NOTES ON THE ARAMAIC PART
OF DANIEL

CHARLES C. TORREY

According to the generally accepted view, the book of Daniel is the work of a single hand. Bevan, *Commentary on Daniel,* 1892, p. 6, writes : " During the last sixty or seventy years almost all writers unbiassed by dogmatic prejudices have maintained both the literary unity of Daniel and the theory of its Maccabean origin." And Cornill, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament,*[5] 1905, pp. 242 f. : " Trotz mancher und zum Teil schwerer Widersprüche in Einzelheiten ist kaum ein anderes ATliches Buch so einheitlich und so in Einem Zuge geschrieben, als gerade Daniel." To me, this view is impossible. I do not, indeed, sympathize with any attempt to analyze the book on the sole basis of the change of language, from Hebrew to Aramaic and back again ; nor with those who, like Meinhold, believe chaps. 2–6 to have been the original book, composed in Aramaic in the fourth century B.C. ; nor, finally, with those who in recent times have divided up the book among nearly as many authors as there are chapters. But to me it is quite plain that *with chapter 7 a new writer takes up the work and carries it on.* Both in his mental habit and in his manner of expressing himself he is altogether different from the writer of chaps. 1–6.

The first half of the book, as far as the end of chapter 6, consists of a succession of edifying popular tales, very simply conceived, and told in a fairly straightforward manner. They deal with miracles, it is true, but after the naive manner of folklore, like the stories in Judges or Exodus, or the narrative of Joseph in Gen. 40 ff. There is nothing dark or mysterious in the manner of presentation. The writer of chaps. 7–12, on the contrary, is a true apocalyptist. Chap. 7 is written in imitation of chap. 2, and therefore shows, necessarily, a good deal of resemblance to the first part of the book ; but even here the change is perfectly apparent, and with the subsequent chapters, to the end, we are in an atmosphere which differs from that of chaps. 1–6 as black differs from white. It is customary to speak of the book of Daniel as " an apocalyptic writing," but the fact ought to be recognized, and strongly emphasized, that *chaps. 1–6 are not at all apocalyptic.* Not even in chaps. 2 and 4 is there anything which could properly be classed under this head. The dreams of Nebuchadnezzar are no more " apocalyptic " than are those of Pharaoh and his officers (Gen. 40 f.), or the vision of Balaam in Num. 24 : 15 ff., or that of the Jewish sibyl in the

Sibylline Oracles, iii. 97 ff. There is an essential difference between
apocalypse and mere vaticination.[1] But in chaps. 7—12 we have a
continuous series of " apocalypses " in the true technical sense. The
interpreting angels are present in every chapter; the strange beasts,
which belong only to the supernatural world, are brought in to make
their impression of terror, as usual; there is in each case the deep sleep,
or trance, in which the seer is given the revelation. Everything is wrapped
in portentous obscurity. The Daniel of these chapters is a character
conceived in a manner very different from that of the first half of the
book. There, he is a man who through his virtue has achieved wisdom.
He is an impressive figure, self-possessed and commanding. He has
" understanding in all visions and dreams." In one case (2 : 19) it is
through a dream that he is enabled to solve the riddle proposed to him,
but in the other cases he sees the answer directly. His interpretation
is straightforward and perfectly definite. Even in 2 : 37—44 there was
nothing that could have caused any of his contemporary readers a
moment's hesitation—though there was here just enough of mystery in
the manner of expression, characterizing the successive kingdoms instead
of naming them outright, to suggest to the later writer how he might
carry this method still further. But in chaps. 7 ff., the Daniel of the
visions is not a person for whom the narrator feels any enthusiasm.
He is merely a passive instrument in the hands of angels, like all the
other heroes of Jewish apocalypses. He sees through nothing; it must
all be explained to him. He gives no interpretation, but merely records
what he is told; and when he awakes from the vision, he is ill from
the effect of it.

There are other indications which point quite as unmistakably in the
same direction, showing that we have before us the work of two different
authors. The literary style of 7—12 differs widely from that of 1—6,
and the fact that the greater part of one of these sections is written in
Aramaic does not suffice to account for the difference. The style of
chaps. 1 ff. has no striking peculiarities. It is somewhat repetitious,
and has a few favorite mannerisms, but on the whole stands near to the
average style of Jewish narrators. The writer of chaps. 7 ff., on the
contrary, has a style which is highly original. While both picturesque
and full of vigor, it is also marvellously disjointed and obscure, and
filled with unusual phraseology, so that every paragraph has its pitfalls

