

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

Amanda M. Davis

Date

A Reconsideration of the MT and OG Editions of Daniel 4

By

Amanda M. Davis
Master of Theological Studies

Candler School of Theology

Dr. Carol A. Newsom
Committee Chair

Dr. Steven J. Kraftchick
Director of General and Advanced Studies

Dr. Carl R. Holladay
Committee Member

A Reconsideration of the MT and OG Editions of Daniel 4

By

Amanda M. Davis
B.A., Florida State University, 2009

Thesis Committee Chair: Dr. Carol A. Newsom, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Candler School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Theological Studies
2012

Abstract

A Reconsideration of the MT and OG Editions of Daniel 4 By Amanda M. Davis

This thesis seeks to address the question of the relationship between the MT and OG editions of the fourth chapter of Daniel. In so doing, I hope to illuminate the textual history of Daniel 4.

In order to properly address the relevant issues of chapter four of the book of Daniel, my first chapter will look at the book as a whole. I will begin with a brief examination of the available Old Greek Daniel manuscripts. Then I will give a short discussion of the current state of the question of the relationship between the MT and OG editions of Daniel. I will very briefly outline the nature of this relationship and point to some relevant scholarship but will follow the line of scholars who view these editions as secondary reworkings of a no-longer extant *Vorlage*.

In chapter two, I will seek to identify the material which made up the *Vorlage* of the MT and OG editions of Daniel 4. I believe that, through identifying the material shared by both the two variant editions of this chapter, we can reconstruct this *Vorlage*. I will also briefly look at the differing arrangements of material as preserved in each of the two literary editions.

In the third and fourth chapters, I will turn to looking at the individual pluses and minuses in the MT and OG editions of Daniel 4 and attempt to classify these as to what was the *Tendenz* of each edition. I will identify some of the more significant pluses and minuses of the later Aramaic and Greek editors of the chapter, and will consider what these additions or deletions say of the different thematic emphases of the present texts.

Finally, I will examine the overall development of these two editions of Daniel as a book in order to trace how the text of Daniel 4 evolved over time. I propose that it was a combination of several factors which led to the ultimate replacement of the OG edition of Daniel by Theodotion's version which was much closer to the MT.

A Reconsideration of the MT and OG Editions of Daniel 4

By

Amanda M. Davis

B.A., Florida State University, 2009

Thesis Committee Chair: Dr. Carol A. Newsom, Ph.D.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Candler School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Theological Studies
2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
ORIGEN'S <i>HEXAPLA</i>	2
Codex Chisianus.....	4
Syro-Hexaplar	5
PAPYRUS 967.....	6
THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS.....	8
THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE OG AND THE MT EDITIONS	9
CHAPTER 2 THE <i>VORLAGE</i> OF DANIEL 4 AND ARRANGEMENT OF MATERIAL . 16	
BASIC OUTLINE OF DANIEL 4.....	16
THE LETTER.....	18
THE DREAM REPORT	23
The Tree Dream and Its Interpretation.....	23
The Animal Transformation.....	25
Arrangement of the Dream Report.....	27
RESTORATION AND PRAISE	28
OTHER ELEMENTS IN THE <i>VORLAGE</i>	29
Focus on the King	29
The Role of Daniel.....	30
CONCLUSIONS	31
CHAPTER 3 ANALYSIS OF THE MT EDITION OF DANIEL 4	32
PLUSSES AND MINUSES IN THE OG EDITION	32
<i>TENDENZ</i> OF THE MT EDITION	45
Court Competition.....	46
Kingship and Authority.....	48
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE OG EDITION OF DANIEL 4	52
PLUSSES AND MINUSES IN THE OG EDITION	52
<i>TENDENZ</i> OF OG	71
The Characterization of the King.....	71
The King's Punishment.....	72
The King's Conversion	75
The Contemptible King to Follow	77
Figure of Daniel	77
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS.....	81
DATING OF THE <i>VORLAGE</i> OF DANIEL 4	81
SOCIAL SETTING OF THE TWO EDITIONS OF DANIEL 4	84
DANIEL 4 IN THE SECOND CENTURY B.C.E.	88
DANIEL 4 IN THE COMMON ERA.....	90
CONCLUSIONS	92
APPENDICES	93
APPENDIX 1: MT AND OG TEXT OF DANIEL 4.....	93
APPENDIX 2: DANIEL MANUSCRIPTS	99
APPENDIX 3: ARRANGEMENT OF DREAM SEQUENCE MATERIAL.....	100
APPENDIX 3: PLUSSES AND MINUSES IN MT AND OG DANIEL 4	103
BIBLIOGRAPHY	115

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Old Greek edition of Daniel (OG)—sometimes referred to as the Septuagint version¹—was one of the earliest Greek translations of Daniel.² It was replaced, however, at a very early age by the “Theodotion” edition (θ)—possibly identified with the *kaige* recension—which much more closely resembled the Masoretic version, though it too included the Greek additions to Daniel.³ Theodotion’s translation of Daniel was widely

¹ In order to avoid confusion, I will avoid the designation Septuagint since at times it has been used to refer to both the OG and θ versions.

² Throughout this thesis, I will use Joseph Ziegler’s standard edition of the OG text [*Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954)], which is based on Ms. 88, Syh, and the Chester Beatty fragments.

³ These are “The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youths” (an appendix to ch. 3), “Susanna,” and “Bel and the Dragon” (chs. 13 and 14, respectively), which are present in most Greek versions. For a recent description of the relationship between θ and OG, see Alexander A. DiLella, “The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. John J.

used by the early church fathers and the New Testament authors.⁴ Though supplanted by Theodotion, the OG edition of Daniel was still copied and transmitted for a long time, primarily through Origen's *Hexapla* and the subsequent Hexaplaric editions. It was not until the twentieth century that the first pre-Hexaplaric text of Daniel was discovered (Papyrus 967) and a more accurate picture of the content of OG Daniel emerged.

In this chapter, I will begin by looking at Origen's treatment of the Old Greek text, and specifically the book of Daniel. I will then examine the most important Hexaplaric editions: Codex Chisianus and the Syro-Hexaplar. Next, I will turn my attention to Papyrus 967 and how it differs from the *Hexapla* and Hexaplaric editions. Finally, I will briefly examine the relationship between the OG and the Masoretic editions of Daniel.

Origen's *Hexapla*

In his *Hexapla*, completed by 240–245 CE, Origen set out to establish the “correct” text of Scripture so that Christians could better persuade Jews of the messianic claims of Jesus.⁵ It was divided into six columns (hence its name), with a different text in each

Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols.; Boston: Brill, 2002), 2:593–97. See also R. Timothy McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SBLSCS 43; Atlanta: Scholars, 1996).

⁴ *Herm. Vis.* 4.2, 4 (Dan 6:22); Justin, *Dial.* 31 (Dan 7); *Barn.* 4.5 (Dan 7); Baruch 1:15–18, 2:11–19; Heb 11:33 (Dan 6:23); Rev 9:20 (Dan 5:23); 10:6 (Dan 12:7); 12:7 (Dan 10:20); 13:7 (Dan 7:21); 19:6 (Dan 10:6); 20:4 (Dan 7:9); 20:11 (Dan 2:35).

⁵ Though the LXX version of Scripture had been completed by Jews, it came to be the official version used by the Church. By the time of Origen, Jews began to claim that

column—Hebrew/Aramaic, Hebrew/Aramaic transliterated into Greek, Aquila, Symmachus, Septuagint (=Old Greek), and Theodotion. Occasionally there are additional columns labeled *Quinta* (ε') and *Sexta* (ζ'). This textual arrangement created much difficulty since the different versions (especially the Old Greek and the Hebrew/Aramaic) often contained distinctive word order or added and omitted clauses. When this was the case, Origen gave preference to the Hebrew/Aramaic version, viewing the Old Greek as a corruption of the “original” and “pure” Hebrew/Aramaic text (*Hebraica veritas*). Additionally, Origen took steps to correct the “corrupted” Old Greek text, substituting them for the Hebrew/Aramaic readings. He was unwilling, however, to remove entirely the Old Greek passages not present in the Hebrew/Aramaic version.⁶ Origen’s recensions are marked by a series of signs—asterisks indicate passages found in the Hebrew/Aramaic but lacking in OG and obeli indicate passages of the Greek not included in the Hebrew/Aramaic.⁷

In his lost work, *Stromata*, Origen pronounced his preference for Theodotion’s version of Daniel over the Old Greek one.⁸ This preference was shared by the early

the LXX version had been corrupted because it differed from their own Hebrew version. See discussion in Jay Braverman, *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel: A Study of the Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 7; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978), 15–16.

⁶ Henry B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University, 1902), 67–69.

⁷ Eusebius, *Jerome* 4 (PL 25:515b–16a).

⁸ Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 46–49.

church fathers and is later voiced by Jerome (fourth century CE) who, in his commentary on Daniel, also gave preference to Theodotion's version. He writes that he could not explain how the church came to accept Theodotion's version over that of the Seventy interpreters, only that it was right to be rejected because it "differed widely from the truth."⁹

Origen's *Hexapla* would have been a vast publication, much too large to be copied as a whole—an estimated 3250 leaves or 6500 pages!¹⁰ Sometimes particular books were copied, though these too seem to have been rare since they would have also been extremely large. Instead, what became singularly transmitted was Origen's edition of the Old Greek text, typically omitting his Hexaplaric signs. This edition was later translated into numerous languages, including Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic.

The Hexaplaric witnesses are problematic for a textual study of the Old Greek version of the book of Daniel. Though they preserve the important divergences of the Old Greek text from that of the Hebrew, the frequent adaptations and transpositions make a re-creation of the original text impossible.

Codex Chisianus

⁹ Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, 31. Eusebius, *Jerome* 7 (PL 28:1357c); Eusebius, *Jerome* 4 (PL 25:515b).

¹⁰ Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 74–78.

The Codex Chisianus (Codex 88), written in cursive Greek, is the earliest published copy of OG Daniel—published in 1772 by S. de Magistris.¹¹ The text is dated between the ninth and eleventh centuries CE, and contains Origen’s Hexaplaric recension of Daniel, including his Hexaplaric signs. In addition to the twelve chapters (and additions) of OG Daniel, this codex contains selections from Hippolytus’s commentary on Daniel and Theodotion Daniel.¹²

Syro-Hexaplar (Syh)

Perhaps the most important of the Hexaplaric translations was the Syriac witness to Origen’s Old Greek text, called the Syro-Hexaplar. This text is ascribed to the Monophysite bishop Paul of Tella in the years 616–617 CE, and was a highly literal translation—at times even violating Syriac idioms. Though there exist several Syro-Hexaplar manuscripts of other books, there is only “a single and relatively late manuscript” of Syh Daniel, which is preserved in the ninth-century Codex Abrosianus published in 1788 by C. Bugati.¹³ Like Codex 88, this text also scrupulously retained

¹¹ Also called the Chigi manuscript, sometimes incorrectly listed as ms. 87, as in Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 47ff. For the earliest edition, see S. de Magistris, *Daniel secundum Septuaginta. ex tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codice* (Rome: Typis Propagandae Fidei, 1772).

¹² James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1927), 25–26.

¹³ Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 112–14; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.:

Origen's Hexaplaric signs and the two almost completely agrees in the number and placement of Hexaplaric signs.¹⁴ Syh contains the complete text of Daniel (with Susanna and Bel), along with numerous other books of the OT and LXX.

Papyrus 967

The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri were acquired by A. Chester Beatty around 1930. This collection consists of eleven manuscripts—originally counted as twelve, with Daniel labeled as distinct from the Ezekiel and Esther manuscripts (968), though now they are assumed to be of the same manuscript (967). Their place of origin is Egypt, though the exact location is unknown. There is speculation that they were “discovered among the ruins of some early Christian church or monastery” possibly near Fayum.¹⁵ The collection contains NT mss—Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Acts (P⁴⁵); Romans,

Doubleday & Company, 1978), 77–78. See discussion in Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, 13–18. For photographic facsimiles, see A.M. Ceriani, *Codex syro-hexaplaris ambrosianus* (Monumenta sacra et profana 7; Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1874).

¹⁴ Collins, *Daniel*, 4: “It [Syh] corresponds very closely to the Chigi Ms. Of forty-eight passages marked with asterisks, thirty-seven are common to Ms. 88 and Syh and eleven are peculiar to Syh. Of thirty-eight passages marked with obeli, thirty-four are common to Ms. 88 and Syh and four peculiar to Syh.”

¹⁵ Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible* (8 fascicules; London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933), 1:5.

Philippians, Colossians, and 1 Thessalonians (P⁴⁶); and Revelation (P⁴⁷), OT mss—Genesis (961, 962); Numbers and Deuteronomy (963); Isaiah (965); Jeremiah (966); Ezekiel, Esther, and Daniel (967); and two other manuscripts—Ben Sira (964) and Enoch and a Christian homily.

The Chester Beatty Daniel manuscripts, published between 1968 and 1977, are the oldest witness to the (pre-Hexaplaric) Old Greek version of the book.¹⁶ The papyri are dated to no later than the first half of the third century CE though perhaps as early as the second century. They consist of thirteen leaves, containing Dan 3:72–6:18, 7:1–8:27, though there are large lacunae at the bottom of each leaf.¹⁷ The top of the pages are numbered (141–66), and indicate that Daniel was preceded by other books.¹⁸

One of the distinctive features of this manuscript is its order, since it places chapters 7 and 8 *before* chapters 5 and 6. This is likely an attempt to set the book in a better chronological order, since chapters 7 and 8 are set in the reign of Belshazzar and chapter five ends with his death and quick replacement by the enigmatic Darius the Mede.¹⁹

¹⁶ For full publication information, see Collins, *Daniel*, 4–5.

¹⁷ Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*. For plates of the Daniel papyri, see Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, fasc. 7, 17–38.

¹⁸ Papyrus 967 attests that it was preceded by Ezekiel and followed by Esther. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, fasc. 7, v.

¹⁹ R. Timothy McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV–VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” *VT* 55 (2005): 304–23, esp. 307–08. However, Johann Lust, “The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5,” in *The Book of Daniel in Light of New*

The Dead Sea Scrolls

The book of Daniel is among the top-represented “biblical” manuscripts found at Qumran.²⁰ The primary Daniel fragments were found in cave four, representing 11 of the 12 chapters of the book.²¹ There has also been a significant corpus of “Danielic” material

Findings (ed. A.S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: Leuven University, 1993), 41–53, and Olivier Munnich, “Texte massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel,” in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), have argued for the priority of the order preserved in Papyrus 967.

²⁰ As of 2011, an estimated 10 copies of Daniel have been discovered among the caves of Qumran [Peter Flint, “The SWBTS and the Dead Sea Scroll Library” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, San Francisco, Calif., 21 November 2011)]. See also Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:329–67.

²¹ See Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup 134; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 755–75. There are currently no identified fragments of chap. 12, except a quotation of 12:10 in *4QFlorilegium* (4Q174 1–3 2:3–4). For a complete listing of all Daniel fragments, see Appendix 1; Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:573–85.

discovered at Qumran.²² The Qumran Daniel fragments typically align with the MT, though a few instances—only once in chapters 4–6 (5:7, 4QDan^a)—exhibit textual variants in agreement with the OG.²³

The Relationship of the OG and the MT Editions of Daniel

The relationship of the Masoretic (MT) and Old Greek (OG) editions of Daniel is a very complicated, yet significant one. For the majority of the chapters, the editions are nearly identical, with only minor additions or alterations. For chapters 4–6, however, two clearly distinct versions of the narratives are preserved.²⁴ Eugene Ulrich has coined the term,

²² *4QPrayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242), *4QPseudo-Daniel*^{a-c} (4Q243–45), *4QAramaic Apocalypse* (4Q246), *Four Kingdoms*^{a-b} (4Q552–53). Possibly *4QHistorical Text* (4Q248), *4QDaniel-Susanna?* (4Q551).

²³ McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV–VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” 304; Frank M. Cross, “Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran: Cave 4 of Qumran (4Q),” *BA* 19 (1956): 86. See list of variants in Munnich, “Texte massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel,” 98. The recent purchase by the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary also included a fragmentary papyrus of Daniel 6, though its relationship to the MT or OG editions has not yet been examined.

²⁴ First observed by August Bludau, *Die alexandrinsiche Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältniss zum massorethischen Text* (BibS(F) 2/2/3; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1897). Chapter 3 is also exceptional in that it includes the addition of “The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youths” (3:24–90), though, is otherwise close to the MT edition.

“double literary editions” to describe texts such as these in Dan 4–6, which he defines as “a literary unit appearing in two (or more) parallel forms in our principal textual witnesses, which one author, major redactor, or major editor completed and which a subsequent redactor or editor intentionally changed to a sufficient extent that the resultant form should be called a revised edition of that text.” These sorts of texts have been very influential in providing additional perspectives on textual fluidity of the Second Temple Period.²⁵

The divergent nature of Dan 4–6 in the two editions has led scholars to postulate that at an early period these chapters circulated as an independent collection of stories, and only later gathered to them the remaining stories and visions.²⁶ Evidence of this has

²⁵ See “Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 34–50; repr. from *Perspectives on the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Walter J. Harrelson* (ed. James L. Crenshaw; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University, 1988), 101–16.

²⁶ Collins, *Daniel*, 37–38; Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King*, 144–52; McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV–VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” 318; Klaus Koch, *Das Buch Daniel*, 18–19, 75; Rainer Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* (SBS 131; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 159–60. Cf. Montgomery who posited a separate circulation of chapters 3–6 (*The Book of Daniel*, 36). Originally each of the court tale stories is believed

been found in the analogous doxologies in 3:31–33 MT and 6:26–27 MT, which create an *inclusio* and possibly served as the original beginning and ending of the collection. This view has not, however, entirely won scholarly support since it is clear that in their present form these chapters include many elements that presuppose the other chapters of the book.²⁷

Even if these chapters did circulate as a separate collection of stories, what is especially intriguing is that they do not exhibit a consistent relationship between the MT and the OG, indicating an even more complicated textual history. Chapters 4 and 6 OG are much longer than their MT counterparts, whereas chapter 5 OG is substantially shorter than the MT version, which contains several clearly later redactional elements. In each chapter, however, both versions display secondary alterations which are lacking in the other.

These observations have led to intense scholarly debate on the relationship of the two editions. As mentioned above, already as early as Origin and Jerome it was assumed that when the Old Greek differed from the Hebrew and Aramaic text, it “differed widely from the truth” (i.e., the *Hebraica veritas*), a view which dominated the field of scholarship for centuries and even today has many adherents.²⁸ Nonetheless, there have

to have circulated independently (possibly in oral form), since they seem to be “self-contained units” (Collins, *Daniel*, 29; McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV–VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” 318).

²⁷ See examples in Collins, *Daniel*, 7.

²⁸ Braverman, *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel*, 31. See Pierre Grelot, “La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique,” *RB* 81 (1974): 22. For further on the

likewise been those who have supported the priority of the OG edition over that of the MT.²⁹ Most modern scholars, however, find an approach naming one edition as the “original” text far too simplistic in light of the inconsistencies in the expansions of chapters 4–6, and, instead, advocate for a common *Vorlage*, from which each of the two variant editions stemmed.³⁰ A major proponent of this theory is Eugene Ulrich, who concludes that, “In Daniel 4–6 both the MT and the OG are apparently secondary, that is,

early reception of the OG edition, see the discussions in Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar* (JSOTSup 61; Boston: Brill, 1999), 20–23; Alexander A. Di Lella, “The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:586–93.

²⁹ See Lawrence Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (HDR 26; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 144–52; Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel*, 76; R.H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1929), 1–lxiv; G. Jahn, *Das Buch Daniel nach dem Septuaginta hergestellt* (Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1904); P. Riessler, *Das Buch Daniel* (Kurzgefasster wissenschaftlicher Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments 3/3/2; Stuttgart und Wien: Roth, 1899), 28–52.

³⁰ See Collins, *Daniel*, 6–7, 221; Ulrich, “Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives,” 40; Dean O. Wenthe, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1991), 1–19. Contra Klaus Koch (and others) who argues that for OG “Daniel 4–6 a parent text was used which differs considerably from the Proto-Masoretic *Vorlage*” (“Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:426).

they each expand in different directions beyond an earlier common edition that no longer survives.”³¹ The differences in these chapters, then, are evidence of the work of multiple redactors or translators.

At precisely what stage these expansions were made has also given rise to much debate. Detailed study of the language of these chapters has been conducted, and there are several indications that the OG version was originally composed in a Semitic language, most likely Aramaic. A Hebrew original has also been proposed, though has won few adherents.³² One such clue as to the Semitic origins of the OG edition is its use of parataxis (and... and... and...) and lack of Greek particles (i.e., δέ), lending more to Semitic rather than Greek style.³³ A second indication is its “use of vocabulary in a

³¹ Ulrich, “Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives,” 40.

³² Aramaic: See R.H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1929), l–lxiv. Hebrew: See Ernst Haag, *Die Errettung Daniels aus der Löwengrube: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der biblischen Danieltradition* (SBS 110; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983). Grelot argues that the OG version was based on a (late Maccabean) Hebrew translation of an Aramaic original for Daniel chaps. 2–7: “La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique,” 18–22.

³³ Grelot, “La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique,” 18; Collins, *Daniel*, 6.

Semitic sense” (e.g., ὑψώθη σου ἡ καρδία “your heart was exalted,” 4:22 OG; ψυχή for “self,” 4:33a OG).”³⁴

Additionally, two dissertations written under the direction of Ulrich (those of Wenthe and Pace Jeansonne) suggest that the OG of 1–3 and 7–12 is “a faithful translation of its Semitic *Vorlage*” (i.e., that it accurately conveys the Semitic text, though sometimes adds explanatory glosses or even paraphrases).³⁵ In light of this evidence, Ulrich determines that chapters 4–6 in the OG “appear to be woven from the same fabric as the OG translation of 1–[3] and 7–12,” and OG Daniel, as a whole, “seems to be a consistent, unified document with a consistent translation technique.”³⁶ He

³⁴ Collins, *Daniel*, 6: analysis of Grelot, “La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique,” 18–20. However, as Bludau warned, we must be careful to recognize “the difficulty of distinguishing between Semitizing Greek and translation of a Semitic *Vorlage*” (Collins, *Daniel*, 6; Bludau, *Die alexandrinsiche Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältniss zum massorethischen Text*, 210).

³⁵ Ulrich, “Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives,” 45. Sharon Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12* (CBQMS 19; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988), and Dean Wenthe, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6.” See also Timothy J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSup 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 263. Against this, see F.F. Bruce, “The Earliest Greek Version of Daniel,” *OTS* 20 (1977): 22–40.

³⁶ Ulrich, “Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives,” 45. See also Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 36–37, who similarly concludes that the OG

concludes, therefore, that the differences between the two editions of chapters 4–6 were made at the Aramaic level, and were only later translated into Greek.³⁷ This view has been seriously challenged, however, especially by R. Timothy McLay, who proposes that Daniel 4–6 was translated into Greek very early on, and that only later was added the larger collection of Daniel stories, which had forms much closer to that of the MT.³⁸

This chapter has introduced the various textual witnesses to the Old Greek edition of Daniel and has also described the state of the question in regard to the relationship of the Masoretic and Old Greek editions of Daniel. In the remaining chapters of this thesis, I will turn from the book as a whole, and instead focus on Daniel 4. I will begin by identifying the material which likely made up the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4, which was subsequently edited by the MT and OG authors.

“translator worked faithfully word by word... and that the present muddled condition is largely due to the shuffling into the text of true glosses or doublets which once stood in the marg[in].”

³⁷ Ulrich, “Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives,” 45; Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 248. See, however, Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel*, who argues that the differences in the Old Greek edition of chaps. 4–6 were made on the level of Greek language.

³⁸ See McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel iv-vi and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” 320.

