar lē* ("command to") was formerly thought to be a late literary form. Yet this also occurs in Dt 9:25; Josh 22:33; 1 Sam 30:6, as well as in the postexilic works (Neh 9: 15,22).

B. Words of Persian origin (about 19 or so)

Some of these are attested in the Targums. "About half of the Persian loan words occur in Official Aramaic, and in general can be found in sixth- to fifth-century B.C. literary sources."⁴ To this, Harrison adds,

... all the Persian loanwords in Daniel are specifically Old Persian (which is found on inscriptions from the 6th and 5th cent. B.C.), indicating that the Aramaic of Daniel in this area is certainly pre-Hellenistic rather than Maccabean.

C. Greek words

As in the case of Akkadian loanwords, it is not surprising to find Greek words in Daniel. Waltke notes, "Greek words are now attested in the Aramaic documents of Elephantine dated to the fifth century B.C."⁵

IV. FRAGMENTS FROM QUMRAN

Apparently, the Book of Daniel must have enjoyed some popularity among the inhabitants of Qumran. Mansoor reports,

The Book of Daniel must have been read a great deal: two manuscripts of it were found in Cave One, four in Cave Four, and one in Cave Six. Most of them follow the Massoretic text, apart from a few variants related to the Hebrew archetype of the Septuagint.⁶

Those who mistakenly date the Book of Daniel in the 2nd century BC find the fragments from Qumran to be rather significant. Cross, for instance, writes,

One copy of Daniel is inscribed in the script of the late second century B.C.; in some ways its antiquity is more striking than that of the oldest manuscripts from Qumrân, since it is no more than about a half century younger than the autograph of Daniel. It is thus closer to the original edition of a biblical work than any biblical manuscript in existence, unless it be the Rylands Fragment of John from the first half of the second century A.D.⁷

Despite Cross's claim, however, the evidence is more in favor of a 6th century BC date for the book (see Date and Authorship).

⁴ Ibid., 1:861.

⁵ Bruce K. Waltke, "The Date of the Book of Daniel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 133 (Oct-Dec 1976): 324.

⁶ Menahem Mansoor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983), 7. Cf. J. C. Trever, "The Book of Daniel and the Origin of the Qumran Community," *Biblical Archaeologist* 48 (1985): 81-102.

⁷ Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Biblical Studies*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1961). Cf. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard UP, 1975).

The finds from Qumran consist of the following fragments:

- 1) 1QDan^a (1:10-17; 2:2-6)⁸
1QDan^b (3:22-30)
- 2) 4QDan^a (2:19-35; part of the middle portion of the book)⁹
4QDan^b (middle portion of Daniel)
4QDan^c
- 3) 6QDan (8:16-17?; 8:20-21?; 10:8-16; and 11:33-36,38)¹⁰

V. GREEK TRANSLATIONS

Ideally, it would be helpful to our study of Daniel if we could compare *the* Greek Septuagint text (LXX) with our present critical edition of the Hebrew Bible. Unfortunately, such an ideal Greek text does not exist for Daniel. Instead, what we have are two quite differing Greek traditions, each represented by several Greek manuscripts. These are the "Old Greek" tradition (OG) and another most often referred to as Theodotion (Th)—though there is considerable debate as to whether this latter tradition was even translated by the historic person of Theodotion. Before we can use the Greek translation to supplement our study of the Hebrew-Aramaic text of Daniel, we must first know more about these two Greek traditions, the manuscripts that lie behind them, and the relationship that they have to one another. In the early church, there was a tendency to give preference to the Theodotion tradition, though the reasons for this are not altogether identifiable. Jerome, writing near the end of the fourth century, confessed:

The Septuagint version of Daniel the prophet [Jerome means the OG] is not read by the Churches of our Lord and Saviour. They use Theodotion's version, but how this came to pass I cannot tell. Whether it be that the language is Chaldee, which differs in certain peculiarities from our speech, and the Seventy were unwilling to follow those deviations in a translation; or that the book was published in the name of the Seventy, by some one

⁸ Published by J. C. Trever, "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Cave I," *RevQ* 19 (1965): 323-336. The Daniel fragments appear on plates v and vi.

⁹ The analysis and publication of the fragments from Cave 4 was entrusted to Frank M. Cross of Harvard. In 1956 he reported, ". . . a sizeable proportion of the book of Daniel is extant in three relatively well preserved MSS" ("Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran: Cave 4 of Qumran (4Q)," *Biblical Archaeologist* 19 [1956]: 83-86). In the late 1980's and onward, however, several articles were published by Eugene Ulrich on the mss from Cave 4: "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDan^a," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 268 (1987): 17-37; "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDan^b and 4QDan^c," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 274 (1989): 3-31; and "Orthography and Text in 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b and in the Received Masoretic Text," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls*, edited by H. W. Attridge, J. J. Collins, and T. H. Tobin, 29-42 (Lanham: Univ. Press of America, 1990).

