

Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Textual Criticism and Understanding of the Canonical Book of Daniel

ABSTRACT

What is the relevance of the scrolls found at Qumran and that is related in one way or another to the Book of Daniel? This question is answered in terms of the eight scrolls found at Qumran rendering the biblical text of the Book of Daniel. The contribution of these scrolls to issues relating to textual criticism of the Masoretic text of the Book of Daniel as well as the different versions is discussed. The question is also answered in terms of the nine scrolls found at Qumran that have, or might have, a relationship to the Book of Daniel. The implications of these manuscripts for the Danielic tradition as well as for understanding the canonical book are discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

At least seventeen scrolls found at Qumran have relevance for the study of the Book of Daniel. Eight of these are copies of the biblical book. This is a relatively large quantity in the light of scrolls and fragments from other biblical books found there. Daniel is outnumbered by only eight other books at Qumran – Psalms, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Genesis, Exodus, Jubilees, 1 Enoch, and Leviticus (in descending order of manuscripts). Daniel is a much shorter work, only about one third the size of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets (the last seen as one book at Qumran, Murabbba’at, and Nahal Hever). Only eight manuscripts of the Twelve and six each of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are preserved, and at most four copies of Job and Proverbs.

The value of these scrolls for the textual criticism of the Book of Daniel will be discussed.

Several other scrolls have been found at Qumran that either mention Daniel or contain material that has some relevance to the Book of Daniel. None of these new materials have been known before the findings at Qumran. It bears testimony to traditions related to Daniel among Jews. Nine scrolls have been discovered. Their value (if any) for the textual criticism and understanding of the biblical Book will also be discussed.

2. BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS OF DANIEL FOUND AT QUMRAN

Eight scrolls containing the biblical Book of Daniel have been found at Qumran, while none other scrolls rendering the biblical Daniel have been found in the Judaean desert (Bathélemy 1955:15-152; Baillet 1962:114-116; Ulrich 1987:17-37; 1989:3-26; 2000:239-289).

Table 1: Manuscripts of Daniel found at Qumran, and approximate dates

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Date copied</i>
1QDan ^a	1Q71	Herodian – 1 st half of 1 st century C.E.

1QDan ^b	1Q72	Herodian – early or mid 1 st century B.C.E.
4QDan ^a	4Q112	mid-1 st century B.C.E.
4QDan ^b	4Q113	ca. 20-50 C.E.
4Q Dan ^c	4Q114	late 2 nd or early 1 st century B.C.E.
4QDan ^d	4Q115	ca. mid- or late 1 st century B.C.E.
4QDan ^e	4Q116	late 2 nd or early 1 st century B.C.E.
pap6QDan ¹	6Q7	ca. 50 C.E.

Table 2: List of Biblical passages preserved in manuscripts

1QDan ^a	1:10-17; 2:2-6
1QDan ^b	3:22-30
4QDan ^a	1:16-20; 2:9-11, 29-49; 3:1-2; 4:29-30; 5:5-7, 12-14, 16-19; 7:5-7, 25-28; 8:1-5; 10:16-20; 11:13-16
4QDan ^b	5:10-12, 14-16, 19-22; 6:8-22, 27-29; 7:1-6, 11, 26-28; 8:1-8, 13-16
4Q Dan ^c	10:5-9, 11-16, 21; 11:1-2, 13-17, 25-29
4QDan ^d	3:8-10, 23-25; 4:5-9, 12-16; 7:15-23
4QDan ^e	9:12-17
pap6QDan	8:16-17, 20-21; 10:8-16; 11:33-36, 38

Table 3: List of passages in Biblical order

1:10-17	1QDan ^a
1:16-20	4QDan ^a
2:2-6	1QDan ^a
2:9-11, 19-49	4QDan ^a
3:1-2	4QDan ^a
3:8-10, 23-25	4QDan ^d
3:22-30	1QDan ^b
4:5-9, 12-16	4QDan ^d
4:29-30	4QDan ^a
5:5-7, 12-14, 16-19	4QDan ^a
5:10-12, 14-16, 19-22	4QDan ^b
6:8-22, 27-29	4QDan ^b
7:1-6, 11, 26-28	4QDan ^b
7:5-7, 25-28	4QDan ^a
7:15-23	4QDan ^d
8:1-8, 13-16	4QDan ^b
8:1-5	4QDan ^a
8:16-17, 20-21	pap6QDan
9:12-17	4QDan ^e
10:5-9, 11-16, 21	4Q Dan ^c
10:8-16	pap6QDan
10:16-20	4QDan ^a
11:1-2, 13-17, 25-29	4Q Dan ^c
11:13-16	4QDan ^a