CHAPTER 2

THE *VORLAGE* OF DANIEL 4 AND ARRANGEMENT OF MATERIAL

The aim of this chapter is to recreate what constituted the text of the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4 by identifying the material shared by each of the two variant editions. I will follow the position of Eugene Ulrich that the “double literary editions” of Daniel 4–6 originated from a common *Vorlage*, which the MT and OG authors expanded in their own unique ways. There is some possibility that this *Vorlage* could have been an oral rather than written source, though given the precise nature with which it is preserved in each edition, a written source seems most likely.¹ I will also examine how this *Vorlage* was arranged in the subsequent editions and, when possible, what this says of the probable order of material in the *Vorlage*.

Basic Outline of Daniel 4

I believe that from comparing the MT and OG editions of Daniel 4, we can derive the

¹ Recall the arguments of Dean O. Wenthe, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1991), and Sharon Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12* (CBQMS 19; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988), for the OG’s faithful translation of an Aramaic original very close to that of the MT.

basic outline of the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4 from the elements common to both editions. Daniel 4 is the story of King Nebuchadnezzar who has a troubling dream for which he seeks its interpretation. The king recounts his dream to the wise Jewish sage, Daniel, who then makes known the horrific meaning of the dream to the king, along with a warning to “change his ways” lest the events of the dream unfold soon. All that was predicted happens to Nebuchadnezzar: he is removed from his position as king, and lives among (and as) the animals for seven years, until the appointed time arrives and he is reinstated in his kingship.

In reality, however, this basic outline is a drastic oversimplification of the events of the fourth chapter of Daniel, since each subsequent edition has developed the *Vorlage* in a variety of ways. In the extant editions of this narrative, the events which befell Nebuchadnezzar are repeated numerous times and with substantive variations often in different places. So how, then, are we to discern what constituted the *Vorlage* of the chapter and what parts are later editorial expansions? I propose that the best way to do this is to identify the major narrative developments and examine each of these individually.

Within this narrative we can identify four separate narrative patterns at play.² The first is that of a letter from Nebuchadnezzar, addressed to his subjects. This sets the scene for the author to recount the story of what happened to Nebuchadnezzar. What follows is

² Similarly, see Lawrence Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (HDR 26; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 87–121, who identifies several sources of Daniel 4 including a “Condemning Dream Source A,” a “Bull Sojourn,” and a “Wall Pronouncement Story.”

Nebuchadnezzar's dream report, which is a combination of two distinctive elements: a tree dream and an animal transformation. In the final part of the chapter, there is a restoration scene in which Nebuchadnezzar is returned to his throne and he praises God. For the most part, these four narrative forms have been combined in generally the same order in both editions, indicating that they were likewise in the *Vorlage*.

The Letter

A letter formula is preserved in MT 3:31–33 and OG 4:34c. Other Jewish works of the Second Temple Period—such as Ezra, 1 Maccabees, and 2 Maccabees—also used this formula.³ It is unlikely that these verses arise from an actual letter from Nebuchadnezzar, since no events such as these have been identified in the sources of his reign.⁴ It is more probable that the original author(s) used the format of an official royal letter in order to begin the narrative, drawing on the authority that such a letter would command.

³ See Ezra 7:12; 1 Macc 10:18, 25; 14:20; 15:2, 16; 2 Macc 1:1, 10. It is interesting (and Fitzmyer points out) that only in Dan 3:31–33 and 6:26–28 is this letter format transformed into an epistolary form (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” *Semeia* 22 (1981): 27).

⁴ There has been much speculation, however, that this narrative is based on events from the reign of the later Neo-Babylonian king, Nabonidus. For a somewhat recent discussion of this, see Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (JSJSup 61; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1999), 51–99.

This letter follows standard forms of ancient Aramaic letter writing, opening with the *praescriptio* (3:31 MT; 4:34c OG), which identifies the sender, the recipients, and sometimes supplies a greeting.⁵ The sender of the letter is “Nebuchadnezzar, the king.” The recipients of the letter are “all the peoples, nations, and persons of every language (lit. “tongues”) who dwell in all the earth.”⁶ These groups are addressed in numerous places in MT and OG Daniel (3:4, 7, 31; 5:19; 6:26; 7:14 MT; 3:4, 7; 6:26 OG). The greeting is a proclamation of peace: “May your peace abound.”

The middle of the letter (3:32 MT; 4:34c OG) consists of a description of the purpose of the king’s writing this letter: “It seemed good to me to declare the signs and wonders which the Most High God has done for me.”⁷ This is an indication of what will be laid out in more detail in the following narrative.

The letter closes with a doxology (3:33 MT; 4:34c OG), which stresses the greatness of God’s works and the eternity of his rule: “How great are his signs! How

⁵ For a full discussion of ancient Aramaic letters, see Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” 25–57, esp. 30–35. The “name” of the letter is missing in the MT edition but the OG supplies this (ἐπιστολάς). The precise wording of the proclamation of peace used in 3:31 is attested only here and in Dan 6:26 (and later rabbinic traditions likely influenced by these verses).

⁶ The OG is similar but not exact: “to all the nations and all the countries and all who dwell in them.” This strange designation “tongues” is not unique to the MT, but is used elsewhere in the OG version (4:18, 34b), indicating that this language was probably included in the *Vorlage*.

⁷ Greek has only “deeds,” lacking the parallelism of the MT edition.

mighty are his wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom! His authority is from generation to generation!”⁸

Both the MT and OG editions of the Daniel 4 material underwent an extensive period of evolution, and this is perhaps most evident in the placement of the letter in the two editions. The MT edition opens directly with the letter (3:31–33), serving as a foundation for the recounting of the events which gave rise to the need for the letter.⁹ In the OG edition, however, the letter is placed at the very end of the narrative and the narrative instead opens with the regnal year of the king—“in the eighteenth year of the

⁸ The Greek again lacks the parallelism in this line of the praise. Perhaps the opening line of the praise has been corrupted in the OG edition (or purposefully changed), since it includes the awkward ὅτι ἔστι θεός, and elsewhere in the chapter does include “signs and marvels” in parallel (4:34a). In the MT edition, this doxology serves as a frame for the entire chapter, being repeated in 4:31.

John Collins proposes that, though doxologies such as this one sometimes occur in NT passages, we should more properly look to neo-Babylonian and Persian royal inscriptions for a parallel, since they too often begin with a similar praise of the gods [*Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 222]. I think this is a stretch since letters are often different from inscriptionary forms, and the framing of the narrative makes a more likely reason for the inclusion of this doxology here.

⁹ Though numbered as part of chap. 3, following the Medieval numbering system of the Vulgate, these verses actually constitute the beginning of chap. 4, and this is reflected in the numbering of most English translations.

kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar” (4:1).

This is one of the few examples where the logical location in the *Vorlage* can be deduced, since we can detect several clues in the letter and surrounding material that indicate its original position. One of the most important of these is the verb tense used in each edition. The Aramaic uses a participle plus an infinitive construct to denote present tense: שָׂרַר קָרַטְי לְהַתְּנִיחַ “it is/seems good for me to declare it” (3:32). The Greek repeats this phrase twice, using two different tenses: (1) future tense—ὕποδειξω: “I will show” (4:34c), (2) the aorist tense—ἔδοξε μοι ἀποδείξαι: “it seemed good to me to show” (4:34c). Given the OG’s placement of the letter at the end of the chapter, the aorist should be anticipated. The future tense, however, is unusual in its current context, making it likely that this passage was moved from its original location represented by the MT.

In Joseph Fitzmyer’s discussion of the standard format of Aramaic letters we can find a further clue as to the original placement of this letter. The current OG introduction according to the regnal year of the king is also an element sometimes found in Aramaic letters, typically toward the end of the letter.¹⁰ Thus, if we move the letter to the beginning of the narrative and subtract the OG plus material in 4:34c—“and he sent letters about everything...”—the regnal year of the king serves as an alternative ending to the letter.¹¹ In moving this letter to the end of the narrative, however, the Greek author

¹⁰ Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” 37.

¹¹ I am not proposing here that the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4 included the designation of the king’s regnal year—something very unlikely to have been removed from the MT edition—but rather that there are multiple stages of redaction resulting in the current OG edition. It seems that at an early stage—possibly at the Semitic level—a redactor

was able to bring this chapter in line with others in Daniel, which likewise began with the regnal year and concluded with a royal edict.¹²

Finally, we have one more indication that the letter belongs to the beginning in the OG edition: a literary reading of the chapter. T. J. Meadowcroft remarks that by opening the narrative with the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, the OG author gives no indication of "who is being spoken to by the first-person narrator, or for what purpose," and it is only in the final verses of the chapter that we learn these things.¹³ In opening with the letter format, however, the MT makes better literary sense in that the "device of the epistle provides a reason for the sovereign to speak autobiographically in this chapter."¹⁴ In regard to the present placement of the letter in the OG, it seems "confused" and "misplaced," probably moved to the ending in an effort to extend the confessional material.¹⁵

expanded the letter by including additional Aramaic epistolary elements. This will be discussed further in my chapter 5.

¹² Cf. Dan 1:1; 2:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1; 10:1; 11:1, for introductory regnal formulas and Dan 3; 6, for concluding royal edicts. For further arguments on the priority of the letter's position in the OG, see Charles, *Book of Daniel*, 79–82. Charles' suggestion that the MT deleted the regnal year here seems entirely unlikely since it could have likewise been included in the letter.

¹³ T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSup 198; Sheffield, U.K.: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 33.

¹⁴ Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 33.

¹⁵ Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 34.

The Dream Report

The dream sequence in its present form is a compilation of two elements: (1) a tree dream and (2) an animal transformation.¹⁶ For clarity's sake, I will first discuss these separately, and then bring them together in order to talk about their arrangement in the MT and OG editions.

The Tree Dream and Its Interpretation

In the first part of his dream, Nebuchadnezzar sees a tree whose appearance is great and whose height reaches to the heavens, being visible to all the earth (4:8, 17 MT/OG). Its branches are a resting place for birds, give shade for wild animals, and provide food for the entire earth (4:9, 18 MT/OG). An angel comes from heaven to command that the tree be cut down and destroyed (4:10–11, 20 MT/OG), with only the root of the tree which is spared and left in the ground (4:12, 20, 23 MT/OG).¹⁷

The function of the tree dream seems to be purely allegorical. There is no expectation that Nebuchadnezzar would actually become a tree and be chopped down and destroyed, and the tree language is absent from the affliction scene (vv. 25–30 MT/OG).¹⁸

¹⁶ See Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King*, 107–13, for the identification of these two elements as from distinct sources.

¹⁷ Not all elements are present in every instance in both editions. The occurrences in the MT edition tend to be fuller than those in the OG.

¹⁸ This will be a major difference from the following prediction, which is certainly understood in a literal sense.

Therefore, the meaning of this dream is to be found as a reflection of the king's status and position. The tree itself refers to Nebuchadnezzar, who reigns over a vast empire just as the tree's branches provide shelter and food to everyone in the earth. That the tree reaches toward the heavens and is visible to the end of the earth indicates Nebuchadnezzar's exalted status.

The tree that functions as a symbol for a person is common in biblical literature and elsewhere in the ancient world.¹⁹ The tree in Dan 4 is especially similar to that of Ezek 31 with a few notable exceptions. Both texts depict a tree using similar language and to represent of a king.²⁰ Neither text explicitly points to the king's pride as the reason for the condemnation of the king, though this seems likely from the descriptions.²¹ The

¹⁹ See Ezek 17 (tree=Jehoiachin); 19 (vine=Israel); 31 (tree=pharaoh of Egypt); Ps 37 (tree=wicked man); *Genesis Apocryphon* 19:14–16 (tree=Abraham); Herodotus 1.108 (vine=Cyrus). See also Gen 2; Isa 4:2; 11:1; Jer 23:5; 33:15; Zech 3:8; Lam 4:20; 2 Baruch 35–37; Herodotus 7.19; *Shah Nameh* 13:2 for tree imagery.

²⁰ Ezekiel explicitly identifies Assyria as the tree, “a cedar in Lebanon,” which reaches to the heavens, and gives shelter to the birds and wild animals. The Ezekiel material, however, includes a description of the waters which fed the tree and made it grow.

²¹ 4:27 “this is Babylon the Great, which I built as a royal house by the strength of my power and for the glory of my majesty”; Ezek 31:10 “and its heart was exalted in its height.” Also see André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (trans. David Pellauer; Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), 73–74: “The cosmic tree is one form of union between the gods and men, a bridge

MT version of Dan 4, however, ends with a note of hope for the king, whereas the destruction is complete in Ezekiel. In the MT the root is left in the ground, indicating that while Nebuchadnezzar will be dethroned, his kingdom will be kept for him once he is humbled.²²

The Animal Transformation

The second element comprising Nebuchadnezzar's dream report is the account of an animal transformation, which is described four times in each edition: (1) the initial dream in MT 4:12a β –14, OG 4:12–14a; (2) Daniel's interpretation of the dream in MT 4:20a β –22, OG 4:20–23; (3) the heavenly voice's pronouncement in MT 4:29, OG 4:29–30; (4) and the action sequence in MT 4:30; OG 4:30a–b. The transformation occurs in three stages— animal actions, animal mind, and animal appearance—with Nebuchadnezzar becoming increasingly more animal-like in each stage (though in no single iteration are all three stages present). It is only when Nebuchadnezzar becomes fully “animalized” that he is most humble and his kingdom will be returned to him.

between the two worlds. Of course the gods may ascend and descend this ladder at will, but for men it is the means by which they may approach the divine in so far as it is possible for them to do so.”

²² Contra Ezek 31:11–16, where the tree is chopped down by a foreign tyrant rather than an angel, and it is ruined and sent to Sheol with no chance of redemption. For more detail on the tree in Dan 4, see Peter W. Coxon, “The Great Tree of Daniel 4,” in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (JSOTSupp 42; Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1986).

In the first stage, Nebuchadnezzar will begin to act like an animal. He will eat grass from the field (MT 4:12, 20, 22, 29, 30; OG 4:12, 13, 14a, 29, 30a) and he will be bathed with the dew of heaven (MT 4:12, 20, 22, 30; OG 4:13).²³ It is also in this first stage that Nebuchadnezzar will be bound with “a band of iron and bronze” (MT 4:12, 20; OG 4:14a, 29?, 30a?; Greek lacks “iron”). Scholars have long attempted to identify a practice of placing metal bands around tree stumps to prevent them from cracking.²⁴ Though there is some evidence for Mesopotamian practices of wrapping trees in metal, it is never only the stump.²⁵ As shown above, however, the tree imagery only has an *allegorical* meaning and is never *literally* applied to Nebuchadnezzar, and the fact that this phrase is meant in the literal sense indicates that this imagery should be associated with the animal transformation.²⁶

²³ The second phrase, וְרָטַל שָׁמַיָא יִצְטַבַּע “bathed with the dew of heaven” is significant because it allows us to see how later editors added to the much-shorter *Vorlage*, since this appears only once in the Greek but has been added three more times in the MT (but not in 4:29 as might be expected given its juxtaposition to his eating the grass of the field). It seems more likely that the MT edition consistently expanded the *Vorlage* by repeating the full parts of each element, rather than that the OG regularly deleted different parts of the element in each instance.

²⁴ See discussion in Collins, *Daniel*, 226–27.

²⁵ See Collins, *Daniel*, 226–27.

²⁶ This solves the difficulties of interpretation, since an animal could easily be understood as being chained. We will return to these bands in our discussion of OG pluses in chap. 5, where it has a very different use than in the MT edition.

In the second stage, Nebuchadnezzar will begin to think like an animal. His human heart will be exchanged for that of an animal. This strange phrase is only mentioned once in each edition: 4:13 MT and 4:30b OG.²⁷ Even though these occur in different points of the narrative—the dream sequence in MT; the action scene in OG—it is clearly attested in each edition, pointing to its presence in the *Vorlage*. It is interesting to note that in the Old Greek his flesh and heart are changed at the same time.

In the final stage of the animal sequence, Nebuchadnezzar will be physically transformed into an animal. His hair will grow long like eagles' feathers and his nails will grow long like claws—those of a bird in MT 4:30; those of a lion in OG 4:30b. It is notable that in both editions this embellishment is lacking in three of the four animal transformation scenes, but occurs only in the final fulfillment scene.

Arrangement of the Dream Report

These two elements—the tree dream and the animal transformation—were combined by the author of the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4 and presented as a single dream report.²⁸ In this dream sequence, the MT and OG editions generally preserve the same order of material, though it has also been slightly adapted throughout (See Appendix 3). Neglecting the

²⁷ Perhaps this is also implied by MT 4:31, 33 where his “reason” returned to him.

²⁸ I think it is possible that the author of the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4 was working with two written sources (esp. the tree motifs in Ezekiel), though this should not be automatically assumed. The author here seems to share small commonalities with much other Jewish or ANE literature, though seems to be using these elements in their own unique way to create the dream as it now stands in Dan 4.

unique pluses of each edition, in twenty-four verses a different order is preserved only eight times. In all but two of these instances, the material which has been moved is only one line away from its position in the other edition. The overall common arrangement serves as a further indication that the MT and OG editions were working from a common text, which they have only slightly adapted.

From the arrangement of the material of the dream report, the general tendencies of each edition at once become visible. The MT edition offers six pluses where it has expanded the narrative to include each individual element in each reiteration of a particular element (vv. 11, 13, 17–18, 20, 22–23, 30).²⁹ The OG, on the other hand, has a tendency to repeat short lines, combining this with its own unique material (vv. 12, 14a, 30). Some scholars have referred to this tendency of the OG author as dittography, though I think their repetition is purposeful due to its pairing with unique material.³⁰ Perhaps a more likely explanation is that of James Montgomery, who proposed that these lines were originally glosses on the margins which have moved into the text.³¹

Restoration and Praise

The restoration scene (vv. 31–34) is the most divergent in the two editions. Likely this scene was very simple, stating only that at the end of the appointed period the king acknowledged the God of heaven and was returned to his throne. Each subsequent

²⁹ The exception is the animal heart which occurs only once in each edition—v. 13 in MT and v. 30 in OG.

³⁰ Charles, *The Book of Daniel*, 79

³¹ Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 36–37

edition, however, has greatly expanded this scene, by including additional prayers. It is interesting that in v. 31 the MT preserves the same prayer as from 3:33, though with the order reversed. This should probably be viewed as a secondary development meant to frame the chapter. The other MT prayers (vv. 32, 34) emphasize the superiority of the heavenly king over the earthly king. The OG prayers, on the other hand, focus on the power of God to remove and establish kings and to perform signs and wonders (repeated in v. 34c). Additionally, the OG narrative has added a full conversion scene (vv. 34a, b).

It seems possible that this scene is similar to that of *4QPrayer of Nabonidus*, which likewise has a very simple account of the king's healing and restoration. This text mentions the king's praying to other gods without relief, as does the OG edition, making it possible that this was part of the *Vorlage*.

Other Elements in the *Vorlage*

Focus on the King

What is perhaps the most interesting feature about this narrative is that it is cast primarily from the first person perspective of the king. This is the one of the few narratives in the Hebrew Bible to be told from this perspective—the only other occurrences are in Ezra, recording the edicts of Persian kings (Ezra 1; 4:17–22; 6:1–12; 7:21–26); see also *4QPrayer of Nabonidus*—and the goal in doing this seems to be to especially draw the reader's attention to the role of the king in this chapter. It is also likely that this first person style is used to imitate the style of Assyrian and Babylonian royal inscriptions, most probably the Harran Stele of Nabonidus.

This first person perspective is not maintained throughout, however, and in the middle of the narrative it shifts to the third person, though back again to the first person in the final verses. Some commentators have proposed that this shift is natural since Nebuchadnezzar cannot be expected to narrate his own punishment, whether from shame or inability.³²

The Role of Daniel

In the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4, Daniel plays only a minimal role in this narrative. He is called in order to interpret the dream, after which he disappears from the stage entirely. The later editions have expanded the role of Daniel, though these elements are clearly secondary—the court competition in the MT and the introduction of Daniel as the “ruler of the wise men and the leader of those who decide dreams.” It seems possible that the *Vorlage* originally preserved only a nameless Jewish sage as in *4QPrayer of Nabonidus* and the figure of Daniel was secondarily inserted into the narrative when the other stories

³² See Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 223 who points out that the third person shift accounts for the period of the king’s madness in which “he would not have been a sane witness.” R. Glenn Wooden, “Changing Perceptions of Daniel: Reading Daniel 4 and 5 in Context,” in *From Biblical Criticism to Biblical Faith: Essays in Honor of Lee Martin McDonald* (eds. William H. Brackney and Craig A. Evans; Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 2007), 15–18, says that this should lead the reader to distrust the contents of the narrative because of its foreign viewpoint. Wooden links chaps. 4 and 5, though it should be noted that chap. 5 is told from the third person perspective, not from the first as is chap. 4.

(Dan 1–6) began to circulate. It seems probable, however, that Daniel was present in the narrative before either expanded edition was created.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have shown that the emphasis on the king of Daniel 4 is especially important to our understanding of the overall narrative. I have also attempted to reconstruct the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4. By envisioning what made up the original text, we can use this as the point of departure in order to see more clearly how the MT and OG editions have each altered the *Vorlage*, expanding in their own unique directions.

In the following two chapters I will look closely at the MT and OG editions of Daniel 4. I will isolate the substantive additions in each edition and show that through an examination of this plus material we can see how these subsequent editions have reshaped the role of the king in this chapter, allowing us to identify the *Tendenz* of each respective edition.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF THE MT EDITION OF DANIEL 4

Although these two editions of Daniel 4 stem from a common Semitic *Vorlage*, their similarities alone should not be emphasized. They still preserve two very distinct accounts of the same narrative. Each version has undoubtedly experienced a long history of adaptation and reworking at the hands of their respective editors. This is what makes them so interesting to Second Temple scholars.

In this and the following chapter, I will explore the differences between the Masoretic and Old Greek editions of Daniel 4, beginning with a look at the pluses and minuses in each edition respectively. In the second part of the chapter, I will look at what these particular pluses and minuses say about the *Tendenz* of the editor(s) of each edition.

Pluses and Minuses in the MT

What follows are both the significant and insignificant pluses and minuses of the MT edition of Daniel 4. We will see that the general tendency of the editor(s) of this chapter is to enlarge and multiply descriptions of the same events, so that the OG edition often preserves shorter evaluations in many instances. However, the number of short, singular pluses is extremely limited in the MT edition, which we will see is the general approach of the OG editor(s).

Dan 4:2

MT adds *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת בְּרֹאשִׁי* “the thoughts on my bed and the visions of my head.” This plus occurs two additional times in the MT edition of Daniel 4—4:7 *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת בְּרֹאשִׁי* and 4:10 *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת בְּרֹאשִׁי* both “the visions of my head upon my bed”—as well as two additional times elsewhere in Daniel—2:28 *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת בְּרֹאשֶׁךָ* “the visions of your head upon your bed”; 7:1 *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת בְּרֹאשֵׁהוּ* “the visions of his head upon his bed.” It is interesting that *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת* occurs in the phrase only in 4:2. Montgomery suggests that *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת* is certainly secondary in this instance since it interrupts the “metrical balance of the v[erse],” and was probably included in order to avoid the usual connotation carried by *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת* as pertaining to dreams causing nocturnal emissions.¹ Perhaps in the other instances in Dan 4 MT, *וְהַחֲוִיּוֹת* was entirely replaced with the alternative phrase. The occurrences in Dan 4 OG are all lacking—OG simply has *ἐνύπνιον* “dream”—though this phrase is translated in 2:28 OG and 7:1 OG, with the exception of Papyrus 967 where it is omitted in 7:1, perhaps indicating this phrase is secondary in the other chapters as well.²

Dan 4:3–6

¹ See James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1927), 225–27, for a list of Rabbinic and inscriptionary evidence.

² Dean O. Wenthe, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1991), 129.