¹⁰ Published by M. Baillet and J. T. Milik, "Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran," *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* 3:114-116 [see plate xxiii].

or other not familiar with Chaldee, or if there be some other reason, I know not; this one thing I can affirm—that it differs widely from the original, and is rightly rejected.¹¹

A. The Old Greek Tradition (OG)

There are three primary witnesses to the OG tradition:

1. Codex Chisianus (ms 88)

This manuscript (sometimes referred to as Chigi) is variously dated to the 9th-11th centuries AD, and was finally published in 1772.¹² Collins, however, believes that it attests not the original OG but Origen's Hexaplaric recension.¹³ Jobes and Silva point out that the Chigi manuscript (88) has two distinctives: "it is one of the few manuscripts that include the Hexaplaric signs, and it is the only Greek manuscript that preserves the Old Greek (rather than the Theodotonic) version of Daniel in its entirety."¹⁴

2. The Syro-Hexapla (Syh)

This manuscript is in Syriac rather than Greek, although it is a witness to the OG.¹⁵ Collins states that this was made by the Monophysite bishop Paul of Tella in AD 616-17, and published in 1788.¹⁶ Goldingay, however, dates it to the 9th century AD.¹⁷ McLay notes, "The Syh is an extremely literal translation of Origen's Hexapla into Syriac."¹⁸ [By this he means the fifth column of the Hexapla, not the work in its entirety]. He adds,

One notable feature of 88 and Syh is the extent of their agreement. Ziegler refers to them as 'sister manuscripts'.¹⁹

3. Fragments from Ms 967

¹¹ Jerome, "Preface to Daniel," in *Patrologia Latina* 28, col. 1357, ed. J. Migne; idem, *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, trans. W. H. Fremantle (1892; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 492; quoted in John C. Collins, *Daniel*, 3-4.

¹² Codex Chisianus was referred to as manuscript 88 in both Rahlfs' edition (1935) and Ziegler's edition (1954) of the Septuagint, but was incorrectly numbered as 87 by H. B. Swete.

¹³ John J. Collins, *Daniel*, 4.

¹⁴ Jobes, Karen H.; and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 2000), 63.

¹⁵ Regarding the Syriac translation of Daniel, see Richard A. Taylor, "The Peshitta of Daniel: Questions of Origin and Date," in *VI Symposium Syriacum, 1992*, ed. R. Lavenant, 31-42; and "The Peshitta of Daniel," in *Monographs of the Peshitta Institute* 7 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994). The Syriac text is available in a nineteenth century facsimile edition published by A. M. Ceriani (*Codex syro-hexaplaris ambrosianus*. Monumenta sacra et profana 7; Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1874).

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Goldingay, xxvi.

¹⁸ McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, 6-7.

¹⁹ Ibid., 7.

This is an incomplete but nevertheless significant witness to the OG. Papyrus 967 dates to the early 3rd century AD (perhaps even 2nd century) and was discovered in Aphroditopolis in Egypt in 1931.²⁰ Its leaves are found today in three different locations.²¹ McLay concludes, "The only extant pre-hexaplaric manuscript of Daniel is papyrus 967, which was discovered in 1931 and required 46 years and the efforts of four editors before it was fully published."²²

The primary edition of the OG has been that of Ziegler (1954, 1968).²³ However, it was based on ms 88, Syh and one portion of papyrus 967 (namely, the Chester Beatty fragments). Unfortunately, Ziegler's edition is lacking some of the crucial manuscript evidence, as the Cologne and Barcelona fragments of 967 were not available to him at the time. Yet there are a number of variants between 967 and Ziegler's text.²⁴ Furthermore, McLay contends that there are instances where the reading of 967 should be accepted over Ziegler's text. He concludes, "There is no doubt that 967 is the more faithful witness to the original OG text."²⁵ At this point, we must still await the publication of a *standard critical edition* of the OG text, though McLay mentions that a new revised edition of Ziegler's text is in preparation by O. Munnich. Naturally, Rahlfs' 1935 edition of the Septuagint is even more deficient for OG, since none of the fragments of papyrus 967 had been published at that time.²⁶

B. Theodotion (Th or θ)

The common tradition has been that Theodotion made his translation of the Old Testament into Greek about 180-181 AD. The earliest mention of Theodotion comes from the end of the second century AD by Irenaeus (lived ca. AD 120-202) who makes a passing comment about him in regard to the *virgin birth* prophecy from Isa 7:14. He states, ". . . Theodotion the Ephesian has interpreted, and Aquila of Pontus, both Jewish proselytes."²⁷ This does not necessarily mean, however, that the textual tradition given us

²⁰ Collins, 4.