1 Also designated as: 6QpapDan.

Flint (1997:42-45) discusses four issues relevant to the biblical Qumran Scrolls. It is necessary to identify the precise contents, in the first place, because these documents are normally heavily damaged. Secondly, it is also necessary to determine the form of the biblical Book of Daniel found in the manuscripts. Most of the Daniel scrolls have been heavily damaged and exist only in fragmentary state. The third issue concerns individual readings. The Daniel scrolls contain many variants from the Masoretic text. Some are minor while others are important. Neither the minor or important readings that differ from the received text can be ignored. Fourthly, it is also important to determine what the status of the Book of Daniel was at Qumran. Did the Qumran community regard it as Scripture or as a writing existing alongside other Qumran writings? The large number of preserved copies may be regarded as a determining factor showing the importance of the book in the Qumran community. The way in which Daniel was used at Qumran shows its authoritative status. For instance, the *Florilegium* (4Q174) quotes Daniel 12:10 with the accompanying words, "as written in the book of Daniel, the prophet". This shows that Daniel was regarded as Scripture, and may even have belonged to the *Nebi'im* in the Qumran community. By the end of the Qumran period, in 68 C.E. when the settlement was destroyed by the Romans, the *Torah* and *Nebi'im* were complete, while the *Ketubim* was still being assembled. The Qumran community possibly viewed the Book of Daniel as the last of the Prophets.

It is clear that all chapters, except chapter 12, of the biblical Book are represented in the biblical manuscripts at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium (4Q174 1-3 ii.3-4^{sup}), which is dated to the late first century B.C.E. or the early first century C.E., presents however a slightly variant quotation of Daniel 12:10: "...as it is written in the book of Daniel the prophet: '[For the wicked] to act wicked[ly...]' and the righteous shall pu[rify themselves, and make themselves w]hite, and be refined" (Allegro 1968:54). It is explicitly stated that it is written in the book of Daniel the prophet.

Seven of the eight scrolls originally contained the entire Book of Daniel, very much in the same form as that found in the Masoretic text. The eighth manuscript, 4QDan^c, contains only material preserved from Daniel's prayer in Daniel 9. The extent of this prayer may have covered five columns (Ulrich 2000:287). The scroll does not qualify as a copy of the Book of Daniel.

All these scrolls agree with the Masoretic text. Individual readings will be discussed separately. It is important to note that the scrolls do not agree with the longer text of the Septuagint (Flint 1997:41-60).

4QDan^c from the late second or early first century B.C.E. is closer to the autograph than any other book among the biblical Qumran Scrolls. Cross (1995_:43) is of the opinion that the book is "no more than about a half century younger than the autograph" (ca. 168-165 B.C.E.) of the book. Ulrich (2000:270) is of the opinion that the Scroll should be dated in 50 B.C.E.

3. TEXTUAL VARIANTS OF DANIEL FOUND AT QUMRAN

Ulrich (2001:575-579) presents a list of the more important textual variants where the Daniel scrolls differ from each other or from the Masoretic text. The list is not comprehensive, as many of the less significant variants are omitted, such as the presence or absence or copula, direct object markers, prepositions, etc.

From 4QDan^a, for instance, the following important examples are in order. In 2:40 the fourth kingdom is described by the Masoretic text as "like iron which crushes, it will break and crush all these" ("all these" referring to the preceding three kingdoms). 4QDan^a has a longer text: "[like iron which c]rushes all th[ese, it will break and cru]sh all the earth" (fragment 5 ii 9). The added words ("all the earth") is a better syntagmatical option by allowing "all these" to be read after "which crushes". The longer text is also found in the Septuagint and in the Greek papyrus 967.

The Masoretic text of Daniel 3:2 states: “And King Nebuchadnezzar sent”. 4QDan^a is substantially different: “And Michadnezzar sent” (frg. 7, line 8). The Aramaic text has visibly been corrected from “Michnezzar” to “Michadnezzar”. The lack of “king” in the scroll may reflect a different Hebrew text, but the other (“Michadnezzar”) is a transmission error rather than another name for the king.