Here the MT has a significant plus of a court legend similar to those elsewhere in Daniel or other literature (see Dan 1–6; Gen 37; Esth). The king calls in before him the wise men of Babylon, *הַרְטְמֵי אֲשֶׁכֶּיָּא כְּשָׂדִיָּא וְגִזְרֵיָּא* “the magicians, the conjurers, the Chaldeans and the diviners,” who are unable to show him its interpretation. These verses also include additional descriptions of Daniel, some of which are repeated throughout the chapter. First, the MT editor introduces Daniel with his accompanying Babylonian name, Belteshazzar (4:5, 6, 15, 16), *כְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵי* “like the name of my god.” Second, Daniel is described as having “a spirit of the holy gods” in him (4:5, 6, 15). Third, Daniel is called *רֹבֵּ הַרְטְמֵיָּא* “chief of the magicians” (4:6). Finally, it is said of Daniel that “no mystery baffles [him]” (4:6). That these elements occur in only four verses of chapter 4 (vv. 5, 6, 15, 16), rather than throughout the narrative, seems to further indicate their secondary nature.

All of this court-related material is lacking in the OG edition of Daniel 4. Upon waking from his dream, Nebuchadnezzar calls only Daniel, in whom he has full confidence of his ability to interpret the dream. The only potential indication that the OG editor knew of this material is his description of Daniel as *τὸν Δανιηλ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν σοφιστῶν καὶ τὸν ἡγούμενον τῶν κρινόντων τὰ ἐνύπνια* “ruler of the wise men and the leader of those who interpret dreams” in 4:15, which recalls 2:48 where Daniel is made *ἄρχοντα καὶ ἡγούμενον πάντων τῶν σοφιστῶν Βαβυλωνίας* “ruler and leader of all of the wise men of Babylon.” In the OG, however, this description probably serves a different purpose, since this is the first mention of the figure of Daniel in the chapter and seems an appropriate introduction. It is also possible that this description was a

secondary addition to the text.³

Dan 4:7

MT adds *וַהֲוֹנֵי רֹאשִׁי עַל-מִשְׁכְּבִי* “And the visions of my head upon my bed.” See above note on Dan 4:2.

Dan 4:8

The MT includes a different description of the tree in this verse than does the OG edition: *וַהֲוֹנֵי רֹאשִׁי עַל-מִשְׁכְּבִי וְהָיָה רָבָה אֵילָנָא וְהִתְקַר* “The tree grew large and became strong”; *καὶ ἡ ὄρασις αὐτοῦ μεγάλη* “and its appearance was great.” This verse is repeated in whole in 4:17 and interpreted in 4:19, with the variant descriptions being preserved in each edition.

Dan 4:9

The foliage of the tree (*עֲפָנֶיהָ*) is mentioned several times in the MT edition (see also 4:11, 18), though never in that of the OG.

Dan 4:10

MT again adds *בְּהֲוֹנֵי רֹאשִׁי עַל-מִשְׁכְּבִי* “in the visions of my head upon my bed.” See above note on Dan 4:2.

Here the MT edition expands the description of the angelic watcher: *מִן-שָׁמַיָא נִתְהַת* “and Behold! A holy watcher descended from heaven.” The OG separately

³ Unfortunately, this verse is among the damaged portions of Papyrus 967 and lost in a lacunae at the bottom of the page so this remains mere speculation.

expands this description: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος ἀπεστάλη ἐν ἰσχύι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “and Behold! An angel was sent with power from heaven.” The *Vorlage* probably only included וַאֲלֵי עִיר מִן־שָׁמַיָא “and Behold! A heavenly watcher.”

Dan 4:11

The acts of destruction commanded by the watcher are expanded in the MT edition: וַיִּדְבֹר אֱלֹהִים וַיִּצְוֶה אֶת־הַמַּלְאָכִים לְעַלֹּם אֶת־הָעֵץ וְלִפְזֹז אֶת־פְּרִיָּהּ וְלִפְזֹז אֶת־עָנָף אֶת־עָנָף וְלִפְזֹז אֶת־פְּרִיָּהּ וְלִפְזֹז אֶת־עָנָף אֶת־עָנָף וְלִפְזֹז אֶת־פְּרִיָּהּ וְלִפְזֹז אֶת־עָנָף אֶת־עָנָף “Cut down the tree, Cut off its branches, Strip off its foliage and scatter its fruit; Let the beasts flee from under it, And the birds from its branches.” The OG simply records: Ἐκκόψατε αὐτὸ καὶ καταφθείρατε αὐτό “Cut it down and destroy it.”

This is the first of five MT pluses dealing with the wild animals (also 4:13, 18, 20, 22). This animal motif is not entirely unique to the MT, since it is shared three times with the OG (4:9, 12, 29) as well as included an additional two times in the OG (4:14a, 30b).⁴

Dan 4:12–13

The strange וּבְאֶסְרוֹ הַיָּדָיו בְּרִנְדָּל וּבְנִחָשׁ “and in a band of iron and bronze” occurs here and at v. 20 in the MT edition, where it seems to be referring to the stump of the tree. Explanation of this element, however, is entirely lacking from Daniel’s interpretation of the king’s dream and in the dream’s fulfillment. In the OG, the band is mentioned only once at 4:14a καὶ ἐν χειροπέδαις χαλκαῖς “and in shackles made of bronze,” where it lacks the reference

⁴ In his discussion of the animal motif, Wenthe incorrectly states that it was used 9 times in the MT (rather than 8) and neglects the two OG additions. See Wenthe, “The OG Translation of Daniel 1–6,” 134–35.

to iron and gives a radically different sense (i.e., pertaining to a person), and they are employed twice in the later narrative—4:29 δήσουσί σε “they will bind you”; 31a ἐπεδήθην “I was bound.”

That the king’s human heart would be changed to that of an animal is stated only once in each edition, though at very different places in the narrative—in the king’s recitation of the dream in MT 4:13 (לִבְבִי מִן־אֲנִימָא וְשִׁנּוֹן וְלִבִּי חִיָּה וְהִתְחַב לָהּ) and in the fulfillment of the dream in OG 4:30b (both his flesh and his heart are changed: ἠλλοιώθη ἡ σάρξ μου καὶ ἡ καρδία μου). This is perhaps also insinuated in 4:31 MT, which states that the king’s reason returned to him (מִנְדַעַי עָלַי יָחֹב).

The stump of the roots, band of iron and bronze, wet with dew of heaven, and feeding with the animals for seven years are often grouped together in the MT edition of chapter 4, though they are often piecemeal or entirely lacking in the OG verses. It seems that this sequence has been fully repeated in the MT to help smooth the narrative; see MT 4:20–21 and 4:22–23 (lacking the reference to the band of iron and bronze).

Dan 4:14

The first line—בְּגֹזְרַת עִירֵין פְּתֻגְמָא וּמֵאֲמַר קְדִישִׁין שְׂאֵלְתָא “The sentence is by the decree of the angelic watchers and the decision is a command of the holy ones”—is entirely lacking in OG v. 14, though a similar statement can be seen in v. 11: προστέτακται γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑψίστου “for it has been commanded by the Most High,” though the repetition of the MT is absent. See, however, 4:21 MT which has a near exact counterpart in the OG. The “angelic watchers” and the “holy ones” likely indicate the same group as in 4:10, 20. It is likely that the parallelism here has been added by the MT editor.

The second line is again different from the OG edition and reflects further alterations by the MT editor(s). The message has been universalized—*עֲלִיָּא בְּמַלְכוּת אֱנוֹשָׂא*—rather than pertaining only to the king’s knowledge of this fact. The MT has also added that “the Most High is ruler over the kingdom of men and bestows it on whom He wishes,” which highlights the separation of the two kingdoms (heavenly and earthly) and the priority of the heavenly one, a recurrent theme throughout the chapter (cf. 3:33; 4:6, 8, 10, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34), but perhaps most explicit here.

One small, yet important, plus in the Aramaic version is in 4:14—*אֲנָשִׁים וְקִיָּם עֲלֶיהָ*—“sets over it the lowest of men.” This plus is significant because it creates a great contrast between *אֱלֹהָא עֲלִיָּא* “God Most High” and *שְׂפַל אֲנָשִׁים* “the lowest of men.” This is then turned on its head by the MT editor, in that the king will only be exalted from his status as the lowest of men once he recognizes his subservience to the Most High God.

Dan 4:15

Here, the MT edition includes another plus and returns to the court motif, substituting the name Belteshazzar for Daniel, asserting again that Daniel has a spirit of the holy gods in him, and reiterating that none of the Babylonian wise men could reveal what the king asked. See note on 4:3–6.

Dan 4:16

Continuing the court legend material, the MT edition yet again echoes that Daniel’s name was Belteshazzar (three times in this single verse!).

The MT plus in Daniel’s response to the king’s dream—*וְרַעְיוֹנָיו יִבְהַלְגָּהּ* “his thoughts alarmed him”—seems to mimic that of the king’s own response to his dream.⁵ The same verb *יִבְהַלְגָּהּ* is used in this chapter only here and in v. 2. This is especially interesting, when, in another MT plus, the king himself offers Daniel comfort at his troubling response—*בִּלְטַשְׁשַׁצַּר הַלְמָנָא וּפְשָׂרָא אֶל־יִבְהַלְגָּךְ* “Belteshazzar, do not let the dream or its interpretation alarm you.”

Dan 4:17

The tree that *רָבָה וַתִּקְרַךְ וְרוּמָהּ יִמְטָא לְשָׁמַיָא וַחֲזוּתָהּ לְכָל־אַרְעָא* “became large and grew strong and its height reached to heaven and its appearance was visible to all the earth” is repeated from 4:8.

Dan 4:18

Again this verse is repeated from earlier in the narrative, 4:9—*בְּרָא וּבָעֲנָפוּרָיו יִשְׁכַּנְּן צִפְרֵי שָׁמַיָא*—*וְעֲפֹתָהּ שְׁפִיר וְאַנְבָּתָהּ שְׁנִיָא וּמְזוֹן לְכָל־בְּהֵמַת הַתְּחוּמֵי תְּרוּל חַיִּינַת* “and whose foliage was beautiful and its fruit abundant, and in which was food for all, under which the beasts of the field dwelt.”

Dan 4:19

The first identification of the king as the tree—*אַנְתָּהּ־הוּא מַלְכָּא* “It is you, O King”—occurs in v. 19 in the MT edition.⁶ The placement is different in the OG edition (vv. 17 and 19).

⁵ These two words are also paired in 5:6, 10; 7:28. See also 7:15 which pairs the terms from 4:2 *וַחֲזוּנֵי רַאשֵׁי יִבְהַלְגֵּנִי*.

⁶ Reminiscent of 2 Sam 12:7, Nathan says to David “You are the man.”

Wenthe notes that “the identification of the king *precedes* a larger exposition of the tree’s significance in the OG and follows it in the MT.”⁷

MT includes another plus repeating the earlier descriptions of the tree: לְשִׁמְיָא רְבִית וְהִקְפָּתָ וְרִבּוּתָךְ רְבִית וּמָנְתָ “and grown strong, and your majesty has become great and reached to heaven.”

Dan 4:20–21

For a description of the “holy one, descending from heaven,” see note on 4:10. This entire line beginning with וּבְאֵסוּרֵי דִּי-פְרִיגֵל וּנְחָשׁ is repeated from 4:12–13 (see discussion there), lacking only the reference to the changing of the king’s heart. See discussion in 4:14 for reference to “the decree of the Most High.”

Dan 4:22–23

See note on 4:12–13 for this repetitious description of the king’s animal behavior.

An interesting MT reading occurs in v. 23, where the king is told that he will be punished until he recognizes הִי שְׁלִטָן שְׁמֵיָא “that heaven is ruler.” This reference to “Heaven” seems to be related to the deity, since elsewhere in Daniel 4 the king must recognize הִי-שְׁלִיט עֲלֵיָא “that the Most High is ruler” (v. 22). Nowhere else in the Aramaic portions of the book of Daniel (nor in the OG) is the designation “Heaven” used without an antecedent—it is typically אֱלֹהֵי שְׁמֵיָא “God of heaven” (Dan 2:18, 28, 37, 44; 4:34 מִלְּדֵי שְׁמֵיָא; 5:23 מִתְּרֵא-שְׁמֵיָא).⁸ Perhaps the text has been corrupted and אֱלֹהֵי has fallen out, but

⁷ Wenthe, “The OG Translation of Daniel 1–6,” 138.

⁸ See also Ezra 5:11, 12; 6:9, 10; 7:12, 21, 23.

the OG reading here is κύριος ζῆ ἐν οὐρανῶ “the Lord lives in heaven,” which is also unique to this reading in Dan 4. It is also possible that the *Vorlage* contained only אֱלֹהִים, since it is attested elsewhere in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period and has common usage in Greco-Roman religions.⁹

Dan 4:24

In this verse in the MT, there is a plus making this phrase a doublet—פְּרֹק וְשִׁוְרָהּ בְּמִצְוֹתַי עֲגִינוּ—וְהִטְוֶה בְּצַדִּיקָהּ “and break away from your sins by doing righteousness and from your iniquities by showing mercy to the poor”—which is absent from the OG. Additionally, this is “the only use of פְּרֹק וְשִׁוְרָהּ in Biblical Aramaic.”¹⁰

Dan 4:25

Several times throughout the narrative, the MT and OG editions preserve different passages of time. This is one possible instance of the trend—the MT edition has immediate fulfillment/action (אֵלֶּא כֹּלָּא עֲלֵ-נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מִלְּכָא “All of this happened to King Nebuchadnezzar), whereas the OG has a more prolonged or measured sense of time (Nebuchadnezzar τοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ συνετήρησε “kept the words in his heart,” indicating that it would be fulfilled at some point in the future).

⁹ Cf. 1 Macc 3:18–19; 4:10; 2 Macc 7:11; *m. ’Abot* 1:3, 11; 2:12; 4:4, 11, 12; Matt 21:25; Luke 15:18, 21; John 3:27. See Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 239–42, or John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1996), 89, for fuller discussion and listing of the literature.

¹⁰ Wenthe, “The OG Translation of Daniel 1–6,” 142.

Dan 4:26

The locations are different in each edition—MT has *על־היכל מלכותא די בבלמלךה* “he was walking on the palace of the kingdom of Babylon” (meaning the roof?); OG has *ἐπὶ τῶν τειχῶν τῆς πόλεως μετὰ πάσης τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ περιεπάτει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πύργων αὐτῆς διεπορεύετο* “he was walking on the walls of the city with all of his glory and passing through all of its towers.” It cannot be deduced what may have been original to the *Vorlage*, only that each edition indicates a location with an elevated view of the kingdom so that the following statement about the glory the king has brought to the city of Babylon is warranted by his vantage point.

Dan 4:27

The MT preserves the king’s comment about Babylon’s greatness in the form of a rhetorical question; the OG presents this as a statement.

Dan 4:28–29

Here the MT has *עוד מלךא בפה מלךא* “While the word was still in the king’s mouth,” while the OG has *καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείας τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ* “and at the completion of his word.” These two depictions are close enough to posit a common *Vorlage* here with the understanding that the voice from heaven was an immediate response to the king’s previous statement.

In keeping with the general tendency of the MT edition, there is included a plus here of “seven periods of time will pass over you” which serves to express the full portrait of the dream related earlier.

Dan 4:30

Here we can see another instance in which the MT and OG preserve different lengths of time, with the MT expressing imminence—*בְּהַשְׁעָה הַהִיא* “immediately/in that very hour”—and the OG expressing delay—*ἕως δὲ πρωί* “by morning.”

The MT has another plus giving fuller details of the dream’s fulfillment than in the OG—*וּמַטְּל שָׁמַיָא גִשְׁמִיהּ יִצְטַבַּע* “and his body was drenched with the dew of heaven.”

The MT and OG are at variance here with their description of the type of comparison for the king’s claws—MT *כְּצִפְרֵין* “like those of a bird,” OG *ὡσεὶ λέοντος* “like those of a lion.” This probably indicates that both editions include pluses here, though the MT rendering is possibly more likely given the high occurrence of “birds” already present in this chapter.

Dan 4:31–32

The title “Him who lives forever” is used only this once in Dan 4, and is absent from the OG edition. There is a similar construction in Dan 12:7 *וַיִּשָׁבַע בְּחַי הָעוֹלָם* “and he swore by Him who lives forever.”¹¹

The MT edition concludes with a series of prayers which are either entirely lacking or significantly different in the OG edition. The first of these prayers is a doxology, which has been reproduced from 3:33—*שְׁלֹשָׁנֵהוּ שְׁלֹשָׁן עָלָם וּמְלִכּוּתָהּ עִם דָּר וְדָר*. The

¹¹ John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 231, points out additional parallels in Sir 18:1; 1 Enoch 5:1; and in the title ’El ‘Olam of Gen 21:33.

terms שְׁלֵטָן “dominion” and מְלָכוּת “kingdom” have been reversed in 4:31. The OG edition only records this prayer once, in 4:34c where it parallels 3:33.¹²

The second prayer is in v. 32—שְׁמַיָא וְדָאָרֵי אַרְעָא וְלֹא אִיִּתֵי דִי־יִמְתָא בִּידָהּ וְנֹאמֵר לָהּ מָה עֲבַדְתָּ—“All the dwelling in the earth are accounted as nothing, and he does as he wishes with the host of heaven and those dwelling in the earth. There is none who will strike his hand or say to him what are you doing.” It is likely that the second occurrence of “inhabitants of the earth” is due to dittography and should be deleted.¹³ This prayer is absent from the OG and not similar to any other prayer in the book of Daniel.¹⁴

Dan 4:33

The MT has a plus here stating that upon his reinstatement on his throne, the king’s counselors and nobles began seeking him out—וְלִי תִדְבְּרוּ וְרִבְרִבְנֵי וּבִעֲוֹן. This is lacking in the OG of Daniel.¹⁵

A further MT plus in this verse is that וְרָבוּ נְתִיבָהּ הַוֹּסֶפֶת לִי “exceeding greatness was

¹² For similar prayers, see Dan 6:26 and Ps 145:13.

¹³ Collins, *Daniel*, 212.

¹⁴ See, however, Isa 40:17 for “accounted as nothing,” and Job 9:12; Eccl 8:4; Isa 45:9 for “What are you doing?”

¹⁵ Cf. Job 42:11, where וְכָל־יֹדְעָיו לָפָנָיִם “all who knew him before” also seek him as part of his restoration.

added to me.”¹⁶ This is in contrast to the OG, which states only that he was restored to his throne, indicating that he was reestablished in his former position and glory (i.e., he was no greater than he had previously been).

Dan 4:34

The title “King of heaven” is also unique to this verse in all the Hebrew Bible, although it does occur elsewhere in the Greek Bible—for example, 1 Esd 4:46, 58; Tob 13:7, 11.¹⁷ This title is lacking from the OG edition, though ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “God of heaven” does occur twice (4:34a, 34b).

This is the third prayer of the MT plus material in the closing verses—כָּל לְהַשְׁפִּילָהּ “for all His works are truth and His ways justice, and He is able to humble those who walk in pride.” This prayer is not present in the OG edition.

Tendenz of the MT Edition

After a thorough examination of the pluses and minuses of the MT edition of Daniel 4, we can discern several distinctive themes and perspectives that the editor(s) have added to the original edition of this narrative. In this part of the chapter, I will explore the *Tendenz* of the MT edition of this chapter, focusing on the added court competition and the notion of kingship portrayed in the pluses and minuses identified above.

¹⁶ Cf. Job 42:12, where he is blessed even more than he had been before his troubles began, including in the number of his possessions.

¹⁷ Similarly, מֶלֶךְ-שָׁמַיִם Dan 5:23; מֶלֶךְ הַשָּׁמַיִם Jer 7:18; 44:17–19.

Court Competition

The most significant *Tendenz* of the MT edition of Dan 4 is that of the court competition (4:3–6, 15–16).¹⁸ Beginning in v. 3, Nebuchadnezzar orders that all of the “wise men of Babylon” be brought before him to tell him the interpretation of his dream. These “wise men” include “the magicians, the conjurers, the Chaldeans and the diviners” (4:4 וְגִזְרֵי־אֱשֵׁרָא וְחֹרְטְמֵי־אֲשַׁפִּיִּיא כַּשְׂדֵּי־אֲשַׁפִּיִּיא). Once they are assembled, none of them is able to tell him its interpretation. Strangely, when Daniel arrives on the scene, he is asked to relate both the interpretation and the dream itself (4:6; contradicts 4:5, 7–15).¹⁹ After recounting his dream, Nebuchadnezzar again asks Daniel to tell him the interpretation (without mention of the dream), with full confidence that even though the “wise men” could not, Daniel will be able. Daniel proves himself capable in the matter and explains to Nebuchadnezzar the meaning of his dream.

This entire scene mimics that of Dan 2. There the king also summons the Babylonian wise men (v. 2 וְגִזְרֵי־אֱשֵׁרָא; v. 10 וְחֹרְטְמֵי־אֲשַׁפִּיִּיא וְכַשְׂדֵּי־אֲשַׁפִּיִּיא וְלִמְכַשְׁפִּיִּים וְלַכַּשְׂדִּיִּים).

¹⁸ See Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Jewish Court Legends* (HDR 26; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 1–38, for a discussion of the “wisdom court legend” genre, esp. 6–12 for the difference in court competition and court conflict.

¹⁹ This is possibly a textual corruption, which Collins, *Daniel*, 208 (following Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 226), alters reading חֲזִי “behold” for חֲזִי “visions”: “behold the dream that I saw and tell its interpretation” rather than “say the visions of the dream I saw and its interpretation.”

only occurs in Dan 4).²⁰ The king demands that they tell him both his dream and its interpretation (vv. 2, 5, 6, 9, 26, 28). If they cannot tell him both the dream and its interpretation, they will be executed (vv. 12–14). Even facing such harsh punishment, the wise men are unable to tell the king what he has requested (vv. 7, 10–11). When Daniel learns of his and the other wise men’s impending death, he prays to God and “the mystery” is revealed to him (vv. 18, 19). He then appears before Nebuchadnezzar (vv. 25–30), relates the dream and its interpretation (vv. 31–45), and is greatly rewarded (vv. 46–49).

The only elements present in Dan 2 which are lacking from Dan 4 are the king’s death threats toward the wise men and Daniel’s reward for his retelling and interpretation.²¹ The absence of these elements is probably due to the unique emphasis on the king in chapter 4, which is the only one in the book of Daniel to be told from the first person perspective of the Gentile king as opposed to that of Daniel or from the third person view of the narrator. What is especially innovative is that the expected reward for

²⁰ This term recalls *4QPrayer of Nabonidus*, in which a Jewish גזר speaks to the king and directs him to praise God, which many scholars have argued could have been a source for Dan 4, or at least preserves an alternate (more original) version of the narrative.

²¹ The reward of the court hero and punishment for his opponents are typical elements of court tales (see Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King*, 6–12). However, the threat of execution of the wise men for their inability to perform the requested duties (rather than for their opposition to the hero) seems to be unique to Dan 2.

Daniel would be riches and an elevated political position (as in chapters 2 and 5). Instead, here, these seem to be applied to the king himself. In 4:33, the MT adds that, upon his restoration, the king comments, “my counselors and my nobles began seeking me out; so I was *reestablished* in my sovereignty, and *surpassing greatness* was added to me.” The effect is that this even further emphasizes the focus on the king in this chapter.

In addition to these verses depicting the court scene itself, there are other additions throughout Dan 4 which accentuate this motif. The primary purpose of these additions seems to unify this chapter with the others of Dan 1–6, since these elements occur throughout the other chapters as well: Daniel is given the name Belteshazzar [4:5, 6, 15, 16 (three times!); cf. Dan 1:7; 2:26; 5:12];²² he is described as having “a spirit of the holy gods” in him (4:5, 6, 15; cf. 5:11, 12, 14; 2:28); he is called “chief of the magicians” (4:6 *רֵבִי הַרְטֵמְיָא*; cf. 5:11; 1:19, 20); and it is said that “no mystery baffles [him]” (4:6; cf. 1:17, 19, 20; 2:18, 28, 30, 47).