²¹ In addition to the Chester Beatty fragments of ms 967 (located in Dublin), there also exists the Cologne and Barcelona fragments.

²² McLay, 7.

²³ Joseph Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

²⁴ See Tim McLay, "A Collation of Variants from 967 to Ziegler's Critical Edition of *Susanna, Daniel, Del et Draco*," *Textus* 18 (1995): 121-34.

²⁵ McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, 7.

²⁶ The initial publication of papyrus 967 (containing fragments of ch 3-8) was that of F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* (London: Walker, 1937). Subsequent publications of other portions were provided by Angelo Geissen, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel 5-12 sowie Esther 1-2, 15* (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 5; Bonn: Habelt, 1968); Winfried Hamm, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap. 1-2 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (PTA 10; Bonn: Habelt, 1969); idem, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap. 3-4* (PTA 21; Bonn: Habelt, 1977); and R. Roca-Puig, "Daniele: Due semifogli del codice 967: P. Barc. inv. nn. 42 e 43," *Aegyptus* 56 (1976): 3-18.

²⁷ Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Edinburgh, 1867; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1981), 451 [from III.21.1).

by Theodotion comes from the latter second century AD. Collins claims that because "the version of Daniel attributed to him was already known to New Testament authors, scholars posited a pre-Christian 'proto-Theodotion' whose work was allegedly taken up by the second-century author."²⁸ In other words, Theodotion (rather than providing an entirely new translation) may have merely been passing on a Greek tradition that had been in existence for two or more centuries.²⁹

The primary witnesses to "Theodotion" are Codex Vaticanus (B), Codex Alexandrinus (A), Origen's Hexaplaric recension (see Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 49-53), and the Lucianic recension ($L = \Theta^L$).³⁰ The critical text of Ziegler is the standard edition for Th (though Rahlfs' edition is also good, being based on B, A, and L).

C. Drawing Conclusions About Th and OG

If OG is older than Th (and scholars even debate this point), the question still remains as to whether or not Th is merely a recension (or revision) of the former. Most scholars have assumed this to be the case.³¹ Before commenting further on that, however, it would be wise to point out some of the challenges that we are faced with if we are to use the Greek text for text-critical purposes in regard to the Hebrew-Aramaic text:

1. We have two differing traditions of the Greek text (OG and Th), and we are not entirely sure of the relationship between them.
2. We still do not have a standard critical edition of OG, since Ziegler did not have all of papyrus 967 available to him when he prepared his edition (and McLay has demonstrated that 967 does have superior readings in some places).³²

²⁸ Collins, 10. See Collins (commentary, 9 [ftnotes 78 and 79]) for examples of readings thought to be Theodotianic in Matthew and Revelation. Jobes and Silva also point out a reference to Dan 6:23 in Heb 11:33, noting, "Although the author of Hebrews is otherwise heavily dependent on the 'Septuagint' or the Old Greek, this passage reflects Theodotion's rendering: '[God] shut the mouths of the lions' (*enephraxe ta stomata tōn leontōn*), rather than the Old Greek which says, 'God saved me from the lions' (*sesōke me ho theos apo tōn leontōn*)" (Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 42).

²⁹ A. Schmitt has argued that the characteristics of Daniel-Theodotion do not fit those found in materials otherwise attributed to Theodotion. See Schmitt, *Stammt der sogenannte θ -Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); and "Die griechische Danieltexte (<< θ >> und o') und das Theodotionproblem," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 36 (1992): 1-29.

³⁰ Lucian was a presbyter from Antioch (d. AD 312).

³¹ Jeansonne and Wenthe have argued that Th is a revision of OG (in which the reviser had as one of his goals adjusting the translation toward the contemporaneous Hebrew text), but McLay has called into question Jeansonne's approach and statistical sampling. See Sharon Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 19; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988); and Dean O. Wenthe, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1-6" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Notre Dame, 1991). Armin Schmitt has also argued against Th being a revision of the OG text (and that Th in Daniel cannot be ascribed to Theodotion).

³² McLay (241) goes so far as to call 967 the most reliable extant witness to the OG, though he confesses that 967 has (like 88 and Syh) suffered some corruption from Th and correction toward MT.