In 10:19 this “man” encourages Daniel, and the Masoretic text continues: “And when he spoke to me, I was strengthened and said, ‘Let my lord speak, for you have strengthened me’”. In fragment 15 of 4QDan^a it is written: “[...] and I said, ‘Speak, my lord (or possibly, ‘My lord has spoken’), for you have strengthened me’” (line 18).

The manuscript witnesses attest three separate levels of development in the history of the text. The three strata of orthography, individual textual variants, and variant editions of the book should be treated as separate types of development, each of which has a distinctive history.

The Qumran manuscripts attest the Hebrew-Aramaic language distribution. 1QDan^a as well as 4QDan^a preserves the shift from Hebrew to Aramaic at 2:4b. 4QDan^a as well as 4QDan^b display the shift from Aramaic to Hebrew at 8:1.

3.1 Orthographical development

Neither the Masoretic text nor the Qumran scrolls shows a consistent orthographic system. For instance, the *mater lectionis* is used in a particular text, but not in subsequent verses. And the interchange of the letters a and h is commonplace, with the correct letter preserved in the Masoretic text or the scrolls interchangeably.

The short passage in which both 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b have overlapping text at the beginning of Daniel 8 shows six instances in which the two scrolls or the Masoretic text differ one from another orthographically. In five of the six readings 4QDan^a agrees with the Masoretic text in a shorter reading. Four times 4QDan^b adds _ where the other two lacks it, and once it has the longer cohortative form, commonly found in the Qumran texts, for an indicative. In the sixth instance 4QDan^a has the _ added as a *mater lectionis*. 4QDan^b was copied a century later than 4QDan^a, and it is conjectured that 4QDan^b may have been copied from a scroll in the text-family of 4QDan^a and that one of the scribes intentionally expanded the orthography of the text (Ulrich 2001:580).

3.2 Individual text variants

It is striking how little variation there actually is. There is virtually nothing of significance (cf. Flint’s 1997:43–44 discussion of the variants in 4QDan^b). The minor additions involve relatively little meaning. The Old Greek frequently agrees with the Qumran reading against the Masoretic text, and the Masoretic text usually has the shorter text (Collins 1993:330).

There are also occasional errors in the Masoretic texts and scrolls, as at 2:24 and 11:17. The Masoretic text also divides two expressions, ____, at 2:43, and ____, at 6:10. At 8:1 the scribe of 4QDan^a erred by using the formula of 10:1, realized the error and correcting it before finishing the line.

Some variants are palaeographically induced; some are due to linguistic or other confusion.

A few variants are more complicated, as in the longer reading in 4QDan^a and the Old Greek at 1:20; the double variant at 2:28 where 4QDan^a and Old Greek preserve an insertion against the Masoretic text; alternate names for the king at 3:2 and 11:1; and the number of horns at 8:4 in the various traditions.

Where 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b overlap, they agree with one another, often accompanied by the Old Greek, against the Masoretic text and Theodotion. 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b never agree with the Masoretic text against each other. In orthography 4QDan^a and the Masoretic text always agree with each other against the fuller spelling of 4QDan^b. But at the level of textual variants 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b agree, underscoring the distinctness of the orthographic and textual levels.

3.3 Variant literary editions

Four variant editions of the biblical Book of Daniel exist that can be traced, in addition to one or two extant scrolls that may have served as a source for the book (Eshel 2001:387), and in addition to the Daniel compositions found at Qumran (Flint 2001:331-363). The well-known 4QPrayer of Nabonidus was related to a source of the Book in one way or another, while 4QDan^e may reflect a copy of an originally separate prayer incorporated into Daniel 9.

The four variant editions of the biblical Book of Daniel are an edition no longer extant in any preserved manuscript but may be taken as the core or basis for the pair of parallel editions; the edition witnessed by the Masoretic text for chapters 4-6 (2₁); the parallel edition witnessed by the Old Greek for chapters 4-6 (2₂); and the edition which includes the "Additions" (The Prayer of Azariah, the Song of the Three Jews, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon). The Old Greek of Daniel 4 and 6 is longer than the Masoretic text, whereas the Masoretic text of chapter 5 is much longer than the Old Greek. Ulrich (1999:40-41) is of the opinion that both the Masoretic text and the Old Greek are secondary, each expanding in different directions, beyond an earlier common edition that no longer exists. The Masoretic text as well as 4QDan^a, 4QDan^b, and 4QDan^d attest edition 2₁, judging from the variants preserved from Daniel 4-6. The Old Greek attests edition 2₂. No evidence exists to link any of the other Daniel scrolls to either of the editions. Edition 3 is only attested by the Old Greek and Theodotion.