Kingship and Authority

As shown in the previous chapter, the *Vorlage* of Dan 4 placed great emphasis on the king, probably more than any other unit in the entire Hebrew Bible. The manner in which the MT edition portrays the king deserves a significant amount of attention, since it has rewritten the *Vorlage* in several distinctive ways to express its own purposes and suppositions.

²² It is only in 4:5 that the distinctive note *דָּנִיֵּאל הָיָה שְׂמֵהוּ בִּלְטִישַׁצַּר בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵי* “Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, like the name of my god” is included, bringing even this description of Daniel back to attention on the king.

The first distinctive way in which the MT portrays the king in chapter four is his being inept and powerless. This is evidenced most clearly in the added court scene. The king is fearful about the dream he had and is unable himself to do anything about it, so he orders that the wise men of Babylon assemble before him so that they can do something about it. The wise men, however, are unable to do what the king requests.²³ The king presumably dismisses the wise men and seems resigned to not knowing the significance of his dream וְעַד אֶתְהַיִּין “until finally” Daniel arrives on the scene.²⁴ Since there is no mention of Daniel being summoned by the king, only that הָקָרַבְתִּי לִי “he came in before me,” this indicates that he came at a later time than the other wise men, possibly of his own accord.²⁵ When Nebuchadnezzar addresses Daniel, he adds the distinctive note לֹא-אֵינְס לְךָ “there is no mystery which troubles you,” indicating his hopes that Daniel will be able to solve this mystery, even though the king and the other wise men were unable. If we view the editor(s)’ use of רָז in this verse as signifying their familiarity with chapter two,²⁶ then we can associate Daniel’s ability to solve the mystery with his having a

²³ The text in chapter 2 is silent about how the king deals with the ineptitude of the Babylonian wise men, which sharply contrasts with his reactions in chapter two (i.e., extreme anger and death threats).

²⁴ This phrase וְעַד אֶתְהַיִּין “until finally” seems to express the king’s exasperation or perhaps hopelessness that no one has been able to tell him the meaning of his dream.

²⁵ Was he not called with the first wise men (כָּל חֲכִימָי דְבָבֶל), or did Daniel choose to not come until later? Was this a violation of the king’s command? Cf. chapter 2.

²⁶ In all of Daniel, this term occurs only here and in chapter 2 (vv. 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47).

revelation from אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיָא “the God of Heaven.”²⁷ The fact that this plus material occurs at the beginning of the narrative serves to introduce the king as being inept and powerless over even his own thoughts. This is in contrast to God, who has ultimate authority and is גִּלְיָא רְוּנָא “the revealer of mysteries” (2:28, 29, 47).

Though the MT may emphasize the role of King Nebuchadnezzar in this chapter, he is significantly overshadowed by another king, the מֶלֶךְ שָׁמַיָא “King of Heaven” (4:34). Throughout this chapter, the MT edition has consistently rewritten its *Vorlage* so as to sharply contrast the heavenly and earthly kingdoms and their respective rulers in order to demonstrate that the heavenly ruler is far superior to the earthly one.

Perhaps the most explicit way in which this is done is in the titles used for the king and for God throughout this chapter. The designation most often used for God in this narrative is “Most High” (vv. 14, 21, 22, 29, 31; אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיָא 3:32), though שָׁמַיָא “Heaven” (4:23), תִּי עֲלֵמָא “He who lives forever” (4:31), and מֶלֶךְ שָׁמַיָא “King of Heaven” (4:34) are also employed. Nebuchadnezzar is most often referred to as the “the king” and sometimes by his name, however, in 4:14 the MT edition gives a very distinctive identification—שְׂפַל אֲנָשִׁים “the lowest of men.” This terminology directly contrasts the king (the lowest of men) with God (the Most High), and states that only after the king is so extremely humbled (becoming the שְׂפַל אֲנָשִׁים) and recognizes the true “Most High,” will he again be exalted.

Another way in which the MT edition contrasts the two kings is through references to their dominion. Throughout the chapter, Nebuchadnezzar is shown to have dominion over the animals and birds (vv. 9, 18, 19)—i.e., the inhabitants of the earth. In

²⁷ 2:18, 19; but 2:28: אֱלֹהֵי בְּשָׁמַיָא.

relation to God, however, all of the inhabitants of the earth are כְּלֵהּ הַשָּׁמַיִם “accounted as nothing” (v. 32), indicating that God himself is more magnificent than all of Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom. Further, it is God who has dominion over the kingdoms of men (v. 14, 22, 29, 32), as well as the host of heaven (v. 32), and his kingdom is eternal (3:33; 4:31), in contrast to Nebuchadnezzar’s which is fleeting and dependent on God’s whims (vv. 21, 22, 28, 29).

Goldingay has noted that “the confession of God as King [4:34] might seem to leave no place for human government.”²⁸ This, however, is not the point of the MT edition, “rather, the chapter continues to assume that if God’s kingship is acknowledged, human kingship can then find its place.”²⁹ This is precisely how the chapter ends: once Nebuchadnezzar acknowledges his place in the divine-human realm, he is reestablished on his throne with even more greatness than he had before (4:33).

²⁸ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 96–97. Cf. Judg 8:23; 1 Sam 8:4–7; 12:12

²⁹ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 96–97.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE OG EDITION OF DANIEL 4

In this chapter, I will further explore the differences between the double literary editions of Daniel 4 by examining the OG edition. I will begin by identifying the individual pluses and minuses in the OG edition. Once we see clearly what the OG has added or subtracted, in the second part of the chapter, we can categorize these pluses and minuses and see what these say about the *Tendenz* of the OG edition.

Pluses and Minuses in the OG

*Dan 4:34c*¹

Using Joseph Fitzmyer's analysis of Aramaic letter forms, it seems likely that the OG edition has expanded the letter format of the *Vorlage*. The phrase "at all times" is sometimes present after the greeting of peace to the recipients.² The word "and now" often follows the greeting and serves as a transitional phrase from the greeting to the body of the message.³ The final line of this verse—καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἐπιστολὰς περὶ

¹ I begin with 4:34c because, as I have shown in chapter two, this epistolary introduction seems to have been original to the beginning of the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4.

² Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Epistolography," *Semeia* 22 (1981): 34.

³ Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Epistolography," 35.

πάντων τῶν γενηθέντων αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι τοῖς οὖσιν ὑπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ—explicitly states Nebuchadnezzar’s sending of letters, something absent in the MT edition, though is perhaps implied by the letter format (i.e., letters are written in order to be sent). Perhaps, as James Montgomery notes, this line directly followed v. 34b as the original ending of the chapter in the OG, before the letter was moved to its current location.⁴

The phrase ἔδοξε δέ μοι ἀποδείξαι ὑμῖν “and it seemed good to me to show to you” is a reduplication of the previous line—ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν “I will show you”—though with the verb in a different tense.⁵ This reflects the general OG tendency identified in chapter two of a repeated line which serves as a link to the unique OG material, here to show to you καὶ τοῖς σοφισταῖς ὑμῶν “and to your wise men...”

The OG plus continues in the next phrase ὅτι ἔστι θεός “that God is [one],” which has replaced the original first line of this doxology reflected by the MT edition אֵלֵהוּהִי כְּגֹדֵל רַבְרָבִין “How great are his signs!” This phrase is distinctive and recalls Deut 6:4, שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד “Hear O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one.” The OG has dropped the parallelism here between signs and wonders, including only the broader term θαυμάσια “marvelous things” in the second line. Elsewhere in the chapter, however, the OG does include the same parallelism as the MT (v. 34 σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα).

The OG edition includes two pluses in which references to σοφιστάς “wise men”

⁴ James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1927), 247.

⁵ See discussion in chapter 2 for the significance of the verb tenses in this verse.

are made (vv. 15, 34c). Perhaps it is only meant as the Greek equivalent of the Aramaic חֲכִימֵי מַלְכוּתִי, “wise men of my kingdom.” It is also possible, though, that it denotes a particular group, and could offer insight into the identity of the author of the OG edition.

Dan 4:1

The designation that these events occurred in the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign is a further expansionary element of the letter form in the OG edition (see note above on 4:34c and discussion in chapter 2).⁶ What is significant in the identification of these events in the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign is that this would have been immediately after his destruction of the Jerusalem temple, for which the OG explicitly condemns the king later in the narrative (v. 19), and he is represented as being “at ease in his house.”⁷

Dan 4:7

⁶ Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” 37.

⁷ As noted by Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 247. See Jer 52:29, which gives this year. Contra 2 Kgs 25:8, which records the nineteenth year. Some view this introduction as “editorial ineptitude” due to chap. 2 being dated to this same year and the impossibility that the editor meant for these two events to take place in the same year. See F.F. Bruce, “The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel” in *Instruction and Interpretation: Studies in Hebrew Language, Palestinian Archaeology and Biblical Exegesis* (OtSt 20; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 28.

The OG edition includes here the plus: καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἄλλο ὅμοιον αὐτῷ. “and there was no other like it,” in its description of the tree. This description occurs nowhere else in Daniel in either edition. Elsewhere in the Bible, this phrase is typically used of kings (Saul: 1 Sam 10:24; Solomon: 1 Kgs 3:12–13; 2 Chr 1:12; Neh 13; Hezekiah: 2 Kgs 18:5; Josiah: 23:25; 2 Chr 35:19b; Judas Maccabeus: 1 Macc 9:29; King of Assyria: Ezek 31:8) or of God (Exod 15:11; 1 Chr 17:20; 2 Chr 6:14; Ps 34:10; 70:19; 85:8; 88:9; Job 37:23).⁸ In this verse, it seems to indicate the extreme status of Nebuchadnezzar and his reason for pride, as in Ezekiel 31, the only other passage dealing with a foreign king.

Dan 4:8

One of the most discussed OG pluses of the entire narrative is that of v. 8: ὁ ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη ἐν αὐτῷ ὄκουν καὶ ἐφώτιζον πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν “the sun and the moon dwelt in it and illuminated the whole earth.” These cosmic elements are entirely lacking from the MT edition and this is the only time they are mentioned in the OG edition. They are likely added here to indicate the extreme nature of the king’s (i.e., the tree’s) self-exaltation, since his reach extends far beyond earthly boundaries and he perhaps even proposes to cause the sun and moon to provide light for the earth. Another plus in this verse καὶ τὸ κύτος αὐτοῦ ἕως τῶν νεφελῶν πληροῦν τὰ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “and its span to the clouds, filling the area under heaven,” is a further expansion of the vastness of the tree. Together these two pluses transform the description of the tree in the MT edition and in Ezekiel 37, where it is only providing shelter for the birds and animals, to a picture of a king desiring heavenly rather than earthly status.

⁸ Also used of Israel in Deut 33:29.

Dan 4:9

The OG adds that the branches of the tree were 30 stadia long. The word στάδιον occurs only here in all of Daniel, though it occurs several times in 2 Maccabees (11:5; 12:9, 10, 16, 17, 29), “where all occurrences (sic!) relate to distances in conjunction with military campaigns.”⁹ Perhaps this term should be viewed as further indictment of Nebuchadnezzar for his destruction of the Jerusalem temple.

Dan 4:10

In its description of the angel, the OG edition adds that it was sent ἐν ἰσχύι “with power.” This is again repeated in the angel’s description in v. 20, though there with the addition παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου “by the Lord.” The role of angelology has been heightened in the OG edition, as angels are mentioned six times (vv. 10, 19, 20, 21, 29, 30c) compared with only three times in the MT (vv. 10, 14, 20).¹⁰

Dan 4:11

That the king’s punishment has been commanded by the Most High is repeated in v. 20

⁹ Dean O. Wenthe, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1991), 134.

¹⁰ See Wenthe, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6,” 61, 135.

OG (vv. 14, 21 MT).¹¹ Here, the OG adds the phrase ἐκριζῶσαι καὶ ἀχρειῶσαι αὐτό “to uproot it and to render it useless.”¹² This phrase is awkward since it is followed by the command to preserve one of its roots in the very next line (v. 12). The term ἀχρειῶσαι is used nowhere else in Daniel, though appears in a similar context in Jer 11:16—ἠχρεώθησαν οἱ κλάδοι αὐτῆς “its branches were rendered useless.” Perhaps a more meaningful parallel is found in 1 Esd 1:53 where this term is used in reference to Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction of Jerusalem and the temple—καὶ συνετέλεσαν πάντα τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτῆς ἀχρεῶσαι—and is a further recollection of Nebuchadnezzar’s deeds.

Dan 4:12–13

The phrase ὅπως μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς... νέμηται “so that he may feed with the animals of the earth” carries the same sense as the following verse—βοσκηθῆ σὺν αὐτοῖς “he will graze with them”—though they use different verbs. The MT has only וַיִּשְׁבֶּה אֶת־בְּשָׂבִי אֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה. This again reflects the tendency of the OG author to repeat lines in order to present their own unique material—ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι χόρτον ὡς βοῦς “in the mountains like an ox.”

Dan 4:14

This verse relates the final words of the angel, that the king must acknowledge that the

¹¹ There are actually several diverse designations for the commander: v. 11 OG τοῦ ὑψίστου; v. 14 MT יְיָ־שַׁדַּי and יְיָ־שַׁדַּי־אֱלֹהֵינוּ; v. 20 OG τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου; v. 21 MT אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

I have chosen Most High since it is the only identical term used in each edition.

¹² ἐκριζῶσαι occurs also in v. 23 OG.

Lord of heaven has authority. Both editions, however, preserve different ideas of what the Lord has authority over. In keeping with their emphasis on the subordination of the earthly king to the heavenly one, the MT edition has the equivalent of πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς “over the kingdom of men.” The OG instead has “over everything which is in heaven and on earth,” which is a response to the expanded reach of the tree in v. 8.

Dan 4:14a

This verse preserves a large OG plus in which Nebuchadnezzar witnesses the occurrence of the things of which the angel spoke. First, the tree is cut down in one day, even ἐν ὧρᾳ μιᾷ τῆς ἡμέρας “in one hour of the day.” Several times throughout Daniel 4 events occur in the span of an hour (4:16, 30 MT; 4:14a, 16, 23 OG).

Second, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ ἐδόθησαν εἰς πάντα ἄνεμον, καὶ εἰλκύσθη καὶ ἐρρίφη “its branches were given to every wind, and it was dragged and thrown away.” This language is repeated nowhere else in Daniel 4 in either edition. Winds are mentioned in the latter chapters of Daniel, though always the “four winds,” and are associated with destruction of gentile kings (7:2; 8:8; 11:4 OG). Outside of this verse, the phrase “every wind” is found only in Ezekiel 5:10, 12; 12:14; 17:21, where it deals with judgment and scattering in the wind, though in reference to Israel or its rulers, rather than to gentile kings.

Next, the imagery switches to that of the animal transformation, though here it differs substantially from the MT edition. As would be expected, he (who? an animal? the king?) eats grass with the animals of the earth: καὶ τὸν χόρτον τῆς γῆς μετὰ τῶν

θηρίων τῆς γῆς ἦσθιε. What is unique, however, is the understanding of the bands of bronze and iron. The OG transforms these bands into an imprisonment scene, where he is καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν παρεδόθη καὶ ἐν πέλαις καὶ ἐν χειροπέδαις χαλκαῖς ἐδέθη ὑπ’ αὐτῶν “delivered into prison and bound by them with shackles and bronze manacles.” This imprisonment language occurs again in v. 22.

Finally, the plus material closes with the king’s note that he “marveled exceedingly at all these things, and sleep escaped from [his] eyes”: σφόδρα ἐθαύμασα ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις, καὶ ὁ ὕπνος μου ἀπέστη ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου. The purpose of this line seems to be to transition from the dream itself back to the king, and the next verse which begins with the king in his bed.

Dan 4:15

In v. 15 OG, morning comes and the king calls Daniel. This is different from the MT, where the king continues his ongoing conversation with Daniel, because of the MT plus material where the king had already called for the wise men in v. 3 and Daniel entered in v. 5. The difference in placement of Daniel’s entrance means that, in the OG edition, the first recitation of the dream was purely for the audience and we are only told of the king telling the dream to Daniel.

Here, the OG identifies Daniel as τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν σοφιστῶν καὶ τὸν ἡγούμενον τῶν κρινόντων τὰ ἐνύπνια “the ruler of the wise men and the leader of those who decide dreams.” This is the only indication that this edition knew of the court scene related by the MT edition, and should likely be viewed as a late addition to the text.

Dan 4:16

Rather than the simple fearful response preserved in the MT edition (Daniel מְלִיץֵי יְהוָה וְהַלְהִיבֵהוּ הַלֵּל הַשָּׁמַיִם כְּשָׁעָה בְּחִשְׁבֹתָיו “was appalled for about an hour as his thoughts alarmed him”), the OG gives no less than *seven* descriptions of Daniel’s fear: he “was greatly amazed and since foreboding pressed him and since he was afraid, as trembling seized him and his appearance changed, having shaken his head, having marveled for one hour” *μεγάλως ἐθαύμασεν, καὶ ὑπόνοια κατέσπευδεν αὐτόν, καὶ φοβηθεὶς τρόμου λαβόντος αὐτόν καὶ ἀλλοιωθείσης τῆς ὀράσεως αὐτοῦ κινήσας τὴν κεφαλὴν ὥραν μίαν ἀποθαυμάσας*). The OG edition also includes that Daniel replied to the king *φωνῆ πραεῖα* “in a quite voice.”

Dan 4:17

The OG edition adds that the great tree τὸ ἐν τῇ γῆ πεφυτευμένον “the one that was planted in the earth.” The imagery of “planting” occurs only here in all of Daniel, but recalls a long list of parallels from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible/Septuagint. The occurrences in the prophets shed light on our understanding of this verse, since the people Israel are condemned for their unrighteousness and will plant vineyards and gardens for another people to enjoy.¹³ Once they return to the Lord, however, they will again enjoy the fruit of their own plantings.¹⁴ Perhaps most importantly, though, is Ezekiel 19, in which the vine planted by the waters will be plucked up and planted in the wilderness just as the king of Daniel 4 will also be sentenced to the wilderness.

The placement of the phrase, “It is you, O king,” is different in each edition—v.

¹³ Amos 5:11; Isa 5:2; 17:10–11; 40:24; Jer 2:21; also Deut 28:39.

¹⁴ Amos 9:14; Isa 37:30; 65:22; Jer 31:15; Ezek 28:26.

17 OG before the full description of the tree; v. 19 MT after the full description of the tree. The placement in the OG interrupts the flow of Daniel’s speech.

Dan 4:18

At this point, both the MT and OG include pluses. The MT repeats the entire description from v. 9. The OG has ἡ ἰσχύς τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ τῶν γλωσσῶν πασῶν ἕως τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ χῶραι σοὶ δουλεύουσι “the strength of the earth and the nations and all the languages unto the ends of the earth and all countries are slaves to you.” Dean Wenthe remarks that “the plus of the MT describes the tree and the OG describes *the significance* of the tree.”¹⁵ This also applies to the remainder of Daniel’s interpretation.

Dan 4:19

In v. 19, the OG explains the image of the tree that ἀνυψωθῆναι καὶ ἐγγίσει τῷ οὐρανῷ “was exalted and neared heaven,” adding καὶ τὸ κύτος αὐτοῦ ἄψασθαι τῶν νεφελῶν “and its span touched the clouds.” This line occurs in v. 17 in the MT edition.

The OG author further adds the explanation, σὺ, βασιλεῦ, ὑψώθης ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς ὄντας ἐπὶ προσώπου πάσης τῆς γῆς, ὑψώθη σου ἡ καρδία ὑπερηφανία καὶ ἰσχύι τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ· τὰ ἔργα σου ὤφθη, καθότι ἐξερήμωσας τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἡγιασμένου “You, O king, have been exalted above all humans who are upon the face of the whole earth. Your heart was exalted with pride and power toward the holy

¹⁵ Wenthe, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6,” 139.

one and his angels. Your works were seen, how you ravaged the house of the living God because of the sins of the sanctified people.” This is the only place in this chapter where Nebuchadnezzar is explicitly condemned for the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and is likely an OG plus, since it is absent from the MT edition which would have had no reason for its removal. The theology reflected here is similar to that of 1 Esdras 1:49, though different vocabulary is used for the Jewish impiety—Dan 4:19 ἀμαρτίαις; 1 Esd 1:49 δυσσεβήματα.

Dan 4:20–23

For the description of the angel, see note on v. 10.

Here, the OG again expands the king’s punishment: ὁ ὕψιστος καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σὲ κατατρέχουσιν “the Most High and his angels are pursuing you” (v. 21), and ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ σὲ ἐτοιμάζονται καὶ μαστιγώσουσί σε καὶ ἐπάξουσι τὰ κεκριμένα ἐπὶ σέ “Behold, they are being prepared against you, and they will whip you, and they will bring the judgments against you.” The king will also be imprisoned εἰς τόπον ἔρημον “in a desert place.” In the MT edition, the king is only driven away from mankind and the animal imagery is repeated. These verbs occur in the active tense, though without a subject (lit. “they will drive you away”). In contrast, the OG supplies a subject—the Most High and his angels.

In the doxologies following the reassurance of Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom, the MT and OG editions are dissimilar. The MT is very strange תְּהַדְּרֵהוּ יְיָ שְׁלֹשָׁן שָׁנִים, and is the *lectio difficilior*, and should therefore be read as original. The OG exchanges κύριος ζῆ

ἐν οὐρανῷ for אֱמֻנָה, making the statement more “orthodox.”¹⁶

Dan 4:24

Several times throughout chapter four the OG edition adds assertions of Daniel’s accuracy—v. 24 ἀκριβῆς γάρ μου ὁ λόγος, καὶ πλήρης ὁ χρόνος σου “for my word is accurate and your time is complete”; v. 30 καὶ οὐχ ὑστερήσει ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων οὐθέν “and not one of these things will fail”—which are lacking from the MT edition.¹⁷

Daniel’s instructions to the king are two-fold in each edition, though somewhat vary—אֲנִי אֶמְצָא בְּךָ חַסְדִּים וְרַחֲמִים וְעֲשֵׂה לְךָ חַסְדִּים וְרַחֲמִים; αὐτοῦ δεήθητι περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σου καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι. The OG author has understood חַסְדִּים as almsgiving.¹⁸

The reasons for the king to follow Daniel’s instructions are expanded in the OG edition—ἵνα ἐπιείκεια δοθῇ σοι καὶ πολυήμερος γένη ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς βασιλείας σου, καὶ μὴ καταφθείρη σε “so that kindness might be shown to you and you might be long-lived on your throne and you might not be destroyed.” The MT has only אֲנִי אֶמְצָא בְּךָ חַסְדִּים וְרַחֲמִים

¹⁶ See discussion in chapter 3 on this verse in the MT.

¹⁷ Cf. Dan 2:45.

¹⁸ It is well known that in classical Hebrew this word is used in many senses, meaning ‘justice, innocence, faithfulness to the Covenant...’ In the time of early Judaism, however, the word designated ‘good works,’ especially alms-giving (cf. Matt 4:1–14).” André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (trans. David Pellauer; Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), 84. For a recent treatment of this subject, see Gary Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University, 2009).

סגללל לל.¹⁹

Dan 4:25

At v. 25, the OG and MT editions preserve different transitional phrases between the angel's announcement and its fulfillment. The OG has καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν λόγων Ναβουχοδοноσορ, ὡς ἤκουσε τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ ὀράματος, τοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ συνετήρησε “and at the completion of the words, Nebuchadnezzar, as he heard the verdict of the vision, kept the words in his heart.” The terminology “to keep/guard” is rare in the LXX, with the verb typically referring to keeping the law or commandments, and only in one other instance occurs with “words” (Sir 13:12).²⁰ It does occur in two other instances in OG Daniel, though in very different contexts.