3. Chapters 4–6 of Daniel in the OG appear to be quite different than the other chapters of OG, which may suggest that the Greek translator was working with an entirely different *Vorlage*.

McLay assumes that ch 4–6 represent an alternative *Vorlage* than 1–3 and 7–12 (which supports Abertz' contention that 4–6 may be from a different translation).³³ McLay concludes, "Therefore, our working hypothesis is that the *Vorlage* of OG was very close to MT except in chapters 4–6 and the end of chapter 3 where OG has differences due to the long addition in the text."³⁴

4. Finally, although OG for the most part closely adheres to the MT, there is the problem of evaluating variant readings in the OG as against the MT.

McLay's comments in this regard are quite insightful. He posits,

There are three basic options: 1) Does the OG reflect a different *Vorlage* or a misunderstanding of the *Vorlage*? 2) Is the reading merely a dynamic rendering or does it in some way reflect the TT of the translator? 3) Is there evidence of theological *Tendenz* on the part of the translator, which motivated the rendering? Only with a balanced assessment of the TT of the whole book/unit in question can the text-critic begin to evaluate each possible variant and whether it originates from a differing *Vorlage*.³⁵

How then are we to evaluate OG and Th, and the relationship between them? McLay suggests three options:

There are at least three ways by which we could characterize Th's relation to OG. 1) It could be a completely independent translation. 2) It could be a recension in the way that it is generally understood. That is, Th had the OG and proto-MT before him and copied OG as long as it formally reproduced the *Vorlage*. In certain cases Th standardized the terminology, though not always consistently, and Th introduced corrections to the OG where it departed from his proto-MT *Vorlage*. These corrections may have resulted from Th's perception that OG translated incorrectly or too freely. 3) Another way to view their relationship is that Th did have both proto-MT and OG (or may have been familiar with OG), but that Th translated his *Vorlage* more or less independently and employed OG occasionally or when confronted with difficult passages."

Based on his intensive studies, McLay opts for the third possibility. Elsewhere, he states that ". . . the Theodotion text in Daniel is an independent translation and not a revision of the Old Greek."³⁶ Furthermore, he is of the opinion that the text of OG has been

³³ R. Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel*, SBS 131 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988). Collins (6-7) provides a helpful summary of the complicated and inconsistent translation of ch 4–6 in OG.

³⁴ McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*, 12.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 9. McLay uses the abbreviation TT to represent "translation technique."

³⁶ *Ibid.*, xv. In contrast to McLay, however, Collins asserted that Th is "better read as a correction of the older translation to conform more closely to the Hebrew-Aramaic. The difference between such a correcting revision and a fresh translation with an eye on the OG does not, however, appear to be either clear-cut or very significant" (11).

corrupted through harmonization to MT and Th.³⁷ If this were true, it would then require that the original OG text be disentangled as much as possible from the latter corrupted form, a task which would obviously be near impossible to do. Based on McLay's sampling of five passages, he concluded that both the OG and Th were attempting to give a faithful rendition of "a text virtually identical to MT," though OG tends to be more of a *dynamic translation* in contrast to the formal equivalence in Th.³⁸

Thus, there is a need for a great deal more work before we can confidently speak of the relationship of OG and Th, as well as their reliability for emending the readings of the MT. If McLay is correct, however, Th should be given due respect as a vital witness itself and not merely seen as a revision of the OG text. Furthermore, Th should certainly be regarded as the more reliable witness for chapters 4–6 in particular.

VI. ADDITIONS AND OTHER DANIEL STORIES

Like other books of the Old Testament, the Book of Daniel was eventually translated into Greek and became part of the Greek Septuagint. The Greek version of Daniel is actually longer than the Hebrew-Aramaic text. It adds, "The Story of Susanna" and "The Story of Bel and the Dragon." After Dan 3:23, a praise for deliverance from the furnace is added, entitled "The Song of the Three Children" along with the accompanying prayer of Azariah.³⁹

The placement of these additional stories is not the same in all Greek manuscripts, however. For instance, "The Story of Susanna" is found before Daniel 11 in the version of Theodotion but after Daniel 12 in the Old Greek and in the Vulgate. Yet it appears after "Bel and the Dragon" in Papyrus 967.

³⁷ Ibid., 14. See McLay's *Appendix* on page 245 for a list of the possible borrowing between OG and Th that he discovered in his studies.

³⁸ Karen Jobes has concluded that "θ' Daniel appears to be a more literal rendering of the Hebrew than OG Daniel" (*Invitation to the Septuagint*, 272).

³⁹ Not only are these stories excluded from the Hebrew Bible, but they have the appearance of being unfounded tales distinct from the miraculous stories of Scripture.