There are no textual variants due to the sectarian motivation unique to the Qumran community. The book was composed in the troubled period that gave rise to several Jewish parties, including the Pharisees and Essenes (Collins 1993:35-38). But none of the variants betrays any alteration by a scribe to the text in favour of his own party's theology or beliefs. The evidence of Daniel, in line with other biblical books copied and circulated at Qumran, is that points of difference were kept elsewhere while it does not occur in the Scripture (Ulrich 1999:21-22).

4. NON-BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS OF DANIEL FOUND AT QUMRAN

Material related to the Book of Daniel or traditions about Daniel are found in nine more Qumran scrolls, representing seven distinct compositions. They are all written in Aramaic, like Daniel 2:4b to 7:28.

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Date copied</i>
PrNab ar	4Q242	72-50 B.C.E.
psDan ^a ar	4Q243	early 1 st century C.E.
psDan ^b ar	4Q244	early 1 st century C.E.
ps Dan ^c ar	4Q245	early 1 st century C.E.
Apocalypse ar	4Q246	last third of 1 st century B.C.E.
papApocalypse ar	4Q489	ca. 50 B.C.E.
DanSuz? Ar	4Q551	late 1 st century B.C.E.
Four Kingdoms ^a ar	4Q552	ca. early 1 st century C.E.
Four Kingdoms ^b ar	4Q553	ca. early 1 st century C.E.

4.1 4Q242, 4QPrNab ar or "The Prayer of Nabonidus"

This prayer was first published in 1956 and contains several fragments of a first column and one fragment of a later column. Milik first suggested the placement of the fragments, followed by most researchers, but Cross suggested an alternative placement (Milik 1956:407-415; Cross 1984:260-264). Collins (1996:84) is of the opinion that Cross' placement should be accepted, but the alternative is not impossible. The script is a type of semi-cursive which Cross (1984:260) dates to the period 75-50 B.C.E.

The king's name is given as *Nabunay* (cf. Akkadian *nabû-na'id*); he is clearly Nabonidus, of Teiman (= Teima in line 2). As the last king of Babylon (556-539 B.C.E.), he absented himself from Babylon and lived in Teima in Arabia. Information about his stay in Teima is found in a cuneiform inscription, *Nabonidus Chronicle* (Pinches 1882:139-176), as well as in the *Verse Account of Nabonidus*, which is written from the viewpoint of the Babylonian clergy and is hostile towards the king (Pritchard 1969:305-307). Nabonidus' own account is preserved in an inscription from Harran (H2), published shortly after Milik's translation of 4Q242 (Gadd 1958:35-92).

Nabonidus' absence from Babylon was due to the Babylonian clergy's opposition to his rule, and was related to his preference for the moon-god Sin, as well as his plans to rebuild the temple of Sin at Harran (Beaulieu 1989:27).

The *Prayer of Nabonidus* does not refer to Daniel, but common themes between the *Prayer* and the Book of Daniel include a reference to a Babylonian king afflicted for seven years, his recovery due to an exilic Jew from Judaea, a king who speaks in the first person, and a written proclamation which praises the true God. Collins (1996:86) writes that "the Prayer supplies the missing link between the Babylonian traditions and the biblical book". 4QPrNab occupies an intermediate place in the tradition between the Babylonian accounts of an historical incident and the formation of the book of Daniel.

Differences also exist between the *Prayer* and the Book of Daniel: Nabonidus did not suffer from an illness, and no mention is made of a Jewish diviner.