Dan 4:26

Nebuchadnezzar's location for his pronouncement is different in the MT and OG editions. The OG places Nebuchadnezzar ἐπὶ τῶν τειχῶν τῆς πόλεως μετὰ πάσης τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ περιεπάτει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πύργων αὐτῆς διεπορεύετο “walking on the

¹⁹ In rabbinic literature, Daniel is chastised for offering the king the way out of the sentence and is responsible for its 12 month delay. Daniel receives his due punishment, however, when he is cast into the lion's den (*B. Bat.* 4a). Lacoque, *The Book of Daniel*, 85.

²⁰ With law or commandments: Sir 15:15; 35:1; 37:12; 44:20; Ezek 18:19; Dan 3:30. It is interesting that in Sir 13:12, the not keeping of words is paired with imprisonment, though that the OG author meant this as a reference is rather unlikely.

walls of the city in all his glory and going through its towers.” Though both versions seem to include secondary elements, it is clear that each editor wants to show that he has an elevated view of the city.

Dan 4:28–29

The temporal remark, καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείας τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ “and at the completion of his word,” echoes the language of v. 25. There, the phrase occurs with Nebuchadnezzar’s keeping the words in his heart, perhaps indicating that he will heed Daniel’s advice and avert the judgment. After Nebuchadnezzar’s pronouncement, however, we can presume that he has not changed his ways and the judgment will now be carried out.

In the MT edition there is no mention of what will become of Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom while he is שִׁבְעַת שָׁנִים . Seven years seems quite a long time for the king to be absent without another ruler being appointed, even if temporarily. The author of the OG has supplied this missing information, stating that Nebuchadnezzar’s throne will be given ἐτέρῳ, ἐξουθενημένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου, “to another, a despised man in your house.” It is further said that βασιλεὺς ἕτερος εὐφρανθήσεται ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου καὶ κρατήσῃ τῆς δόξης σου καὶ τῆς ἰσχύος σου καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας σου “another king will rejoice in your house and will take your glory and your power and your authority,” a statement which is repeated several times.²¹

²¹ V. 28: καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν σου καὶ τὴν δόξαν σου καὶ τὴν τρυφήν σου παραλήψεται “and will take your authority, your glory, and your luxury”; v. 29: καὶ τὸν οἶκον τῆς τρυφῆς σου καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἕτερος ἔξει “and another will have your luxurious house and the kingdom.”

The OG adds that this will all take place at sunrise—ἕως δὲ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς— and again adds the pursuit of the angels (vv. 21, 23), though with the addition that οὐ μὴ ὀφθῆς οὐδ’ οὐ μὴ λαλήσης μετὰ παντός ἀνθρώπου “you will never be seen, nor will you speak with any person.” The next line continues the imprisonment scene (v. 22), ἰδοὺ ἀντὶ τῆς δόξης σου δήσουσί σε “Behold, instead of your glory they will tie you.”

Dan 4:30, 30a, 30b

This verse ends the voice from heaven’s declaration to the King Nebuchadnezzar, stating that this will happen ἕως δὲ πρωὶ “by morning,” which parallels “at sunrise” in the previous verse, and adds two statements affirming the accuracy of these predictions— πάντα τελεσθήσεται ἐπὶ σέ “all of these things will happen concerning you,” καὶ οὐχ ὕστερήσει ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων οὐθέν “and none of these things will fail/be postponed.”²²

With v. 30a, the OG narrative shifts back to the first person, with the introduction of Nebuchadnezzar as king of Babylon, who says he ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἐπεδήθη “was bound seven years.” This is followed by his statement that χόρτον ὡς βοῦν ἐψώμισάν με “they (who?) fed me grass like an ox” and that he ἀπὸ τῆς χλόης τῆς γῆς ἤσθιον “would eat the tender grass of the earth,” which perhaps indicates his newfound ability to obey a higher power than himself. In the MT edition, however, Nebuchadnezzar’s punishment is described in the third-person, rather than being told in first-person as is done in the OG.

OG v. 30b returns to the king’s punishment, specifically his animal

²² Perhaps this last note confirms that Daniel will not be able to postpone the king’s judgment this time.

transformation, which is much different in the OG than in the MT edition. In his physical transformation his hair is said to grow long like eagle’s wings and his nails like those of a lion—the MT has like those of a bird. Perhaps a parallel should be seen between the OG description of the king here and the first creature in Dan 7:4 which was like a lion with eagle’s wings.²³ In v. 30b, the OG includes its only reference to the changing of the king’s heart, though with the addition that his flesh was also changed—ἡλλοιώθη ἡ σὰρξ μου καὶ ἡ καρδία μου. This occurs much earlier in the MT edition (v. 13). Additionally this entire scene is told in the first person in the OG, whereas the MT is still in the third person.

The OG further expands the king’s animal transformation with his statement γυμνὸς περιεπάτουں μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς. ἐνύπνιον εἶδον, καὶ ὑπόνοιαί με εἰλήφασιν, καὶ διὰ χρόνου ὕπνος με ἔλαβε πολὺς καὶ νυσταγμὸς ἐπέπεσέ μοι “I walked about naked with the animals of the field. I saw a dream and forebodings gripped me, and after a while a great sleep overtook me, and drowsiness fell upon me.” None of this material is present in the MT edition, and it seems much more like the actions of a human than of an animal.

Both editions offer multiple versions of the king’s restoration—vv. 31, 33 in MT; vv. 30a, 30c in OG, showing that the restoration scene was substantially edited in each edition. In the first OG occurrence, the king claims three actions that led to his restoration—μετὰ ἔτη ἑπτὰ ἔδωκα τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς δέησιν καὶ ἠξίωσα περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου κατὰ πρόσωπον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀγνοιῶν μου τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν θεῶν τοῦ μεγάλου ἐδεήθην “After seven years I gave my soul to

²³ Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, 85.

supplication and I petitioned before the Lord, the God of heaven, concerning my sins, and I entreated the great God of gods concerning my ignorance.” This description is absent from the MT, but plays into the conversion narrative of the OG.

Dan 4:30c

The second OG occurrence of the king’s restoration is in v. 30c—ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐτῶν ὁ χρόνος μου τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως ἦλθε, καὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἄγνοιαι μου ἐπληρώθησαν ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐδεήθην περὶ τῶν ἄγνοιῶν μου τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν θεῶν τοῦ μεγάλου “At the completion of seven years my time of redemption came, and my sins and my ignorances were fulfilled before the God of heaven, and I entreated the great God of gods concerning my ignorances.” This mirrors the previous verse where Nebuchadnezzar reported his actions; here, we see that his prayer led to his redemption. The only difference from the previous verse of Nebuchadnezzar’s final action is the placement of the verb ἐδεήθην.

Now an angel is said to call from heaven and say to Nebuchadnezzar, δούλευσον τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ δὸς δόξαν τῷ ὑψίστῳ· τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ ἔθνους σου σοι ἀποδίδεται “Be subject to the holy God of heaven, and give glory to the Most High. The dominion of your nation is being given back to you.” In the remaining narrative, Nebuchadnezzar follows directions well: in v. 34 he praises the Most High and in v. 34a he writes that none may speak against the God of heaven. What is strangely absent from the remaining narrative, however, is the treatment of the “contemptible” king who ruled in Nebuchadnezzar’s absence once Nebuchadnezzar is returned to his throne.

Dan 4:34

In the final doxologies, the OG and MT editions preserve different descriptions of God. The OG first identifies the Most High as τῷ κτίσαντι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ τοὺς ποταμοὺς καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς “the one who created the heaven and the earth and the seas and the rivers and everything that is in them.” This is similar to v. 14 OG, where the Lord has authority over πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, though the description has been expanded here to include the waters.

Next, the OG identifies the Most High as θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων “the God of gods and Lord of lords and King of kings.” This is probably the highest epithet given of God in either edition of Daniel. According to the king of Daniel 4, the Most High is deserving of praise ὅτι αὐτὸς ποιεῖ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα καὶ ἀλλοιοῖ καιροὺς καὶ χρόνους ἀφαιρῶν βασιλείαν βασιλέων καὶ καθιστῶν ἑτέρους ἀντ’ αὐτῶν “because he does signs and wonders and changes seasons and times, removing kings from their kingdoms and setting others in their place.” This addition in the OG has likely been borrowed from Dan 2:21, which includes this same doxology.

Dan 4:34a

Here the OG includes a large plus, which details the full conversion of the king. Nebuchadnezzar is said to serve God out of fear (αὐτῷ λατρεύσω, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ τρόμος εἴληφέ με), to praise all his holy ones (καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους αὐτοῦ αἰνῶ), to offer sacrifices every day of his life (ἐγὼ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς βασιλείας μου περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τῷ ὑψίστῳ θυσίας προσοίσω εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ), to do what is pleasing to God along with everyone he rules (καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιήσω, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ λαός μου, τὸ ἔθνος μου καὶ αἱ χῶραί μου αἱ ἐν τῇ

ἐξουσία μου), and to condemn to death any who speak against God (καὶ ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν εἰς τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ὅσοι ἄν καταληθῶσι λαλοῦντές τι, τούτους κατακρινῶ θανάτῳ). All of these actions are lacking from the MT edition, which details the king praising, honoring, and exalting the Most High, but not his actual conversion.²⁴

The king's conversion in the OG is even more explicit in his next statement, which asserts God's power over that of other gods—οἱ γὰρ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἰσχὺν ἀποστρέψαι βασιλείαν βασιλέως εἰς ἕτερον βασιλέα καὶ ἀποκτείνειν καὶ ζῆν ποιῆσαι καὶ ποιῆσαι σημεῖα καὶ θαυμάσια μεγάλα καὶ φοβερὰ καὶ ἀλλοιωῶσαι ὑπερμεγέθη πράγματα, καθὼς ἐποίησεν ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “For the gods of the nations do not have power in them to give away the kingdom of a king to another king and to kill and to make alive and to do signs and great and terrible marvels and to change very great matters as the God of heaven has done with me.”²⁵

²⁴ Some have taken the king's “repentance” in the MT a step further. See for example, Matthias Henze, “Nebuchadnezzar,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 992–93, who proposes that all of the court tales in Dan 2–4 “are conversion narratives that culminate in Nebuchadnezzar's conversion and his doxologies to the God of Daniel.” It must be questioned, however, whether we can really expect that the king in the MT is portrayed as being “converted” to serving *only* the God of Daniel, or whether his prayer and repentance serve to acknowledge the Most High as *a god* among many.

²⁵ Similarly, see *4QPrayer of Nabonidus* lines 7–8, which likewise contrasts the Jewish God with the gods of the nations (gods of silver, gold, bronze?, clay?, wood, and stone).

Dan 4:34b

Next, the OG mentions that King Nabouchodonosor wrote a letter to all the nations (even beyond those he himself ruled?).²⁶ In the letter he commands the people *Κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ αἰνεῖτε καὶ θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν προσφέρετε αὐτῷ ἐνδόξως* “Praise the Lord, God of heaven. Bring sacrifice and offering to him gloriously,” which echoes some of the things the king has professed he will do in v. 34a. Finally, Nebuchadnezzar restates that God has restored him to his throne.

***Tendenz* of the OG Edition of Daniel 4**

After our examination of the OG edition of Daniel 4, we can discern the general tendencies of the OG plus material. The OG pluses typically duplicate a phrase of the *Vorlage*, combining this doublet with a secondary phrase stressing its own unique interpretation of the first phrase (vv. 34c, 8, 11, 13, etc.). Often these doublets are explaining or expanding the interpretation of something that is strange in the *Vorlage* (i.e., the bands of bronze and iron becomes imprisonment). The OG author has also included several pluses, some of them quite lengthy, which have no root in the *Vorlage* (vv. 1, 7, 9, 14a, 19, etc.).

The pluses in the OG edition also indicate several distinctive themes and perspectives that the author has added to the narrative of Daniel 4. In this part of the chapter, I will explore the *Tendenz* of the OG edition of this chapter, focusing on the characterization of the king, his punishment and conversion, the contemptible king to

²⁶ See also v. 34c for Nebuchadnezzar’s sending letters.

follow, and the figure of Daniel portrayed in the pluses and minuses identified above.

The Characterization of the King

In the OG edition of Daniel 4, the king is portrayed very differently than in the MT. Whereas the MT emphasized the humility of the king, the OG, in contrast, stresses the king's greatness (11 times in the OG compared to only 3 times in the MT).²⁷ In fact, he is so great it is even said that "there was no other like him" (4:7 καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἄλλο ὅμοιον αὐτῷ) and when he is restored to his throne, the OG states merely that his greatness was *returned* to him (4:34b καὶ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη μου ἀποκατεστάθη μοι). We see that, aside from his experience, the king's greatness is consistent throughout the entire narrative: he is great in the beginning and at the end he is *equally* as great. This is different from the MT edition where upon his restoration, the king says he is *added* "exceeding greatness" (4:33 וַיִּרְבּוּ יַתִּירָה הַקִּסְפָּה לִּי).

Perhaps the best indicators of the king's greatness are in the longer OG additions. In v. 8, the tree challenges the heavenly powers in the statement "the sun and the moon dwelled in it and illuminated the whole earth." That the tree has reached (and encompasses!) the sun and moon certainly emphasizes his self-exaltation. Similarly, the statement of 4:19 portrays the king in opposition to the deity: "Your heart was exalted with pride and power toward the holy one and his angels." This highlights his desires to obtain equivalence to even the Jewish God and his angels.

In the OG edition, then, the king's greatness serves to emphasize his own

²⁷ See 4:1, 7, 8, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34b. Only 4:1, 27, 33 occur also in the MT edition; the remainder are OG pluses.

understanding. The punishment the king receives is so that *he* may now recognize a different source of his greatness: God rather than himself. The king's greatness in the MT edition, however, is focused on God throughout the entire narrative: the king's power is consistently contrasted to that of God and after the king acknowledges the source of his greatness he becomes even greater. The MT edition is also structured to focus not on the king's understanding, but that of the *audience*, shown especially by the MT plus in v. 14, עַד־דָּבָרֵת דִּי יִנְדַעְוּן חַיִּיִּא "so that the *living* may know."

The King's Punishment

Another significant difference in the OG is the explicit statement of the king's responsibility for the desolation of the temple (v. 19). This is lacking in the MT edition and it seems unlikely that if it have been in the *Vorlage* that the MT author would have removed it.²⁸ In explicitly stating Nebuchadnezzar's attack on the temple was a result of the sins of the sanctified people, the OG dispels any questions as to why this narrative punishes Nebuchadnezzar primarily for his pride. The OG makes it loud and clear that Nebuchadnezzar's act of destruction was in fact a further symbol of his self-exaltation, and an attempt to elevate himself above God and his angels.

Since the reasons for the king's punishment are expanded in the OG, it seems

²⁸ This fact has been used to support theories that Daniel 4 was originally based on Nabonidus traditions and was later associated with the infamous Nebuchadnezzar. For more on "The Babylonian Prehistory of Nebuchadnezzar's Madness," see chapter two in Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (JSOTSup 61; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1999).

reasonable that the punishment itself was also expanded. First, the OG reinterprets the enigmatic בְּאַסִּיר דְּיִּפְרָעַל וְנִקְוָשׁ “band of bronze and iron” from the MT (v. 12ff.). The meaning of the band is uncertain in the MT, though it seems likely it was applied to the tree imagery in a metaphorical sense.²⁹ In the OG, however, the band passes beyond metaphor and are literally applied to Nebuchadnezzar’s human person as πέδαις καὶ ἐν χειροπέδαις χαλκαῖς “shackles and bronze manacles” (v. 14a), which are used to bind and imprison the king. The OG further combines the bands with the MT’s מִדְּאִנְשָׁא “driven away from humanity” to create a desert prison, in which the angels pursue the king, whip him, and bring judgments against him (vv. 21–23, 29).

The OG author also tells of the king’s animal transformation in a unique way. Whereas the MT edition typically relates the fuller version of events—he will eat grass like an animal and his body will be wet with dew for seven periods of time (vv. 12–13, 20, 22, 30; v. 29 no dew), the OG edition often tells an abbreviated version of the transformation or entirely lacks it (vv. 14a, 29, 30 no dew; vv. 12–13 match MT).³⁰ The animal transformation is also weakened in the OG, in the description of the king’s heart being changed. In the MT edition, the changing of the king’s heart is mentioned early in the narrative (v. 13) and explicitly states that it was exchanged for the heart of an animal. This shapes each subsequent retelling, which are all cast in the third person, indicating

²⁹ See discussion in chapter 3.

³⁰ It seems most likely that the MT edition has expanded each retelling to include the fuller version, rather than that the OG has deleted the dew, given that the MT also lacks the dew at one point (v. 29). The MT has similarly expanded each retelling of the tree metaphor.

that Nebuchadnezzar himself was incapable of narrating because he no longer had the mental capacities of a human. In the OG edition, however, it is only said that the king's heart and flesh were changed with no reference as to how they were changed and this occurs very late in the narrative (v. 30). Contrary to the MT, the placement of this change in the OG edition occurs in a first person narrative and is followed by a human description of the king, serving to minimize the extent of the animal transformation.

In regards to the king's punishment the OG has one final plus: he is said to have walked about naked with the animals and to dream another frightening dream before falling asleep. This imagery does several things. First, Nebuchadnezzar is walking. This implies that he is, in fact, not crawling like the animals. Thus, he has retained more of his humanity. That the narrative also includes his nakedness, however, should be viewed as a sign of his humility meant by this description. In addition to highlighting his humanity and humility, this language also evokes Edenic imagery. Both his walking about naked with the animals and his deep sleep recall actions of the first man, Adam. This imagery seems severely out of place in a description of the gentile king who destroyed the Jerusalem temple. But this is only a continuation of the final significant Greek plus related to the king: his conversion.

The King's Conversion

Contrary to the MT, where Nebuchadnezzar is only stated to have acknowledged the Most High, the final verses of the OG detail a full-blown conversion narrative. Nebuchadnezzar actually becomes a worshipper of the Jewish God, rather than only praising him as one among other gods in the MT edition. In v. 34, the king goes far

beyond simple praise of the deity for his restoration. Nebuchadnezzar acknowledges the Most High as the creator of all things and his power as being greater than that of all other gods (“the gods of the nations”). He even assigns him the supreme epithet “God of gods and Lord of lords and King of kings.” But he doesn’t stop at praise. In vv. 34a–b, the king commits to serving the Most High, offering daily sacrifices to him, and to doing what is pleasing to him. Further, Nebuchadnezzar even gives an edict that the people of his kingdom should do the same, and that if anyone is caught speaking against the God of Heaven, they are to be condemned to death.

Aside from these verses, the author of the OG edition also foreshadowed Nebuchadnezzar’s coming conversion in the preceding narrative. One way this is done is in the Edenic imagery mentioned above. Nebuchadnezzar is “planted” in the earth, just as God planted the tree in Eden (OG plus in v. 17). God has cared for Nebuchadnezzar and established him in his place, and even though he has fallen he will be returned to his place. The king’s conversion is also prefigured in v. 25, where Nebuchadnezzar is said to have “kept the words [of Daniel] in his heart.” Though it may seem that the king has disregarded Daniel’s advice completely given that his punishment is meted out just as predicted, this is not how the OG author sees it. Later in the narrative, when Nebuchadnezzar is being punished, mention is made of his heart—the only other usage in the entire narrative. The king tells the reader that his heart was “changed,” perhaps indicating that he has finally taken notice of Daniel’s words. His restoration occurs shortly thereafter.

That the OG has the gentile king convert to serving the Jewish God paints an

extremely positive image of the gentile king.³¹ The MT consistently contrasts the king with God, with the king always coming out on the bottom. In the OG, however, the focus is entirely on the king, almost to the point where Daniel (and God) become background figures. The only negative action of the king is his pride, for which he repents. Even when the OG author mentioned his destruction of the temple, he was not condemned for the action in itself (this was allowed because of the sins of the sanctified people) but only for his pride in performing the action. In the end of the OG edition, the king is completely rehabilitated. He recognizes his place in the heavenly hierarchy and converts to serving the Jewish God.

The Contemptible King to Follow

Another significant difference in the OG narrative is the elaboration of the king that will rule in Nebuchadnezzar's stead. In the MT edition, all that is said is that the kingdom will be retained for Nebuchadnezzar until he is returned to his throne. Certainly the reader would have wondered who would be ruling while Nebuchadnezzar was incapacitated; after all, a kingdom cannot be without a king for seven years. The OG author, then, sees this as a need for explanation and greatly expands the *Vorlage*.

In vv. 28 and 29, the Greek author explicitly states that Nebuchadnezzar's throne will be given to *another* king and describes this king in detail—he will be “a despised

³¹ Contra T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSup 198; Sheffield, U.K.: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 55, who proposes that the OG's “attitude toward the king is more adversarial” than that of the MT. In his evidence, however, Meadowcroft does not discuss the king's conversion.

person in your house” ἐξουθενημένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου. Exactly how this phrase should be understood is unclear, though likely it is indicative that Nebuchadnezzar will be especially humiliated by his throne (and authority, glory, power, luxury) being passed to someone that he personally despises (a family member?). John Collins suggests that the despised person is probably derived from v. 14 of the MT, אֲשֶׁר לְפָנָי “the lowest of men.”³² I think this is unlikely since אֲשֶׁר לְפָנָי applies directly to the king himself and contrasts him to God Most High, whereas the contemned person is separate from the king.

Figure of Daniel

Aside from the king, the role of Daniel in this edition is also drastically different from the MT. The MT has given Daniel a much more prominent role, probably to better fit this material with the other court tales of Daniel 1–6. Daniel is described as having a spirit of the holy gods in him, having a name like the name of a Babylonian deity, and being baffled by no mystery, each of which occur in other chapters. The OG author keeps much more strictly to the *Vorlage*, giving Daniel only a minor role in the narrative with the effect that “the reader does not see Daniel interpreting a dream so much as the king receiving an interpretation.”³³

³² John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 231.

³³ Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 36. Cf. *4QPrayer of Nabonidus*.

The OG offers a description of Daniel only once in the narrative, as “the ruler of the wise men and the leader of those who decide dreams” (v. 15), which serves primarily to introduce him to the reader who, given the concise nature of this introduction, is probably already familiar with him from the other Daniel stories. In the MT, on the other hand, Daniel is described in detail throughout the narrative. Though the OG lacks additional descriptions of Daniel, it does at one point give a more detailed description of Daniel’s reaction to hearing the king’s dream. First, the OG “adds the element of fear, which is not implausible in one who must tell the king of impending disaster.”³⁴ The OG also adds several other elements in Daniel’s reaction, which focus primarily on the “outward aspect, which would have struck the eye-witness narrator” (i.e., Nebuchadnezzar).³⁵ This description of Daniel’s reaction goes far beyond that of the MT edition and probably seems a bit strange to a reader that Daniel would feel so strongly about a gentile king. This particular gentile king, however, will later himself become a Jewish convert. Thus, Daniel’s intensified reaction creates pathos and heightens the reader’s sympathy for the king.

This pathos, however, was original to the *Vorlage* and has only been expanded by the OG author. This is apparent in Daniel’s speech which is similar in each edition. Apart from the interpretation itself, Daniel speaks freely only twice in the narrative. First comes the statement “may this dream be for those who hate you and its interpretation for your enemies!” (v. 16), which is almost identical in both editions. It has been suggested that this speech functions in an apotropaic manner, as Assyrian and Babylonian dream

³⁴ Collins, *Daniel*, 228.

³⁵ Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 36.

interpreters typically included similar statements in their rituals.³⁶ But Collins concludes that this is an admittedly weak substitute.³⁷ What is more likely is that this statement reflects Daniel's sympathy with the king and his regret that these things must happen.³⁸ In Daniel's next assertion, he closes out the interpretation with the declaration "may my advice be pleasing to you" and lists actions Nebuchadnezzar should complete "so that [his] prosperity may be prolonged" (v. 24). The recommended actions are very similar in each edition, though the Greek has two additions: "and so that you will not be destroyed" and "my word is accurate and your time is complete." The first addition further shows Daniel's concern for the king's welfare. The verb καταφθείρω occurs only here and in v. 11 of Dan 4, where it refers to the tree's destruction. We know, however, that Nebuchadnezzar will not be completely destroyed since the root remains. In the second addition Daniel highlights his accuracy and warns the king that judgment is at hand. Perhaps this statement is further indicative of Daniel's concern for the king, since it could be understood as Daniel's affirmation to the king that his suggestions for averting destruction are the only accurate ones and he should follow them precisely.

³⁶ A. Leo Oppenheim, "The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East. With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 46.3 (1956): 218–19.

³⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 228–29.

³⁸ T.J. Meadowcroft, "Metaphor, Narrative, Interpretation, and Reader in Daniel 2–5," *Narrative* 8 (2000): 271–72.

CHAPTER 5

DATING AND HISTORY OF DANIEL 4

In this chapter I will provide a synthesis of the data collected in the previous four chapters in order to show how the text of Dan 4 evolved over time and how it was received in subsequent centuries. It seems likely that several factors led to the replacement of the OG edition by that of Theodotion which was much more in line with the MT—although it too included the Greek additions. I will begin with a brief discussion of the issues surrounding the dating of the *Vorlage*. Next I will look at the traditional dating and settings of the double literary editions of Daniel 4 so that we can have a broader understanding of the MT and OG pluses. Finally I will look at how each edition of Dan 4 was or at least could have been understood in two later contexts: (1) the second century B.C.E. and (2) post-70 C.E.

Dating of the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4

It is likely that the Daniel stories [chapters (1)2–6] originally circulated as independent tales and the existence of other Daniel stories such as the Greek additions to Daniel or the Daniel stories found at Qumran are viewed as evidence of this.¹ It also seems apparent,

¹ See R. Timothy McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel iv-vi and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” *VT* 55 (2005): 318–23 for perhaps the most thorough

however, from an examination of the stories themselves, which exhibit no continuity from one to the next. Each story (re)introduces the figure of Daniel and/or his friends as if they were completely unknown and relays an independent narrative, whose events are not mentioned in the others (with the exception of chapter 5, though its mention of chap. 4 may be secondary).²

But the stories do have much in common; why else would they have been joined together as the first half of the book of Daniel? Most noticeably, each story has a very particular setting—the court of a foreign king, typically Babylonian though Median in the case of Dan 6. Aside from their comparable setting, the first six chapters of Daniel consistently represent the Jews as loyal subjects of the king, expressing their aspirations to high political office and showing no condemnation of gentile rule.³ The precarious position of the Jews in the court setting, however, is a reflection of the tension between their political and religious loyalties and suggests a *Sitz-im-Leben* where they are a religious and ethnic minority.⁴ Based on this evidence, Philip Davies (along with many others) has concluded that these stories must have arose and circulated in the Diaspora, “otherwise the stories have no relevance to the lives of their audience, but function as

investigation of the growth and stages of the book of Daniel including the Greek versions.

² See Collins, *Daniel*, 36, for a brief discussion of this.

³ Philip R. Davies, *Daniel* (OTG; Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1985), 54. Chap. 5 in the reign of Belshazzar is sometimes viewed as an exception to the general acceptance of gentile rule in these stories.

⁴ Davies, *Daniel*, 24.

entertaining anecdotes about another time and place.”⁵

We must assume, therefore, that the *Vorlage* of Daniel (1)2–6 was very early (or was at least based on very early sources—as old as the 6th century B.C.E.—either oral or written) and was crafted in a diaspora setting. This is certainly the case for Daniel 4, which has been shown to have a long Babylonian prehistory, most probably rooted in traditions about Nabonidus’s stay in Teima.⁶ Though he is mentioned by name nowhere in the biblical tradition, Carol Newsom has shown that there was probably a substantial amount of Jewish literature about Nabonidus in circulation during or immediately after his reign.⁷ Once his empire was defeated by Cyrus, however, the relevance of these Nabonidus texts would have been short-lived and it is no surprise that his name was replaced by the notorious destroyer of Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar.

Though the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4 (as well as that of the other Daniel stories) may have originated in a diaspora setting, once the Jewish people were allowed to return to

⁵ Davies, *Daniel*, 54. See also Collins, *Daniel*, 48–51; Michael A. Knibb, “The Book of Daniel in its Context,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2002), 1:16.

⁶ For a good recent discussion of the evidence, see Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (JSJSup 61; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1999), 51–99.

⁷ Carol A. Newsom, “Why Nabonidus? Excavating Traditions from Qumran, the Hebrew Bible, and Neo-Babylonian Sources,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (eds. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 57–79.

Palestine (and beyond) from the Diaspora they brought these stories with them where they took on a new interpretive life fitting of their new setting.

Social Setting of the Two Editions of Daniel 4

As has been stated in chapter 1, it is likely that chapters 4–6 were the earliest of Daniel and circulated as a separate written collection of stories. At some point early on, the *Vorlage* for these chapters was edited and expanded in different directions, reflected by the two different literary editions of the MT and OG, though precisely when this occurred remains a matter of speculation. Our oldest attestation of each edition (or at least an Aramaic/Hebrew edition similar to the OG) is found at Qumran, showing that each was already in existence at least by the second or first centuries B.C.E.⁸ It was not until this same period that the book of Daniel took its final shape, with an estimated completion date between 167 and 164 B.C.E.—after Antiochus IV’s desecration of the temple but before the Maccabean purification of the temple.⁹

The MT edition of Daniel is typically assigned a Palestinian provenance.¹⁰ It

⁸ See the chart in Eugene Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:574–79. For dating, see p. 574. The only chapter 4 fragments large enough for examination (4QDan^d) attest to a version most similar to that of MT and are dated in the mid to late first century B.C.E.

⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 38; Lester L. Grabbe, “A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 1:228–29.

¹⁰ Davies, *Daniel*, 12–13; Rainer Albertz, “The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 1:183–91.

seems likely that early in the Hellenistic period, chapters 4–6 were combined into a larger collection consisting of chapters 1–6 and perhaps an early version of chapter 7.¹¹ Later, shortly before the completion of the book, the Hebrew visions were added to the Aramaic stories and the introduction (chapter 1) was translated into Hebrew so as to give the book a Hebrew frame.

In order to make the earliest chapters of Daniel “fit” within this broader collection, an editor probably expanded the *Vorlage* of chapters 4–6 by adding several unifying elements. This redactional coordination can be seen through several additions identified in chapter three of this thesis. The first of these is the attempt to centralize the new collection around the figure of Daniel. In chapter 4, this is accomplished foremost by adding the court competition scene of vv. 3–6 (Cf. Dan 2, 5). Further descriptions of Daniel are also inserted throughout the narrative, identifying Daniel as Belteshazzar (cf. Dan 1:7; 2:26; 5:12) and as having God-given wisdom (Dan 1:17; 2:28; 5:11–12, 14). The emphasis of the early chapters on Daniel allowed the stories to function as a prelude to the visions where Daniel becomes the dominant figure.

The second major redactional element added to Daniel 4 is the stress on the superiority of the heavenly king to the earthly one. This is indicated by a number of pluses in chap. 4 and similarly repeated throughout the other early chapters (1:9–20;

¹¹ Collins states that the Aramaic of these chapters in the MT edition is probably dated to the early Hellenistic period, “although a precise dating on linguistic grounds is not possible... [since] a document written in the Maccabean period would not necessarily show distinctive linguistic features over against Imperial Aramaic, especially within the space of a single chapter” (*Daniel*, 17–18).

2:36–45, 47; 3:16–18, 28; 5:18–23; 6:25–27). When joined to the visions, this emphasis is made even more explicit, where the imminent coming of God’s kingdom on earth is expected which will wholly replace those of the gentile rulers. Daniel 4, then, becomes a “paradigm of the fall of the arrogant” but when similar patterns occur in chapters 8 and 11, clearly referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, there is no longer any expectation of restoration for the gentile leader, rather only for the Jewish people.¹²

In contrast to the MT edition, the OG as a whole is said to have been transmitted in an Egyptian (possibly Alexandrian) setting.¹³ As was stated in the first chapter of this thesis, chapters 1–3 and 7–12 in the OG are generally similar to the MT edition, with only chapters 4–6 being dramatically different. How this came about is explained in numerous ways, though the fact that the OG edition of Daniel 4–6 exhibits an extreme optimism toward gentile rulers—shown especially by Nebuchadnezzar’s conversion in 4:34ff.—makes it likely that this edition was created in a very positive social setting and would have been meaningful to an audience living in a similar setting, most probably that of early Ptolemaic Egypt. Some scholars have proposed that Daniel 4 has “an essentially negative outlook” on the king, but I think they are not taking proper account of the conversion scene or the fact that Nebuchadnezzar is condemned only for his hubris, not

¹² Collins, *Daniel*, 234.

¹³ Collins, *Daniel*, 9. For an Egyptian setting, see McLay, “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel iv-vi and the Formation of the Book of Daniel,” 318–21; for an Alexandrian setting, see Albertz, “The Social Setting of Daniel,” 1:182.

his acts of destroying the temple.¹⁴

The translation of the entire OG book of Daniel is usually dated to the late second or early first century B.C.E.¹⁵ This gives a different time period and social setting than the final compilation of MT Daniel—Antiochus IV Epiphanes has likely met his end and the Ptolemaic kingdom is rather stable. Rainer Albertz proposes that at this point, the variant edition of chapters 4–6 was purposefully chosen by the later compiler of the Daniel stories (around 130 B.C.E.) precisely because of its optimistic viewpoint and the current social setting which allowed Jews the opportunity to work in high offices in the Ptolemaic state.¹⁶ Although this theory is based almost entirely on speculation, it seems, nonetheless, that the editor of the OG edition could have been familiar with the MT edition of these chapters and must have had some reason as to choosing their own version over the other, making Albertz’s proposal at least possible.

¹⁴ See T.J. Meadowcroft, “Metaphor, Narrative, Interpretation, and Reader in Daniel 2–5,” 272, who reaches these conclusions because in 3:32 (the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the three Youths) the king is “unrighteous and the most evil in all the earth.” But this is not even the same chapter, and we should not assume that the view of the king is uniform throughout the OG edition.

¹⁵ Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1927), 38; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1978), 78; Collins, *Daniel*, 8–9. This dating is based on its use by other texts, for example Th Daniel and 1 Macc 1:54 “the abomination of desolation.”

¹⁶ Albertz, “The Social Setting of Daniel,” 1:183.

Just as in the MT edition, when these chapters of Daniel were combined with the other stories [1–6(7)], there was extensive redactional activity in order to unify all of the court tales. This is most apparent in the altered arrangement of Daniel 4, which brings the arrangement of the chapter in line with others (3 and 6) by beginning with the king’s regnal year and ending with a royal edict, though is also noticeable in the introduction of Daniel in v. 15 as “the ruler of the wise men and the leader of those who decide dreams.”

Once connected with the later visions, these earlier chapters were again expanded and reinterpreted. The incorporation of the visions in the OG edition likely occurred after the reign of Antiochus IV, so this could have allowed for a somewhat rehabilitated view toward gentile kingship. In order to do so, the OG editor included elements throughout their book stressing the delay in coming judgment because the deity would have a measured response (delayed judgment/action in chapter 4:15, 21, 23, 29).

Daniel 4 in the Second Century B.C.E.

It seems near certain that the tales of Dan 1–6 were not designed for Antiochus, but it makes sense that they would be later applied to him by a second century reader.¹⁷ Philip Davies nicely summarizes that “Nebuchadnezzar and the exiled Jews are both the *predecessors* and the *prototypes* of the persecuting monarch Antiochus IV and the

¹⁷ Some scholars do posit a Maccabean date for the entirety of the book of Daniel. See, for example, H.H. Rowley, “The Unity of the Book of Daniel,” *HUCA* 33 (1950–51): 233–73; repr. in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament* (London: Lutterloh, 1952), 237–68.

persecuted Jews of Palestine centuries later.”¹⁸ Thus, this is the period in which the stories of Daniel 1–6 received their final shape and we should “expect to find features that reflect the interests of the second century authors-editors.”¹⁹

After the persecutions of Antiochus IV began, those who had endured such atrocities could not tolerate such a positive view of the gentile king as is found in the OG edition of Daniel 4. This is perhaps the reason why it was preserved only in Greek, even though it had at one time likely had a Semitic *Vorlage*. It seems likely that the OG edition of Daniel 4 was suppressed in this period and the MT view became the dominant one, at least in Palestine.

That Antiochus IV Epiphanes was far beyond being converted is directly expressed even within the book of Daniel. In the vision of Daniel 7, Antiochus is represented by the fourth beast. This beast has a mouth “speaking arrogantly” which mirrors the king’s declaration in 4:27. In contrast to the repentant and restored king of Daniel 4, however, the beast of Daniel 7 continues speaking arrogantly until it is slain and its body thrown into the fire. This certainly leaves no room for restoration! Additionally, the fate of the fourth beast is contrasted to that of the earlier beasts in that their lives are “prolonged for a season and a time,” using language similar to that of the root in Dan 4:23–24.

¹⁸ Davies, *Daniel*, 13.

¹⁹ R. Glenn Wooden, “Changing Perceptions of Daniel: Reading Daniel 4 and 5 in Context,” in *From Biblical Criticism to Biblical Faith: Essays in Honor of Lee Martin McDonald* (eds. William H. Brackney and Craig A. Evans; Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 2007), 13.

Antiochus's death is also discussed by other texts from this period, for example 2 Maccabees 9. Here, in his intense hatred of the Jews Antiochus makes a statement full of hubris that he would desolate the Jewish population of Jerusalem (cf. Nebuchadnezzar's statement on the roof of Babylon). In response, he is stricken with a disease by the God of Israel (cf. *4QPrayer of Nabonidus*). Antiochus, however, is sent no dream and no Jewish diviner to reveal to him his folly, rather recognizes of his own accord the error of his ways by thinking himself greater than God. In his recognition, Antiochus professes his intention to become a Jew and profess to the world the might of God. The king is, however, neither restored nor allowed to convert and dies a horrible, gruesome death.

Due to the absence of the conversion of the king, along with the assertion that it is really God who has ultimate authority, it seems probable that after the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes the MT edition became the dominant text of Daniel 4. Though, the OG text of this chapter may have found an audience in Egypt, there was no room for such an optimistic viewpoint in the land of Palestine. It seems likely that this difference in reception gave rise to the need for a Greek translation of MT 4–6 and thus the Theodotion translation was made at this point.²⁰

²⁰ The typical date assigned to this translation is first century C.E. or earlier, due to its use in the NT and in the book of Baruch. Perhaps a better designation would be "Proto-Th" since the traditional date of the person by that name is not until 180 C.E. This edition, then, is attributed to Theodotion probably for his role in the editing of the material rather than for his actual translation (Bruce, "The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel," 22).

Daniel 4 in the Common Era

By the first few centuries C.E., the disparity between the MT and OG editions of Daniel 4–6 was probably quite apparent to the Jewish and Christian readers of the two texts. It seems likely that the Semitic *Vorlage* for these chapters had disappeared from circulation long before this time and that the MT edition became the “official” version used by the Jews, given their preference for the Hebrew/Aramaic text.

It would seem, however, a reasonable expectation that the OG edition, which came to be associated with the translation of the “Seventy,” would have been popular among the Christians. One would also expect that given this edition’s optimistic view toward the conversion of the gentile king, the OG text would have found an audience among gentile converts to Christianity since if it allowed for conversion of one of the most notoriously “evil” gentile kings in the history of Judaism, then it certainly justified their inclusion into the fold. But this was not to be the case.

As shown in chapter one the early church, too, rejected the OG edition. Already by the time of Origen, the Theodotionic version of Daniel was regarded as more authentic than that of the “Septuagint.”²¹ Jerome himself was surprised that the church accepted the translation of a convert rather than that of the Seventy translators and could not explain how this came to be. Nevertheless, he remarked that this was certainly the right decision since it so greatly diverged from the *Hebraica veritas*, and referred to the OG as the

²¹ Eusebius, *Jerome* 4 (PL 25:514); Jay Braverman, *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 7; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978), 20 n. 19.

vulgata editio.²² It is likely that by this period the OG edition of Daniel 4 was suppressed almost completely, with the sole exception of its being reproduced in later recension of Origen's *Hexaplar*, where it was clearly presented as the "non-authentic" version.

Conclusions

In this thesis I have attempted to reconsider the divergent editions of Daniel 4 as represented by the MT and OG editions. In the first chapter, I gave a brief introduction to the available OG manuscripts and listed the primary arguments important to understanding the relationship between the two literary editions of Daniel 4. In the second chapter, I attempted to recreate the *Vorlage* of Daniel 4 by identifying the shared material between the two editions and looked somewhat at the different arrangements of the chapter in the two editions. In chapters three and four I closely looked at the double literary editions and identified probable pluses and minuses. I also looked at what these additions evidence of the *Tendenz* of each edition. Finally, I have looked at the overall development of these two editions of Daniel as a book and shown above how the text of Daniel 4 evolved over time. It seems likely that a combination of several factors as pointed out above led to the replacement of the OG edition by that of Theodotion which was much more in line with the MT.

²² Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, 31. Eusebius, *Jerome* 7 (PL 28:1357c); Eusebius, *Jerome* 4 (PL 25:515b).

APPENDIX 1

MT AND OG TEXT OF DANIEL 4

	MT	OG
3:31 -33	<p>גבויך ננצח מלפני לך עממיא אמיא וקשניא הייך אריז [הרייז] בך ארעא שקמפון ושנא : אמיא והמדיא הי עבר עמי אלהא עליא [עלא]ה] שפר הדיכי לתהייה : אלהיך פמה רבובין והמהדיי פמה תקיפון מלכותה מלכות עלים ושלטנה עם דך ודך : אננה ובוכו נצח שליך הויזי פבייחי ורענן פהיכלי :</p>	<p>(4:34c) Ναβουχοδονοσορ βασιλεύς πασι τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ πάσαις ταῖς γλώσσαις καὶ πασι τοῖς οἰκουμένοις ἐν αὐταῖς· εὐρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη ἐν παντί καιρῷ. καὶ νῦν ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τὰς πράξεις, ἃς ἐποίησε μετ' ἐμοῦ ὁ θεός ὁ μέγας· ἔδοξε δέ μοι ἀποδειχθῆναι ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς σοφισταῖς ὑμῶν ὅτι ἔστι θεός, καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ μεγάλα, τὸ βασιλείου αὐτοῦ βασιλείου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἢ ἕξουσία αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ γενεῶν εἰς γενεάς...</p>
4:1	<p>תלים תזית וידהקנני והרהרין עלי משפכי והזני ראשי ובהקנני : ומעלי שים שלם להנעלה מרמי לךל תפימי כפל היי פשר תקנא והודיעני :</p>	<p>Ἐτους δεκαεκάτου τῆς βασιλείας Ναβουχοδονοσορ εἶπεν Εἰσηνεῦθαι ἡμῃν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου καὶ εὐθηγῶν ἐπι τοῦ θρόνου μου. ἔντυσιον εἶδον καὶ εὐλαβήθην, καὶ φόβος μοι ἐπέπεσεν.</p>
2		
3		
4	<p>פארין עליין [עליי] תרממיא אשפניא פשייא [פשייא] ונמריא ותקנא אמר אנה הנהמיהוין ופשייה לא מההדייך ליי :</p>	
5	<p>ועד אהרין על מרמי פניאל הישמה בלשאצר פשים אליי ודי רוח אלהיך מדישין ביה ותקנא מהמיהו אמרה : בלשאצר רב תרממיא הי אנה ודעה די רוח</p>	
6		

	אֲלֹהֵינוּ קִדְּשׁוּנוּ פָּנֶיךָ וְקִבְּלֵנוּ לֹא־אָנֹכִים לְךָ תְּהִי־הַלְלָמִיד וְיִתְחַנְּנֵנוּ וּפְשִׁיעֵנוּ אֲמִנֵךְ׃	
7	וְהַחַיִּי רֵאשִׁי עַל־מִשְׁפַּכְּךָ חַנּוּהַ חַיִּית וְאַל־יִבְלֵ אֵיזֶל בְּנֵנוּא אֲרִיזָא וְהִרְמֵמָה שְׁמֵנוּא׃	ἐκάθευδον και ἰδοὺ δέεινδρον ὑψηλὸν φυτόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ἡ ὄρασις αὐτοῦ μεγάλη, και οὐα ἦν ἄλλο ὄμοιον αὐτῷ.
8	וְיָבֵה אֵיזֶלָא וְתַקְרָה וְהִרְמֵמָה וְתַמְנָא לְשִׁמְלֵנוּא וְחַזְחֵתָה לְסָרְךָ פַּרְל־אֲרִיזָא׃	και ἡ ὄρασις αὐτοῦ μεγάλη, ἡ κορυφή αὐτοῦ ἦγγυζεν ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ και τὸ κύτος αὐτοῦ ἕως τῶν νεφελῶν πληροῦν τὰ ὑψοκᾶτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὁ ἦλιος και ἡ σελήνη ἐν αὐτῷ ἔκουν και ἐφώτιζον πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ τῷ μήκει ὡς σταδίων τριάκοντα, και ὑψοκᾶτω αὐτοῦ ἐσκιᾶζον πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς, και ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐνόσσευον ὁ καιρὸς αὐτοῦ πολύς και ἀγασθὸς και ἐχρηγεῖ πᾶσι τοῖς ζῴοις.
9	עֲפָרָה שְׁפִירָה וְאִנְיָה שְׁוִיָּה וְכִלְיָנוּ לְכִלְיָנוּ בְּהַחֲזִיחֵהּ תַּמְלִילֵי אֲחֵינוּ וְכַעֲנֵפוּהוּ וְדִרְדְּרוּ [וְדִרְדְּרוּ] צַפְרֵי שְׁמֵנוּא וּמְנֵמָה וְחַזְחֵנוּ פַּרְל־פְּשִׁיעֵנוּ׃	ἐθεώρουν ἐν τῷ ὑπνω μου, και ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος ἀπεστάλη ἐν ἰσχυρὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
10	חַנּוּהַ חַיִּית בְּחַיִּיתֵי רֵאשִׁי עַל־מִשְׁפַּכְּךָ וְאַל־יִבְלֵ עֵרֵךְ וְקִי־יֵשׁ מִן־שְׁמֵנוּא נְחֵמָה׃	και ἐφώνησε και εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐκκόψατε αὐτὸ και κατασφειρατε αὐτὸ προστέτακται γάρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑψίστου ἐκριθῆσαι και ἀχρεῖθσαι αὐτό.
11	קָרָא בְּחֵיל וְכֵן אָמַר גְּדוּדָה אֵיזֶלָא וְקִצְצֵנוּ עַנְיָנוּהִי אַתְמֵה עַפְרָה וּבְדִרְדֵי אִנְיָה תַמְנָה חֲזִיקָא מִן־תְּחִלְתֵּיהִי וְצַפְרֵנוּא מִן־עַנְיָנוּהִי׃	και οὐτως εἶπε Πίξαν μίαν ἀφετε αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ γῆ, ὅπως μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι χόρτον ὡς βοῦς νεμηται.
12	בָּרָב עַמְרָה שְׁרִישׁוּהִי בְּאֲרֵעָה שְׂקֵיךָ וּבְאַסוּהִי הִי־פַרְרֵל וְהִלָּשׁ בְּרִחָאָה הִי בְרָא וּכְפֵל שְׁמֵנוּא וְצַטְפֵּעַ וְעַם־חֲזִיקָא חֲלָקָה בְּעֵשֶׂב אֲרֵעָה׃	και ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ σθμια αὐτοῦ ἀλλοιωθῆ, και ἐπρὰ ἐτη βοσκηθῆ σὺν αὐτοῖς.
13	לְכָבֵה מִן־אַנְשֵׁי אֲנָשׁ [אַנְשׁ־א] לְשִׁנוּ וְלִכְבֵּ חַיִּית וְחִיָּה לְךָ וְשִׁבְעָה עֶדְרֵיךָ וְהִלְפִינוּ עֲלֵיךָ׃	ἕως ἄν γνῶ τὸν κύριον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανω και τῶν ἐπι τῆς γῆς, και ὅσα ἂν θέλῃ, ποιεῖ ἐν αὐτοῖς.
14	בְּחַרְבָּה עֵרֵיךָ פְּרִיגָמָה וּמֵאֲמַרְךָ קִדְּשֵׁנוּ שְׂאֵלָתָה עַד־דְּבָרָתְךָ הִי וְנִדְּעֵנוּ חַיִּיא הִי־שְׁלֵיט עֲלֵינוּ [עֲלֵא־ה] בְּמַלְכֻתְךָ אֲנוּשֵׁי אֲנָשׁ [אַנְשׁ־א] וְלִמְנֵיךָ נַצְפָּא וְתַמְנָה וְשַׁפֵּל אַנְשֵׁיכֵם וְקָרָב עֲלֵיךָ [עֲלֵה־ה]׃	ἐνώπιόν μου ἐξεκώτη ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾶ, και ἡ κατασφραῖ αὐτοῦ ἐν ὄρα μιᾶ τῆς ἡμέρας, και οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ ἐδόθησαν εἰς πάντα ἀνεμιον, και εἰακύσθη και ἐρίφη, και τὸν χόρτον τῆς γῆς μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς ἥσθιε και εἰς φυλάκην παρεδόθη και ἐν πέδαις και ἐν χειροπέδαις χαλακᾶς ἐέσθη ὑπ' αὐτῶν, σφῶδρα ἐθαυμάσσα ἐπὶ πᾶσι
14 a		