The *Verse Account* accuses Nabonidus of impiety towards the Babylonian gods. In the *Harran Inscription* the king attributes his deliverance to the moon-god Sin, while in the *Prayer* he attributes it to the Most High God, or the God of the Jews. The Babylonian source-material has thus undergone a Jewish transformation, with Nabonidus' absence from Babylon explained in terms of an illness, and this illness leads to the revelation of the power of Israel's God. In the canonical text the name of the king has been changed to Nebuchadnezzar, and the name of the Jewish seer is given as Daniel, while he is anonymous in the *Prayer*. The polemic against idols that characterizes the *Prayer* finds its equivalent in Daniel 5 rather than in Daniel 4. Vermes (1962:495-504) has suggested that the preservation of the Prayer at Qumran has to do with the Essenes' interest in healing.

4.2 First Pseudo-Daniel Composition (4Q243-244)

Researchers assumed that the three Pseudo-Daniel manuscripts were part of the same document. However, presently they accept that this is not the case. 4Q245 (4QpsDaniel^c ar) belongs to a different work (Flint 1996:137-150). The other two manuscripts are 4Q243 (4QpsDaniel^a ar) and 4Q244 (4QpsDaniel^b ar), with one overlapping passage (Collins & Flint 1996:95-151).

On palaeographical grounds, the script of 4Q243 and 4Q244 are dated to the early first century C.E. "The most likely time of composition is somewhere between the beginning of the second century BCE and the coming of Pompey. Evidence for a more specific date is not available" (Collins & Flint 1996:137-138).

Milik (1956:411-415) published 4Q243-244 with the main components divided into five sections. The setting is similar to that found in Daniel 1-6. Daniel speaks before a king and his courtiers, presenting a view of history from the time of the Flood to the Hellenistic age. This is of far broader scope than the biblical book. Collins and Flint (1996:97-151) were able to identify and place additional fragments after investigating the scrolls. Their picture of the five sections includes:

- The Court Setting, where Daniel addresses King Belshazzar and his court and explains a writing or book which probably contained the overview of biblical history that follows;

- The Primeval History, dealing with events or material found in Genesis 5-11 (Enoch, the Flood, and Tower of Babel). The Creation and Fall probably did not feature in this survey of history;
- From the Patriarchs to the Exile, including the Egyptian sojourn, crossing the Jordan, the tabernacle, Nebuchadnezzar's conquest, and the exile;
- The Hellenistic Era, distinguished by the presentation of events yet to come and by the presence of Greek proper names;
- The Eschatological Period, which specifies a time of oppression, interrupted by God saving his people "with his great hand". Several terms denote the destruction and restoration associated with the eschatological age.

Common features between the Book of Daniel and 4Q243-244 include: the name Daniel, the setting at the Babylonian court, the mention of Belshazzar, eschatological prophecy, and a similarity between the prophetic review of history in this document and Daniel 11 (Flint 2001:339-340).

Milik (1956:413) proposes further similarities: allusions to seventy years of Babylonian exile, a four-kingdom schema, and a reference to resurrection, but Flint (1997:54) does not find these identifications in the critical edition.

4Q243-244 is acquainted with the tradition that Daniel was active at the Babylonian court, but is not closely modelled on the biblical book. Daniel expounds here the full sweep of Israelite history. It is not clear whether *pseudo-Daniel* is dependent on the biblical book.

In the Book of Daniel the review of history is confined to the post-exilic period and is presented as predictions (as also in *4Qpseudo-Ezekiel* and *4Qpseudo-Moses*). But in 4Q243-244 the survey encompasses the past and the future, as in the *Book of Jubilees*. From the fourth part, the Hellenistic Era, the history is no longer presented as having occurred in the past, but as still to take place in the future (Flint 1997:49). Most of Jubilees is concerned with a history of the patriarchs prior to the time of Moses, but it also includes eschatological passages in chapters 1 and 23. It does not however contain a survey of Israelite history.

4Q243-244 contributes to our understanding of Judaism in the Hellenistic period, notably by its inclusion of primeval history in the sweep of its review.

4.3 Second *Pseudo-Daniel* Document

This work is found in one document, 4QpsDan^c or 4Q245, which is dated to the Herodian period, the early first century C.E., as in the case of 4Q243-244. 4Q245 is written in a larger, clearer hand, but the script is very similar.

There is no overlap between 4Q245 and the twenty fragments found of 4Q243-244. Previously they were considered to be of the same composition because Daniel's name occurs in all three documents. Any attempts at integrating the four fragments of 4Q245 into the first document proved untenable. Beyer (1994:106) tried to integrate the list of names found in fragment 1 of 4Q245 with the review of history in 4Q243-244. The reference to Daniel and a book in fragment 1 (lines 3-4) suggests that 4Q245 is presenting a new revelation, rather than continuing the one found in 4Q243-244.