15	<p>דָּגְרָה הַלְקָא דְחִזָּת אֲגֵרָה מַלְפָּא נְבוּכַדְרֶצְנֶצַּר וְאַנְתָּוָה [וְ]אַנְתָּוָה [בְּ]לְשׁוֹנֵי אֲשֻׁרֵי פִשְׁרָא וְאַנְתָּוָה פִּלְקֶגְלָה דִּי א פִּלְתִּיפִימִי מַלְכוּתֵי לְאַדְרַכְלֵיז פִּשְׁרָא לְהַדְרַעְתֵּי וְאַנְתָּוָה [וְ]אַנְתָּוָה [בְּ]הִל דִּי רִדְחֵי אֲחֵתִין בְּהִישָׁן בְּדָה :</p>	<p>τούτοις, και ὁ ὕπνος μου ἀπέστη ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου. και ἀναστὰς τὸ πρωὶ ἐκ τῆς κλίτης μου ἐκάλεσα τὸν Δαυηλ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν σοφιστῶν και τὸν ἠγούμενον τῶν κρινόντων τὰ ἐνύπνια και διηγησάμην αὐτῷ τὸ ἐνύπνιον, και ὑπέδειξέ μοι πῶσαν τὴν σύγκρισιν αὐτοῦ.</p>
16	<p>אַרְבִּין דְּנִנְיָאָל דִּי־שְׂמָה בְּלִשְׁמֵי אֲשֻׁרֵי אֲשֻׁתִּימִם כְּשַׁעְרָה חֲדָה וְרַעֲזֵיחֵי וְבַהֲלֵמָה עֵינָה מַלְפָּא וְאַנְתָּוָה בְּלִשְׁמֵי אֲשֻׁרֵי חֲלֵמָא וּפִשְׁרָא אֲלֵי־בְהֵימָה עֵנָה בְּלִשְׁמֵי אֲשֻׁרֵי וְאַנְתָּוָה מְרָא [מְרָא] חֲלֵמָא לְשִׁנְאֵיחֵי [לְ]שִׁנְאֵיחֵי [וּפִשְׁרָה לְעֵרִיחֵי [לְ]עֵרִיחֵי] :</p>	<p>μεγάλως δὲ ἐθαύμασεν ὁ Δαυηλ, και ὑπόνοιε κατέσπευδεν αὐτόν, και φοβηθεὶς τρόμου λαβόντος αὐτόν και ἀλλοιοθείσης τῆς ὄρασεως αὐτοῦ κινήσας τὴν κεφαλήν ὥσαν μίαν ἀποθαύμασας ἀπεκρίθη μοι φωνῆ πρᾶξιᾳ Βασιλεῦ, τὸ ἐνύπνιον τοῦτο τοῖς μισοῦσί σε και ἡ σύγκρισις αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου ἐπέλθοι.</p>
17	<p>אַרְלֵינָא דִּי חֲזִיחֵי דִּי רַבָּה וְחַקְרָה וְרִמְמָה וְמַטְאָא לְשַׁמְיָא וְחִזְוִתָּה לְכַלְ אֲרַעָא :</p>	<p>τὸ δένδρον τὸ ἐν τῆ γῆ πεφυτευμένον, οὗ ἡ ὄρασις μεγάλη, σὺ εἶ, βασιλεῦ.</p>
18	<p>וְעַפְרָה שְׂפִיר וְאַנְבָּה שְׂיֵיא וּמֵחֵז לְכֵלֵא בְּהַחֲזִיחֵי חֲדָרֵי חֲזִיחֵי בְּלָא וְכַעֲזִיחֵי : שְׁפִינֵי אֲשֻׁמֵיא :</p>	<p>και πάντα τὰ περὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν τὰ νοσεύοντα ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῆς γῆς και τῶν ἐθνῶν και τῶν γλωσσῶν πασῶν ἕως τῶν περὶ τῆς γῆς και πᾶσαι αἱ χῶραι σοι δουλεύουσιν.</p>
19	<p>אַנְתָּוָה [אַנְתָּוָה] חֲזִיא מַלְפָּא דִּי רַבִּית וְחַקְרָפָה וְרִבּוּתָהּ רַבָּה וְמִשְׁתֵּי לְשַׁמְיָא וְשִׁלְשֻׁנֵיהּ לְכֹרַח אֲרַעָא :</p>	<p>τὸ δὲ ἀνυψωθῆναι τὸ δένδρον ἐκείνο και ἔγγισαι τῷ οὐρανῷ και τὸ κύτος αὐτοῦ ἀψασθῆναι τῶν νεφελῶν· σὺ, βασιλεῦ, ὑψώθης ὑπερ πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπωνς τοὺς ὄντας ἐπὶ προσώπου πάσης τῆς γῆς, ὑψώθη σου ἡ καρδία ὑπερηφανιά και ἰσχὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἄγιον και τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ· τὰ ἔργα σου ὤφθη, καθότι ἐξερημώσας τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ζῶντος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀμάρτιας τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου.</p>
20	<p>וְדִי חֲזִיחֵי מַלְפָּא עֵרִיחֵי וְכַרְיֵישׁ בְּחַתּוּ מִן־שַׁמְיָא וְאַנְתָּוָה אֲחֵרֵי אֵילָנֵי וְחַבְלֹוּחֵי בְּרַם עֵקֶר שִׁירִשְׁוֵרֵי בְּאַרְעָא שְׂבִיבָה וְכַאֲסֹרֵי דִּי־פִרְעֵי וְחֵלֵשׁ בְּרִדְמָא דִּי בְּרָא וְכַמְלֵי שַׁמְיָא וְכַשְׁבֵּעַ וְעַם־חֲזִיחֵי בְּרָא חֲלֵקָה עַד דִּי־שַׁבְעָה עַדְנִין וְחַלְפִין עֲלֵיהֵי :</p>	<p>και ἡ ὄρασις, ἣν εἶδες, ὅτι ἀγγελος ἐν ἰσχύι ἀπεστέλλη πᾶρά τοῦ κυρίου και ὅτι εἶπεν ἐξῶρα τὸ δένδρον και ἐκάκωσα ἡ κρίσις τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου ἧξει ἐπὶ σέ.</p>
21	<p>דְּגָה פִּשְׁרָא מַלְפָּא וְחִזְוִתָּה עֲלֵיא [עֲלֵיא] חִזִּיא דִּי מַטְאָא עַל־מְרָא [מְרָא] מַלְפָּא :</p>	<p>και ὁ ὕψιστος και οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σέ κατατρέχουσιν·</p>
22	<p>וְגַד מְרָדִין מִן־אַנְשֵׁא וְעַם־חֲזִיחֵי בְּרָא לְחִזְוִתָּה מְרָדִין</p>	<p>εἰς φυλακὴν ἀπάξουσσί σε και εἰς τόπον ἐρημον</p>

<p>וַעֲשֵׂהָ כַהֲנֵיךָ לְךָ וְשִׁעְמֹנֶיךָ וּמִשְׁלֵל שְׂמִיָּה לְךָ מִצִּבְעֶיךָ וְשִׁבְעָה עֲדָרֶיךָ וְהִקְפִּיךָ עֲלֶיךָ [עֲלֶיךָ] עֵרֶב הַיַּיִתְגִּדֶנָּה הַיַּיִתְשִׁילֵט עֲלֶיךָ [עֲלֵאֵלֶיךָ] בַּמִּלְכּוֹת אֲנִישָׁא וְלִמְנֹדֶיךָ וְנִצָּהּ וְתִנְהַהּ :</p>	<p>ἀποστειλοῦσί σε.</p>
<p>וְהָיָה אֲמִלְךָ לְמִשְׁבֵּם עֵבֶר שְׂרִישְׁתּוֹ הַיַּיִת אֲיִלְעָה מִלְכּוֹתֶיךָ לְךָ כַהֲנֵה מִזֵּדֶיךָ תִּנְיָעֶיךָ שְׁלִשָׁן שְׂמִיָּה :</p>	<p>καὶ ἡ ρίζα τοῦ δένδρου ἢ ἀφθεΐσα, ἔπει οὐκ ἐξερριζώθη· ὁ τόπος τοῦ θρόνου σου σοι συντηρηθήσεται εἰς καιρὸν καὶ ὄραν· ἰδοὺ ἐπι σέ ἐτοιμάζονται καὶ μαστιγώσουσί σε καὶ ἐπάξουσιν τὰ κεκρυμένα ἐπι σέ.</p>
<p>לָמָּה מִלְּעָא מִלְּפָי וְשִׁפְרָ עֲלֶיךָ [עֲלֶיךָ] וְהִשְׁפִּיר [וְהִשְׁפִּיר] בְּצִדְקָה פִּיךָ וְשִׁנְתֶיךָ בַּמִּתָּן עֲנִיךָ מִן תִּתִּיבָה אַרְבָּה לְשִׁלְתֶיךָ :</p>	<p>κύριος ᾧ ἐν σὺβανῶ, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐπι πάσῃ τῇ γῆ αὐτοῦ δεήθητι περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σου καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι, ἵνα ἐπιείκεια δοθῇ σοι καὶ πολυήμερος γένη ἐπι τοῦ θρόνου τῆς βασιλείας σου, καὶ μὴ καταφείρη σε· τοῦτους τοὺς λόγους ἀγάπησον ἀκριβῆς γάρ μισ οὗ λόγος, καὶ πληρῆς ὁ χρόνος σου.</p>
<p>כָּלֵא מִשָּׂא עַל-גְּבוּכְדָנְעִיר מִלְּעָא :</p>	<p>καὶ ἐπι συντελεία τῶν λόγων Ναβουχοδονοσορ, ὡς ἤκουσε τὴν κρίσιον τοῦ ὀράματος· τοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ συνετήρησε.</p>
<p>לְקִצָּה גְדִדֶיךָ תַחַד-עֲשֵׂר עַל-הַיִּפֹּל מִלְכּוֹתֶיךָ הֵי כִבֵּל מִהַלְלֶיךָ הַיָּהָה :</p>	<p>καὶ μετὰ μῆνας δώδεκα ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπι τῶν τευχῶν τῆς πόλεως μετὰ πάσης τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ περιεπατεῖ καὶ ἐπι τῶν πύργων αὐτῆς διεπορεύετο</p>
<p>עָנָה מִלְּעָא וְאֵמַר הֲלֵא רָא-הָיָה בְּכָל רַבְמָה הַיַּיִתְאָנְהָ בְּיַתְמָה לְכַתָּה מִלְּכֹה בַּתְקָה חֲסִנִי וְלִקְרָה תִרְרִי :</p>	<p>καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Ἀύτη ἐστὶ Βαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη, ἣν ἔγῳ ἠκαδομήσα, καὶ οἶκος βασιλείας μου ἐν ἰσχυρῶ καράτους μου κληθήσεται εἰς τιμὴν τῆς δόξης μου.</p>
<p>עֲזַר מִלְּהָא בְּכַם מִלְּעָא קָל מִן-שְׂמִיָּה נִפְלֵל לְךָ אֲמַרִיךָ גְּבוּכְדָנְעִיר מִלְּעָא מִלְּכּוֹתֶיךָ עֲרַת מִיָּהָה :</p>	<p>καὶ ἐπι συντελείας τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ φωνῆν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἤκουσε Σοὶ λέγεται, Ναβουχοδονοσορ βασιλεῦ, ἡ βασιλεία Βαβυλῶνος ἀφίηται σοι καὶ ἔτερόν διδοται, ἐξουθενημένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καθίστημι αὐτὸν ἐπι τῆς βασιλείας σου, καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν σου καὶ τὴν δόξαν σου καὶ τὴν τρυφήν σου παραλήψεται, ὅπως ἐπιγνώσῃ ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ᾧ ἐάν βούληται δώσει αὐτὴν· ἕως δὲ ἡλίον ἀνατολῆς βασιλεὺς ἔσθης εὐφρανθήσεται ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου καὶ κρατήσει τῆς δόξης σου καὶ τῆς ἰσχύος σου καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας σου.</p>
<p>וּמִן אֲנִישָׁא לְךָ מְרִדִיךָ וְעַם-תִּיבָה בָרַח מִיָּדֶיךָ עֲשֵׂהָ</p>	<p>καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διώξονται σε ἐπι ἔτη ἑπτὰ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ὀφθῆς</p>

	<p>כְּהוֹרֵיךָ לָךְ וְשִׁעְמִיךָ וְשִׁבְעָה עֲדֵינִי עֲדֵינִי וְהִלַּפְתָּן עַל־יָד [עַל־יָד] עַד הַיְי־הַתְּנִיעַ הַיְי־שְׁלֵיט עַל־יָא [עַל־יָא] [הִר] בְּמִלְכּוֹת אֲנִישָׁא וְלִמְדֻרֵי וְצִפְּאָ וְתַנְנָה :</p>	<p>οὐδ' οὐ μὴ λαλήσης μετὰ πᾶντὸς ἀνθρώπου· χόρτον ὡς βοὴν σε ψωμίσουσι, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γλώσσης τῆς γῆς ἔσται ἡ νομὴ σου· ἰδοὺ ἀντι τῆς δόξης σου δῆσουσι σε, καὶ τὸν οἶκον τῆς ἡρσῆς σου καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἔτερος ἔξει.</p> <p>ἕως δὲ πρῶτῃ πᾶντα τελεσθήσεται ἐπὶ σέ. Νάβουχοδονοσορ βασιλεὺς Βαβυλῶνος, καὶ οὐχ ὑστερήσει ἀπὸ πᾶντων τούτων οὐθέν.</p>
30a	<p>בְּחַשְׁמֵיךָ מִלְּמָא כְּפַח עַל־נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר וּמִן־אֲנִישָׁא מְיֻיִד וְעִשְׂבָּא כְּהוֹרֵיךָ וְאַל־ל וּמַשְׁלַל שְׂמֵיךָ גְּשִׁמָּה וְצִפְּבַע עַד הַיְי־שְׁעִירָה פְּנִישְׁרֵיךָ וְרָקָה וְטַפְרֹחֵיךָ כְּצַפְרֵיךָ :</p>	<p>ἔγω Νάβουχοδονοσορ βασιλεὺς Βαβυλῶνος ἔπτᾶ ἔτη ἐπεδήθη· χόρτον ὡς βοὴν ἐψωμίσαν με, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γλώσσης τῆς γῆς ἦσθιον, καὶ μετὰ ἔτη ἔπτᾶ ἔδωκα τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς δέησιν καὶ ἠξίωσα περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν μου κατὰ πρόσωπον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀγνοίων μου τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν μεγάλων ἐδείθη.</p> <p>καὶ αἱ τριγες μου ἐγένοντο ὡς πτέρυγες ἀετοῦ, οἱ ὄνυχές μου ὡσεὶ λέοντος· ἠλλοιώθη ἡ σάρξ μου καὶ ἡ καρδία μου, γυμνὸς περιεπτέρον μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς, ἐνύπνιον εἶδον, καὶ ὑπνώοιαι με εἰληφάσι, καὶ διὰ χρόνον ὑπνος με ἔλαβε πολλὸς καὶ νωσταγμὸς ἐπέπεσέ μοι.</p>
30b		
30c		<p>καὶ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν ἔπτᾶ ἔτῶν ὁ χρόνος μου τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως ἦλθε, καὶ αἱ ἀμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἀγνοιαί μου ἐπληρώθησαν ἐγνωρίον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ ἐδείθη περὶ τῶν ἀγνοίων μου τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν θεῶν τοῦ μεγάλου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀγγελος εἰς ἐκλάσεσέ με ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγων Νάβουχοδονοσορ, δούλευσον τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ ἀγίῳ καὶ δός, δόξαν τῷ ὑψίστῳ· τὸ βασιλείου σου ἔθνος σου σοὶ ἀποδίδοται.</p>
31	<p>וְלִקְצֹת וְלִקְרֹא אֲנִיָּה נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר עֵינֵי וְלִשְׁמֵיךָ נְשִׁלָּח וּמְיֻדֵיעַ עַל־יָהוּב וְלִעַל־יָא [וְלִי] [עַל־יָא] [הִר] כְּרִזְחַת וְלִחַר עַל־מָא שְׂבַחְתָּ וְהִדְרַת הַיְי־שְׁלֵיטָה עַל־יָא וּמְלִכּוֹתָהּ עַם־דְּרַךְ וְרָר :</p>	
32	<p>וְכַל־דְּאֲרֵי [הַיְי־רֵי] אֲרַעָא כְּלָה תְּשִׁיבֵיךָ וְכַמְצִיבָה עֲבָרַךְ כְּתִיל שְׂמֵיךָ וְרֵאֲרֵי [וְ] [הַיְי־רֵי] אֲרַעָא וְלֵא אִיתֵי הַיְי־מִתָּא בְּיָהּ וְהֵאֲמַר לָהּ כְּמָה עֲבָרְתָּ :</p>	
33	<p>כַּה־זְמִנָּא מְקִרְעֵי וְהוּב עַל־יָוְלִקְרַךְ מְלִכּוֹתֵי הַדְּרַךְ וְזוּרֵי</p>	<p>ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ βασιλεία μου ἔμοι, καὶ ἡ δόξα μου ἀπεδόθη μοι.</p>

	<p>דָּרוֹב עָלַי וְלִי הַדְּבָר וְרַבְרַבְנִי וְכַעַן וְעַל־מַלְכוּתִי הַתְּקַנְתָּ וְרַבְרַבְנִי הַתְּיָדָה הַתְּסַפֵּת לִי :</p>	
34	<p>כַּעַן אָנֹכִי נִבְרַכְתָּ לְעַד מְשִׁבַּת וּמְרוֹמֵם וּמְהֻרָּל לְמַלְכֻת שְׁמַיָא דְיָ כָּל־מַעֲדָתֵי קִשְׁט וְאַחֲרֵתָהּ הֵיזֵן וְיָד מְהֻלְכָן בְּגִיָה וְכָל לְהַשְׁפִּילָה :</p>	<p>τῷ ὑψίστῳ ἀνθροπολογύμῳ καὶ αἰνῶ τῷ κτίσαντι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ τοὺς ποταμούς καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς· ἐξομολογύμῳ καὶ αἰνῶ, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶ θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλείων, ὅτι αὐτὸς ποιεῖ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα καὶ ἀλλοιοὶ καιρὸς καὶ χρόνος ἀφαιρῶν βασιλείαν βασιλείων καὶ καθιστῶν ἐτέρονς ἀντ' αὐτῶν.</p> <p>ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν αὐτῷ λατρεύσω, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ τρόμος εἴληφέ με, καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους αὐτοῦ αἰνῶ· οἱ γὰρ θεοὶ τῶν ἔθνων οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἰσχὺν ἀποστρέφειν βασιλείαν βασιλείως εἰς ἕτερον βασιλέα καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ ζῆν ποιῆσαι καὶ ποιῆσαι σημεῖα καὶ θαυμάσια μεγάλα καὶ φοβερά καὶ ἀλλοιωσαι ὑπερμεγέθη πράγματα. καθὼς ἐποίησεν ἐν ἔμοι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἡλλοίωσεν ἐπ' ἔμοι μεγάλα πράγματα. ἐγὼ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς βασιλείας μου περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τῷ ὑψίστῳ θυσίας προσοίσω εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τὸ ἄριστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιήσω, ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ λαός μου, τὸ ἔθνος μου καὶ αἱ χῆραί μου αἰ ἐν τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ μου. καὶ ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν εἰς τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ὅσοι ἄν καταλήθῃσι λαλοῦντές τι, τοὺτους κατακρινῶ θανάτῳ.⁹</p>
34b		<p>ἔγραψε δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ναβουχοδονοσορ ἐπιστολὴν ἔγκυκλιον πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τόπον ἔθνεσι καὶ χόραις καὶ γλώσσαις πᾶσαις ταῖς οἰκουμέναις ἐν πάσαις ταῖς χόραις ἐν γενεαῖς καὶ γενεαῖς Κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ αἰνεῖτε καὶ θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν προσφέρετε αὐτῷ ἐνδόξως· ἐγὼ βασιλεὺς βασιλείων ἀνθροπολογύμῳ αὐτῷ ἐνδόξως, ὅτι οὕτως ἐποίησε μετ' ἔμοι· ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκάθισέ με ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου μου, καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας μου καὶ τῆς βασιλείας μου ἐν τῷ λαῷ μου ἐκράτησα, καὶ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη μου ἀποκατεστάθη μοι.</p>
34c		<p>... καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἐπιστολὰς περὶ πάντων τῶν γενηθέντων αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι τοῖς οὖσιν ὑπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ.</p>