Fragment 1 contains a reference to Daniel and a book (or writing), a list of priests from Qahath down to Jonathan and Simon, and a list of kings from David and Solomon to Ahaziah (and probably Joash and Manasseh). Fragment 2 has clear eschatological connotations in view of its subject matter. Fragment 3 seems to denote a period of thirty-five days or years.

The material may be organised around three themes: the list of priests, the relationship between fragments 1 and 2, and the Hasmonaean names in fragment 1 (Flint 2001:353).

The list in fragment 1 differs from that in 1 Chronicles 5:27-41 in that it includes Abiathar, a descendant of Eli and priest of Shiloh, who functioned as priest together with Zadok during David's reign and at the beginning of Solomon's kingship, when he was banished to Anathoth for supporting Solomon's rival, Adonijah. Abiathar is the sole survivor when Saul massacred the priests of Nob for helping David. The genealogy of Zadok is traced back by 1 Chronicles 5 to Eleazar, son of Aaron. In 1 Chronicles 24 Abiathar's genealogy is traced back to Ithamar, son of Aaron. 4Q245 offers no indication that Abiathar's descent was regarded as problematic.

4Q245 differs from Chronicles also in extending its list of priests into the Hellenistic period by providing the names of Onias, Simon and Jon[athan]. The sequence Jonathan-Simon is only found in the Maccabean period, with the last Zadokite High Priest Onias III, followed by the Hasmonaeans, Jonathan (152-142 B.C.E.) and Simon (142-135 B.C.E.).

The list of royal names is even more fragmentary, but David, Solomon and Ahaziah are clearly legible. Traces of Joash and possibly Manasseh are also visible. The list probably continued down to Zedekiah, the last king of Judah.

The purpose of the priestly and royal lists may be inferred from the reference to the eschatological conclusion of history found in fragment 2, contrasting those "in blindness" who has gone astray, and the others who "arise" and "return". In the *Damascus Document* (col. 1:9) blindness is a stage in the evolution of the community of the elect. The returning group suggests a reversal of the course of history, as described in Daniel 10-12.

Flint (2001:355-356) is of the opinion that the inclusion of Simon and Jonathan in the list of priests in fragment 1 may be explained by showing how in the author's time these institutions have failed or have gone astray. These two individuals were not descendants of Aaron. The Qumran community insisted on the distinction between royal and priestly offices. Hence they expected two Messiahs, of Aaron and Israel. Thus the author of 4Q245 was not specifically anti-Hasmonaeans, but accepted the line of priestly succession as long as the offices of priest and king remained separate (Flint 1997:54).

4.4 4Q246 (4Qapocalypse ar, "The Son of God Text")

The text describes a powerful figure appearing in a time of tribulation, called the "son of God" and "son of the Most High". All nations will obey him (Puech 1996:165-184).

Some researchers view the figure as a messianic figure, while others see him as a wicked usurper, subsequently overthrown by the "people of God". Daniel is never mentioned in the text, but the themes and language remind one of the Book of Daniel. The contents may also have been uttered by a seer or prophet, in the presence of a gentile king, as in Daniel and *pseudo-Daniel*.

4.5 4Q489 (pap4Qapocalypse ar)

Baillet (1982:10-11) first published this text, based on eight small fragments. A possible relationship with Daniel is based on the words, in fragment 1.1, "and its appearance", compared to Daniel 4:8 (11), and fragment 1.2, "you saw", compared to Daniel 2:41. Any firm relationship seems most tenuous due to the survival of such a minor text.

4.6 4Q551 (4QDaniel Suzanna? ar)

The story of Susanna (in Dan 13 – Greek version), an Addition in the *Apocrypha*, features Daniel as young man. 4Q551 mentions a figure who seems to be a judge and plays a prominent role at court. Milik (1981:337-359) suggests that this figure may refer to Daniel and that 4Q551 is an Aramaic counterpart of the story of Susanna. The fragmentary state of the scroll renders such a relationship unlikely (Flint 1999:24-66).