APPENDIX 2

DANIEL MANUSCRIPTS

Type	Name	Date	Contents
Qumran	4QDan ^c (4Q114)	Late 2 nd –Early 1 st c. BCE	10:5–9, 11–13, 13–16, 21; 11:1–2, 13–17, 25–29
Qumran	4QDan ^e (4Q116)	Late 2 nd –Early 1 st c. BCE	9:12–14, 15–17
Qumran	1QDan ^b (1Q72)	Early or mid 1 st c. BCE	Dan 3:22–31
Qumran	4QDan ^a (4Q112)	mid 1 st c. BCE	Dan 1:16–20; 2:9–11, 19–33, 33–46; 2:47–3:2; 4:29–30; 5:5–7, 12–14, 16–19; 7:5–7, 25–8:5; 10:16–20; 11:13–16
Qumran	4QDan ^d (4Q115)	mid or late 1 st c. BCE	Dan 3:8–10(?), 23–25; 4:5–9, 12–16; 7:15–23
Qumran	1QDan ^a (1Q71)	First half 1 st c. CE	Dan 1:10–17; 2:2–6
Qumran	4QDan ^b (4Q113)	First half 1 st c. CE	Dan 5:10–12, 14–16, 19–22; 6:8–13, 13–22; 6:27–7:4, 5–6, 11(?), 26–28; 8:1–8, 13–16
Qumran	6QpapDan (6Q7)	First half 1 st c. CE	8:16–17(?), 20–21(?); 10:8–16; 11:33–36, 38
Qumran	SWBTS Mss	??	Chap. 6
Pre-Hexaplaric	Chester Beatty (967)	2 nd c.–first half 3 rd c. CE	Dan 3:72–6:18, 7:1–8:27
Hexaplaric	Syro-Hexaplar (SyH)	9 th c. CE	Complete
Hexaplaric	Codex Chisianus (88)	9 th –11 th c. CE	Complete

APPENDIX 3

ARRANGEMENT OF DREAM SEQUENCE MATERIAL

*words in *Italics* are similar but not exact in the two editions

Verse	Motif	<i>Vorlage</i>	Pluses
7-9	Tree Dream	(7) I was looking in my sleep and behold, there was a tree in the midst of the earth (8) and its height was tall, and its appearance was great. (9) * ^{MT} The beasts of the field found shade under it, And the birds of the sky dwelt in its branches, * ^{OG} <i>and its fruit was abundant and good.</i> And all the living fed themselves from it. And its height reached to heaven, And it was visible to the whole earth.	
10-11	Angel	I was looking in my sleep, and behold, an angelic watcher from heaven and he called and said: "Cut it down and destroy it.	(11) MT+: Cut off its branches, Strip off its foliage and scatter its fruit; Let the beasts flee from under it and the birds from its branches.
11 OG/14 MT	Verdict	<i>This is the command of the Most High.</i>	
12	Root	"But leave the stump of its root in the ground.	
12 MT/13 OG	Animal	<i>And let him feed on grass like an animal and let his body be wet with the dew of heaven</i> for seven years,	(12) OG+: So that he may feed on grass like an ox, with the animals of the earth in the mountains.
13 MT/30 OG	Heart	<i>Let his heart be changed from that of a man And let him be given an animal's heart,</i>	

Verse	Motif	Vorlage	Pluses
14	Verdict	until he recognizes that the Lord of heaven has authority over everything and does what he wishes with it.”	(14a) OG+: It was cut down before me in one day, and its destruction was in one hour of the day. And its branches were given to every wind, and it was dragged and thrown away. He ate grass with the animals of the earth. And he was delivered into prison and was bound by them with shackles and bronze manacles. I marveled exceedingly at all these things, and my sleep escaped from my eyes.
15–16	Narrative	<i>I called Daniel and told him the dream and asked him to tell me its interpretation. But Daniel was astounded for one hour. Then he answered, “O king, may this dream be for those who hate you, and its interpretation for your enemies!</i>	(*Daniel is already present in the MT edition)
17–19	Tree Dream	“The great tree that you saw, whose appearance was great and its height reached to heaven * ^{OG} “and in which the birds of the sky dwelt, * ^{MT} <i>It is you, O king!</i> You have become great and reached to heaven and your dominion is through all the earth.	(17–18) MT+: and was visible to all the earth, and whose foliage was beautiful and its fruit abundant, and in which was food for all, under which the beasts of the field dwelt
20	Angel	And the vision, which you saw, that an angel said, ‘Chop down the tree and destroy it.’	(20) MT+: Yet leave the stump with its roots in the ground, but with a band of iron and bronze around it in the new grass of the field, and let him be drenched with the dew of heaven, and let him share with the beasts of the field until seven periods of time pass over him.

Verse	Motif	<i>Vorlage</i>	Pluses
21	Verdict	The decree of the Most High will come upon you.	
22–23	Animal	You will be driven away from mankind.	(22–23) MT+: and your dwelling place will be with the beasts of the field, and you will be given grass to eat like cattle and be drenched with the dew of heaven; and seven periods of time will pass over you
23	Root	But the root of the tree, which was spared, means your kingdom will be assured to you,	
23–25	Verdict	after you recognize that Heaven is ruler. Therefore, ^{*MT} <i>may my advice be pleasing to you</i> entreat him concerning your sins and atone for your iniquities with alms so that your prosperity may be prolonged. ^{*OG}	
26–27	Narrative	And after twelve months the king was walking and answering he said, “This is the great Babylon, which I built by the might of my power as a royal house.	
28	Voice from Heaven	Then a voice came from heaven, saying, “King Nebuchadnezzar, to you it is said: Your kingdom has been taken away from you.	
29	Animal	You will be driven away from mankind, ^{*MT} and they will feed you grass like cattle ^{*OG} <i>and your dwelling place will be with the beasts of the field,</i>	
28 OG/29 MT	Verdict	<i>until you recognize that the Most High is ruler over the realm of mankind and bestows it on whomever He wishes.”</i>	
30	Verdict	The word was fulfilled.	
30/30- 30b	Animal	Nebuchadnezzar was driven away from mankind and ate grass like cattle. His hair grew like eagles’ feathers and his nails grew long.	(30) MT+: and his body was drenched with the dew of heaven until

APPENDIX 4

PLUSES IN MT AND OG DAN 4

MT	Vorlage	OG
	<p><u>Dan. 3:31</u> <i>Nebuchadnezzar the king to all the peoples, nations, and persons of every language that dwell in all the earth: "May your peace abound!</i></p> <p><u>32</u> <i>"It seems good to me to declare the signs and wonders which the Most High God has done for me.</i></p> <p><u>33</u> <i>How great are His signs And how mighty are His wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom And His dominion is from generation to generation.</i></p>	<p>[34c]</p> <p>(+) at all times. (+) And now, I will show to you the deeds (-)</p> <p>(+) <i>And it seemed good to me to show to you</i> (+) and your wise men (+) that God is one, (-)</p> <p>(+) And he sent letters about everything that happened to him during his reign to all the nations under his rule.</p>
<u>Dan. 4:1</u>	<p>"I, Nebuchadnezzar, was at ease in my house and flourishing in my palace.</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:1</u> (+) In the eighteenth year of his reign,</p>
<u>2</u>	<p>"I saw a dream and it made me fearful;</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:2</u></p>

and the thoughts on my bed and the visions of my head kept alarming me.	and I was alarmed	
<p>3 (+) So I gave orders to bring before me all the wise men of Babylon, so they might make known to me the interpretation of the dream. 4 Then the magicians, the conjurers, the Chaldeans and the diviners came in and I related the dream to them, but they could not make its interpretation known to me. 5 But finally Daniel came in before me, whose name is Belteshazzar according to the name of my god, and in whom is a spirit of the holy gods; and I related the dream to him, saying, 6 ‘O Belteshazzar, chief of the magicians, since I know that a spirit of the holy gods is in you and no mystery baffles you, tell me the visions of my dream which I have seen, along with its interpretation.</p>		
<p><u>Dan. 4:7</u> (+) ‘And the visions of my head upon my bed:</p>	<p>[The dream:]</p> <p>I was looking in my sleep and behold, there was a tree in the midst of the earth and its height was great.</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:7</u></p> <p>(+) and there was no other like it.</p>
<p>8 The tree grew large and became strong</p>	<p>And its appearance was great. And its height reached to heaven,</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:8</u></p> <p>(+) and its span to the clouds, filling the area under heaven.</p>

	And it was visible to the whole earth.	(+) The sun and the moon dwelled in it
<u>9</u> <i>Its foliage was beautiful</i>	The beasts of the field found shade under it, And the birds of the sky dwelt in its branches, <i>and its fruit was abundant and good.</i> and all the living fed themselves from it.	<u>Dan. 4:9</u> (+) Its branches were about thirty stadia long,
<u>Dan. 4:10</u> (+) in the visions of my head upon my bed, (+) a holy one, descended	I was looking in my sleep, and behold, an angelic watcher from heaven	<u>Dan. 4:10</u> (+) sent with power
<u>Dan 4:11</u> (+) Cut off its branches, Strip off its foliage and scatter its fruit; Let the beasts flee from under it And the birds from its branches.	And he called and said: “Cut it down and destroy it. <i>This is the command of the Most High.</i>	<u>Dan. 4:11</u> [MT 4:14] (+) to uproot it and render it useless
<u>Dan 4:12–13</u> (+) But with a band of iron and bronze around it in the new grass of the field. (+) Let his heart be changed from that of a man And let him be given the heart of an animal,	“But leave the stump of its root in the ground. <i>And let him feed on grass like an animal</i> <i>and let his body be wet with the dew of heaven</i> for seven years	<u>Dan. 4:12–13</u> (+) like an ox with the animals of the earth in the mountains, (+) and he may graze with them

<p><u>Dan 4:14 [4:11]</u> <i>This is the command</i> (+) of the angelic watchers And the decision is a command of the holy ones, So that the living may know (-) (+) over the kingdom of men And bestows it on whom He wishes (+) and sets over it the lowest of men.”</p>	<p>until he recognizes that the Lord of heaven has authority over everything and does what he wishes with it.”</p>	<p><u>4:14</u> (+) which is in heaven and which is on the earth</p>
		<p>[14a] (+) It was cut down before me in one day, and its destruction was in one hour of the day. And its branches were given to every wind, and it was dragged and thrown away. He ate grass with the animals of the earth. And he was delivered into prison and was bound by them with shackles and bronze manacles. I marveled exceedingly at all these things, and my sleep escaped from my eyes.</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:15</u> Belteshazzar (+) since none of the wise men of my kingdom are able to make known to me the interpretation; but you</p>	<p><i>I called Daniel</i> <i>and told him the dream</i> and asked him to tell me its interpretation.</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:15</u> (+) And when I arose in the morning from my bed, (+) the ruler of the wise men and the leader of those who decide dreams,</p>

are able, for a spirit of the holy gods is in you.		
<p><u>Dan. 4:16</u></p> <p>(+) whose name is Belteshazzar</p> <p>(+) and his thoughts alarmed him.</p> <p>(+) The king answered and said, ‘Belteshazzar, do not let the dream or its interpretation alarm you.’</p> <p>Belteshazzar said</p>	<p>[Interpretation:] But Daniel</p> <p>was astounded for one hour and greatly alarmed.</p> <p>He answered “O king, may this dream be for those who hate you, and its interpretation for your enemies!</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:16</u></p> <p>(+) was greatly amazed and since foreboding pressed him and since he was afraid, as trembling seized him and his appearance changed, having shaken his head</p> <p>(+) in a quiet voice:</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:17</u> (see 4:8)</p> <p>which became large and grew strong</p> <p>(+)and was visible to all the earth</p>	<p>“The great tree that you saw whose appearance was great and its height reached to heaven</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:17</u> (+) planted in the earth</p> <p>(+) it is you, O king,</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:18</u> (see 4:9)</p> <p>(+) and whose foliage was beautiful and its fruit abundant, and in which was food for all, under which the beasts of the field dwelt</p>	<p>“and in which the birds of the sky dwelt,</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:18</u></p> <p>(+) The strength of the earth and the nations and all the languages unto the ends of the earth and all countries are slaves to you.</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:19</u></p> <p>(+) and grown strong, and your majesty has become</p>	<p><i>It is you, O king!</i> You have become great</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:19</u></p> <p>(+) and that tree was exalted</p>

great	<p>And reached to heaven</p> <p>And your dominion is through all the earth</p>	<p>and neared heaven and that its span touched the clouds is:</p> <p>(+) <i>You, O king</i>, have been exalted above all humans who are <i>upon the face of the whole earth</i>. Your heart was exalted with pride and power toward the holy one and his angels. Your works were seen, how you ravaged the house of the living God because of the sins of the sanctified people.</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:20–21</u> (4:12–13)</p> <p>(+) a holy one, descending from heaven</p> <p>(+) yet leave the stump with its roots in the ground, but with a band of iron and bronze around it in the new grass of the field, and let him be drenched with the dew of heaven, and let him share with the beasts of the field until seven periods of time pass over him,</p> <p>(+) this is the interpretation, O king,</p> <p>(+) my lord the king</p>	<p>“And the vision, which you saw, that an angel said, ‘Chop down the tree and destroy it’</p> <p>The decree of the Most High will come upon you</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:20–21</u></p> <p>(+) sent in power by the Lord</p> <p>(+) and the Most High and his angels are pursuing you.</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:22–23</u></p> <p>And they will drive you away from mankind</p> <p>(+) and your dwelling place will be with the beasts of the field, and you will be given grass to eat like cattle and be drenched with the</p>	<p>“You will be driven away from mankind</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:22–23</u></p> <p>(+) They will take you away to prison and send you away into a desert place.</p>

<p>dew of heaven; and seven periods of time will pass over you</p>	<p>“But the root of the tree, which was spared, means your kingdom will be assured to you after you recognize that Heaven is ruler</p>	<p>(+) since it was not uprooted: (+) for a season and an hour. <i>The Lord lives in heaven, and his authority is over the whole earth.</i> (+) Behold, they are being prepared against you, and they will whip you, and they will bring the judgments against you.</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:24</u> (+) O king (+) by doing righteousness (+) by showing mercy to the poor</p>	<p>“Therefore, <i>may my advice be pleasing to you</i> entreat him concerning your sins and atone for your iniquities with alms so that your prosperity may be prolonged</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:24</u> (+) <i>for my word is accurate and your time is complete</i> (+) so that kindness might be shown to you (+) and you might not be destroyed.</p>
<p><u>Dan. 4:25</u> (+) All this happened to Nebuchadnezzar the king.</p>		<p><u>Dan. 4:25</u> (+) And at the completion of the words, Nebuchadnezzar, as he heard the verdict of the vision, kept the words in his heart.</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:26</u> (+) on the roof of the royal palace of Babylon.</p>	<p>And after twelve months the king was walking</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:26</u> (+) on the walls of the city in all his glory and going through its towers,</p>

		luxurious house and the kingdom.
<p><u>Dan 4:30</u> (+) Immediately</p> <p>(+) and his body was drenched with the dew of heaven until</p> <p>(+) like birds' claws.</p>	<p>The word was fulfilled.</p> <p>Nebuchadnezzar was driven away from mankind</p> <p>and ate grass like cattle.</p> <p>His hair grew like eagles' feathers and his nails grew long like claws</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:30</u> (+) Now, by morning</p> <p>(+) O King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, and not one of these things will fail.” [30a] (+) “I, Neuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was bound seven years.</p> <p>(+) and would eat the tender grass of the earth. (+) And after seven years I gave my soul to supplication, and I petitioned before the Lord, the God of heaven, concerning my sins, and I entreated the great God of gods concerning my ignorance. [30b]</p> <p>(+) like those of a lion. (+) My flesh and my heart were changed. I would walk about naked with the animals of the field. I saw a dream and forebodings gripped me, and after a while a great sleep overtook me, and drowsiness fell upon me.</p>
<p><u>Dan. 4:31</u> (+) I, Nebuchadnezzar, raised my eyes toward heaven and my reason returned to me, and I blessed the Most High and praised and honored Him who lives forever (+) For His dominion is an everlasting dominion, And</p>	<p>“At the end of that period,</p> <p>I praised and honored the Most High</p>	<p>[30c] (+) of seven years my time of redemption came, and my sins and my ignorances were fulfilled before the God of heaven, and I entreated the great God of gods concerning my ignorances (+) and behold, an angel</p>

<p>His kingdom endures from generation to generation. <u>Dan 4:32</u> (+) All the inhabitants of the earth are accounted as nothing, But He does according to His will in the host of heaven And among the inhabitants of earth; And no one can ward off His hand Or say to Him, ‘What have You done?’</p>		<p>called to me from heaven: ‘Nebuchadnezzar, be subject to the holy God of heaven, and give glory to the Most High. The dominion of your nation is being given back to you.’</p>
<p><u>Dan 4:33</u> (+) my reason returned to me. (+) for the glory of my kingdom, and my counselors and my nobles began seeking me out (+) and exceeding greatness was added to me.</p>	<p>At that time my kingdom and my greatness was restored to me and I was reestablished over my kingdom and my greatness was restored to me.</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:33</u> <u>[4:34b]</u></p>
<p><u>Dan 4:34</u> Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise, exalt and honor the King of heaven (+) for all His works are true and His ways just, and He is able to humble those who walk in pride.</p>	<p>Now I acknowledge and praise the Most High.</p>	<p><u>Dan. 4:34</u> I acknowledge the Most High, and I praise the one (+) who created the heaven and the earth and the seas and the rivers and everything that is in them. (+) I acknowledge, and I praise, because he is God of gods and Lord of lords and King of kings² (+) because he does signs and wonders and changes seasons and times, removing kings from their kingdoms and setting others</p>

² NETS translates the last title βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων as “Lord of kings,” perhaps in an effort to distinguish this title from Nebuchadnezzar’s self-designation as the βασιλεὺς βασιλέων in v. 34b.

		in their place.
		<p>[34a]</p> <p>(+) From now on I will serve him, and trembling has gripped me from fear of him, and I praise all his holy ones</p> <p>(+) for the gods of the nations do not have power in them to give away the kingdom of a king to another king and to kill and to make alive and to do signs and great and terrible marvels and to change very great matters as the God of heaven has done with me. And he changed great things about me.</p> <p>(+) I will offer sacrifices to the Most High as an odor of fragrance to the Lord for my life every day of my reign, and I will do what is pleasing before him, I and my people, [my nation] and my lands that are in my authority.</p> <p>(+) And as many as have spoken against the God of heaven and as many as should be caught speaking anything, I will condemn these to death.”</p>
		<p>[34b]</p> <p>(+) Then King Nabouchodonosor wrote a circular letter to all the nations in each place and to countries and language groups who live in all the countries for generations and generations.</p> <p>(+) Praise the Lord, God of heaven. Bring sacrifice and offering to him gloriously.</p>

[4:33]		(+) I, the king of kings, acknowledge him gloriously, because he has done thus with me. In the same day he established me on my throne, and I took possession of my authority and my kingdom among my people, and my greatness was restored to me.
--------	--	--

OG translation is NETS with some revision.
MT translation is NASB with some revision.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albertz, Rainer. *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 131. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988.
- Barton, George A. “The Composition of the Book of Daniel.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 17 (1898): 62–86.
- Bludau, August. *Die alexandrinsiche Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältniss zum massorethischen Text*. Biblische Studien 2/2/3. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1897.
- Braverman, Jay. *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 7. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978.
- Bruce, F. F. “The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel.” Pages 22–40 in *Instruction and Interpretation: Studies in Hebrew Language, Palestinian Archaeology and Biblical Exegesis*. Oudtestamentische Studiën 20. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Ceriani, A.M. *Codex syro-hexaplaris ambrosianus*. Monumenta sacra et profana 7. Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1874.
- Charles, R.H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1929.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- _____. *Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 20. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1984.
- _____ and Peter W. Flint. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. 2 vols. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Coxon, Peter W. “The Great Tree of Daniel 4.” Pages 91–111 in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 42. Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1986.

- Cross, Frank M. "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran: Cave 4 of Qumran (4Q)." *BA* 19 (1956): 83–86.
- Davies, Philip R. *Daniel*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1985.
- Dines, Jennifer. "The King's Good Servant? Loyalty, Subversion, and Greek Daniel." Pages 205–24 in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Edited by Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken, and Jennifer Dines. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California, 2007.
- Fewell, Danna Nolan. *Circle of Sovereignty: Plotting Politics in the Book of Daniel*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
- _____. "Sages and Sovereigns: A Story of Stories in Daniel 1–6." PhD Diss., Emory University, 1987.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Aramaic Epistolography," *Semeia* 22 (1981): 25–57.
- Flint, Peter. "The SWBTS and the Dead Sea Scroll Library." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. San Francisco, Calif., November 21, 2011.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. 2 volumes. Leiden/Boston: Brill/Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1997–1998.
- Ginsberg, H.L. "The Composition of the Book of Daniel." *Vetus Testamentum* 4 (1954): 246–75.
- Gnuse, Robert. "From Prison to Prestige: The Hero Who Helps a King in Jewish and Greek Literature." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2010): 31–45.
- Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1996.
- _____. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Themes. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- _____. "Stories in Daniel." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 37 (1987): 99–116.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 41A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1983.
- Gowan, Donald E. *Daniel*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2001.
- Grelot, Pierre. "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique." *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974): 5–23.

- Haag, Ernst. *Die Errettung Daniels aus der Löwengrube: Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der biblischen Danieltradition*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 110. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1983.
- Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander A. DiLella. *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1978.
- Henze, Matthias. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 61. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1999.
- _____. "Nebuchadnezzar." Pages 992–93 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Jeansonne, Sharon Pace. *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 19. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*. 8 vols. London: Emery Walker, 1933.
- Koch, Klaus. *Das Buch Daniel*. Erträge der Forschung 144. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.
- _____. and Martin Rösel. *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000.
- Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. Translated by David Pellauer. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
- _____. *Daniel in His Time*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Translated by Lydia Cochrane. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, 1988.
- Lucas, Ernest. *Daniel*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 20. Leicester, Eng.: Apollos/Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Lust, Johan. "The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5." Pages 41–53 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A.S. van der Woude. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 106. Leuven: Leuven University, 1993.
- de Magistris, S. *Daniel secundum Septuaginta. ex tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codice*. Rome: Typis Propagandae Fidei, 1772.
- McLay, R. Timothy. *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 43. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.

- _____. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV–VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel." *Vetus Testamentum* 55 (2005): 304–23.
- Meadowcroft, T. J. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 198. Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- _____. "Metaphor, Narrative, Interpretation, and Reader in Daniel 2–5." *Narrative* 8 (2000): 257–78.
- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.
- Munnich, Olivier. "Texte massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel." Pages 93–120 in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*. Edited by Adrian Schenker. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Why Nabonidus? Excavating Traditions from Qumran, the Hebrew Bible, and Neo-Babylonian Sources." Pages 57–79 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. Studies on Texts of the Desert of Judah 92. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. "The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East. With a Translation of an Assyrian Dram-Book." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 46.3 (1956): 179–373.
- Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Portier-Young, Anthea E. *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Redditt, Paul L. *Daniel*. New Century Bible Commentary. Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Rowley, H.H. "The Composition of the Book of Daniel: Some Comments on Professor Ginsberg's Article." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 272–76.
- _____. "The Unity of the Book of Daniel." *HUCA* 33 (1950–51): 233–73. Repr. pages 237–68 in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*. London: Lutterloh, 1952.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. *2 Maccabees*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

- Seow, C.L. *Daniel*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Stevenson, Kenneth and Michael Glerup, eds. *Ezekiel, Daniel*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament 13. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2008.
- Swete, Henry B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University, 1902.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Daniel." Pages 343–56 in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*. Edited by Robert Alter and Frank Kermode. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1987.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 134. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- _____. "Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated." Pages 34–50 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999. Repr. from pages 101–16 in *Perspectives on the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Walter J. Harrelson*. Edited by James L. Crenshaw. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University, 1988.
- _____. "The Parallel Editions of the Old Greek and Masoretic Text of Daniel 5." In *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Vol.1. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 153. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011.
- van der Woude, A.S., ed. *The Book of Daniel: In the Light of New Findings*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 106. Leuven: Leuven University, 1993.
- Wenthe, Dean O. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1–6." PhD Diss., University of Notre Dame, 1991.
- Willis, Amy C. Merrill. *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 520. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Jewish Court Legends*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 26. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Wooden, R. Glenn. "Changing Perceptions of Daniel: Reading Daniel 4 and 5 in Context." Pages 9–23 in *From Biblical Criticism to Biblical Faith: Essays in*

Honor of Lee Martin McDonald. Edited by William H. Brackney and Craig A. Evans. Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 2007.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.