4.7 4Q552-553 (4QFour Kingdoms^a, ^bar)

Here a seer narrates his vision of an angel and four trees, which symbolise four kingdoms. The tree is found as a metaphor for kings and kingdoms in the Jewish Bible (cf. Judg. 9:7-15; Ezek. 31; Dan. 4). The seer interrogates each of the trees. The name of the first is still preserved, as Babylon-Persia. Details of the second tree are fragmentary, but it probably refers to Greece. The only extant detail of the third tree is that it looks “different”, as does the fourth kingdom in Daniel 7:23. This may represent Syria, although some think of Rome (Cook 1996:441).

The fourth tree is higher still, and represents a mighty power. The majestic language suggests that it represents the eschatological rule of Israel or the kingdom of God (Cook 1996:441). Collins (1999:415-417) is of the opinion that it refers to the Roman empire.

4Qfour Kingdoms^a, ^b is an incomplete text with important similarities to the Book of Daniel, including the four kingdoms theme and the reference to God as Most High. Differences also exist: in Daniel the four kingdoms comprise Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece, whilst in 4Qfour Kingdoms^a, ^b the four kingdoms are Babylon-Persia, Greece, Syria and either Rome or the eschatological kingdom of God.

5. SOME OBSERVATIONS

Some observations can be made with regard to the eight biblical scrolls of Daniel and nine relevant scrolls found at Qumran.

5.1 Several Danielic writings were circulating in the late Second Temple period, written in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. One of these was accepted in the canonical Book of Daniel. The Greek Additions were also accepted in the Septuagint. Others, known as the Dead Sea Scrolls, were significant at Qumran and most likely in at least some other Jewish circles. These last manuscripts never became part of the canonical scriptures. These nine scrolls, between them representing seven different compositions, only became known in 1954 when Cave 4 was opened to scholars.

5.2 The *Prayer of Nabonidus* provides helpful evidence for understanding the growth of the biblical book and for assessing its relationship to earlier Babylonian traditions.

5.3 Seven of the eight biblical Daniel scrolls originally contained all twelve chapters of Daniel, in close similarity to the Masoretic text, and not the longer form found in the Septuagint. One manuscript, 4QDan^e, most likely contained only Daniel's prayer in Daniel 9:4b-19.

There seems to be no real relationship between the Danielic writings found at Qumran and the material preserved in the Greek, containing the Additions of the Prayer of Azariah, the Song of the Three Young Men, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon. The only candidate is 4QDaniel Suzanna? ar, but any connection is highly untenable.

5.4 The non-biblical writings remind one that a richer understanding of Scripture comes about when relevant non-canonical material is taken into account, because it offers insight into the circumstances and historical forces that gave rise to a book such as Daniel.

5.5 The type of material the Book of Daniel and related manuscripts found at Qumran present resonated with the situation at Qumran. The historical events described, in the exile in Babylon and the persecution, as well as the circumstances in which these writings originated, in the Syrian domination, persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes, and the need for perseverance, had affinities with the circumstances of the Qumran community. The Qumran community felt threatened by foreign rulers. Thus, they needed to stand firm in the face of persecution by their fellow Jews, and in the face of Jewish apostasy.

5.6 The eschatological contents of the Book of Daniel must also have been meaningful to the

desert community waiting for the end of the age. Thus the *Florilegium*'s assessment which quotes Daniel 12:10 but transposes the two halves of the verse: "...for [the wicked] shall act wicked[ly...], but the righteous will be purified and refined". This document regards the Qumran community as the remnant that will practice the *Torah* in the last days (Allegro & Anderson 1968:54-55).

5.7 Which of the works found at Qumran were viewed as authoritative by the Qumran community? Three approaches to the question is possible.

- The Book of Daniel is formally indicated as Scripture in fragments 1-3 of the *Florilegium* (4Q174).
- Works represented by a large number of manuscripts were used and read extensively at Qumran, indicating possible scriptural status. The relatively large amount of eight copies of the relatively small Book of Daniel found at Qumran are surprising.
- To determine the status of a book at Qumran, the quotations of, allusions to or dependence on the Book of Daniel or another of the compositions may be used as an indicator of scriptural status. All the works discussed were however composed relatively late (generally in the second century B.C.E. and later), and thus the priority of one over the other can hardly be established.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allegro, JM & Anderson, A A 1968. *Qumrân Cave 4.I [4Q158-4Q186]*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Baillet, M 1962. Grotte 6: 7.Daniel, in Baillet, M, Milik, J T & De Vaux, R (eds.). *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran: Exploration de la falaise, Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q, à 10Q, Le rouleau de cuivre*, 1.114-116 (text) & 2.XXIII (plates). 2 vols. DJD 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1982. 489.Un apocalyptique en araméen (?), in Baillet, M. *Qumrân Grotte 4.III* (4Q482-4Q520), 10-11 & pl. II. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barthélemy, D 1955. 71.Daniel (i); 72.Daniel (ii), in Barthélemy, D & Milik, J T. *Qumran Cave I*, 15-152. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Beaulieu, P A 1989. *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon (556-539 B.C.)*. New York: Yale.
- Beyer, K 1994. *Ergänzungsband*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Collins, JJ 1993. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- 1996. Prayer of Nabonidus, in VanderKam, J C (ed). *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts*. 3:83-93 & pl. VI. DJD22. Oxford: Clarendon.
- 1999. Apocalypticism and Literary Genres, in Flint, P W & VanderKam, JC (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Vol 2:415-417. Leiden: Brill.
- Collins, JJ & Flint, PW 1996. Pseudo Daniel, in VanderKam, JC (ed). *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts*. 2:95-151 & pl. VII-IX. DJD22. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Cook, E 1996. 4Q552-553, in Wise, M, Abegg, M & Cook, E. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, 440-441. San Francisco: HarperCollins.
- Cross, FM 1995. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- 1984. Fragments of the Prayer of Nabonidus. *Israel Exploration Journal* 34:260-264.
- Eshel, E 2001. The Daniel Tradition at Qumran, in Collins, J J & Flint, PW (eds). *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception*, 387-394. Vol 2. Boston, Leiden: Brill.
- Flint, PW 1996. 4Qpseudo-Daniel ar^c (4Q245) and the Restoration of the Priesthood. *Revue de Qumran* 65-69:137-150. Milik Festschrift.
- 1997. The Prophet Daniel at Qumran, in Evans, C E & Flint, P W (eds). *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 41-60. SDSRL 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- 1999. "Apocrypha", Other Previously-Known Writings, and "Pseudepigrapha" in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Flint, PW & VanderKam, JC (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Vol 2. Leiden: Brill.
- 2001. The Daniel Tradition at Qumran, in Collins, J J & Flint, P W (eds). *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception*, 329-367. Vol 2. Boston, Leiden: Brill.
- Gadd, CJ 1958. The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus. *Anatolian Studies* 8:35-92.
- Milik, JT 1956. Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel. *Revue biblique* 63:407-415.

- 1981. Daniel et Susanne á Qumrân, in Carrez, M, Doré, J & Grelot, P (eds.). *De la Tôrah au Messie: Mélanges Henri Cazelles*. Paris: Desclée.
- Pinches, TG 1882. On a Cuneiform Inscription relating to the Capture of Babylon by Cyrus and the Events which Preceded and Led Up to It. *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 7:139-176.
- Pritchard, JB (ed) 1969_. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Puech, É 1996. 246.4QApocryphe de Daniel ar, in VanderKam, J C (ed). *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts*. 3, 165-184 & pl. XI. DJD22. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Ulrich, E 1987. Possible Sources of the Book of Daniel. Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDan^a. *BASOR* 268:17-37.
- 1989. Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDan^b and 4QDan^c. *BASOR* 274:3-26.
- 1999. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. SDSRL 2. Leiden: Brill. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- 2000. 112-116.4QDan^{a-c}, in Ulrich, E et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms-Chronicles*, 239-289, XXIX-XXXVIII (plates). DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 2001. The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls, in Collins, J J & Flint, PW (eds). *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception*, 573-585. Vol 2. Boston, Leiden: Brill.
- Vermes, G 1962. Essenes and Therapeutai. *Revue de Qumran* 3:495-504.

TREFWOORDE

Dooie See-rolle
Tekskritiek
Teksvariante
Boek van Daniël
Masoretiese teks

KEY WORDS

Dead Sea scrolls
Textual criticism
Textual variants
Book of Daniel
Masoretic text

Dr Marius Nel Extraordinary senior lecturer School for Biblical science and Biblical languages North-West-University
P.O. Box 1136
RANT-EN-DAL
1751 E-mail:
mariusnell@mweb.co.za.