---

[1] In my article „Apocalyptic Literature " in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, I
attempted to define the " apocalypse " as a literary product, and to indicate
the principal characteristics of the writings which belong to this peculiar
class. My attempt was, so far as I am aware, the first one of the kind,
and I do not know that any other has been made since that time.

for the interpreter. There is no other Hebrew prose style in the Old
Testament so difficult as that of these chapters.[1]

The fact should also be noticed, in this connection, that the Persian
words (and others probably supposed by the author to be Persian) which
are introduced by the writer of the Daniel *stories* into every part of
his composition, in order to give it local color, are entirely wanting in
chaps. 7–12. In the first part, such words are found in every chapter,
including chap. 1 ; but in the second part the writer does not use this
device at all, not even in chap. 7, though he had abundant opportunity
to do so if he had wished.

Still more striking, and in fact quite decisive by itself, is the contra-
diction in chronology existing between the two parts of the book. The
writer of chaps. 1–6 tells us that his Daniel was carried away from
Jerusalem, together with other young men of the nobles of Israel, in the
third year of Jehoiakim, i. e. in 606 B.C. (1 : 1 ff.). And after telling
the story of his special training in Babylon, and the great reputation
which he and his three companions achieved, he adds (vs. 21): *"And
Daniel continued* (ויהי דניאל) *even unto the first year of king Cyrus."*
As the best commentators have seen and said, there is only one legit-
imate way of understanding this sentence, namely, that Daniel lived
to see the accession of Cyrus, and died in the first year of his reign,
i. e. in 538 B.C. He would then have been eighty years of age, if we
suppose him to have been only twelve years old at the time when he
was carried away from Jerusalem ; but it seems plain from 1 : 4 f., 2 : 1, 48,
that the narrator thought of him as quite a little older than this. Then
follow, in chronological order, the stories of Daniel and his companions
under the successive kings who ruled over Babylonia. First came
Nebuchadnezzar, chaps. 2–4 : then Belshazzar, chap. 5 : then came
Darius, the one king who, according to the Jewish belief, ruled over

---

[1] This does not mean at all that the author of this apocalypse wrote " the
Hebrew of his time," as it has been customary to say. Hebrew was still
the learned language, in the Maccabean period, and was written with
perfect ease by the well educated men of the nation, *and in every variety of
style.* Some wrote with classical elegance, like the authors of Zech. 9—14
and (apparently) i Maccabees. Others, while using a large number of the
Aramaisms and neo-Hebraic words and constructions which are more or less
prominent in all the writings of the Greek period, nevertheless wrote in an
easy and transparent idiom which causes trouble for no one but the purist.
Such are Esther, Koheleth, and Judith (the style of which may, indeed
have been classical as well as transparent). Even such books as Jonah
and Ruth might well, so far as their language is concerned, have been written
in the second century B.C. And such men as the author of Chronicles-Ezra-
Nehemiah and the apocalyptist of Dan. 7—12, who, by the way, differ from

the separate Median kingdom, chap. 6 ;[1] and last of all, at the end
of this same chapter, Cyrus is mentioned, in the words : " So this Daniel
prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian "
(6 : 29).   That is, the writer returns to his original statement, that Daniel
lived to see the day of Cyrus.   The fitness of this verse to serve as
the close of the book is very obvious.   Now in the following chapters,
7–12, the history returns 'of course) upon itself ; beginning with Bel-
shazzar, in chaps. 7 and 8, and continuing with Darius Hystaspis, " the
Mede," in chap. 9.   But the final vision, occupying chaps. 10–12, is
dated *" in the third year of C rus* king of Persia."   Here is a flat
contradiction of the statement in chap. 1.   The only plausible expla-
nation is this, that the later writer, in making his addition to the book,
remembered the words of 6 : 29, but forgot—or chose to disregard—
those of 1 : 21.[2]

Again, it is customary to say that chaps. 1–6 reflect the conditions
of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.   Cornill, *Einleitung,* p. 242, even
goes so far as to say : " Ferner sind gerade in den Danielgeschichten
2–6 die durchgängigen Beziehungen auf Antiochus Epiphanes und seine
Verfolgung der jüdischen Religion ganz besonders unverkennbar."   But
this is a mere delusion.   These stories, so far as they deal with the
perils of devout Jews in the hands of foreign potentates, might perfectly
well have been written at any time after 597 B.C.   The Hebrews of
Jerusalem certainly did not suppose that their brethren who went into
captivity renounced their faith, or that they were all in high favor with
the Babylonian monarchs.   The Second Isaiah, for instance, says in
42 : 22, speaking of the " exiles " of Israel : " They are robbed and
plundered ; entrapped in holes, and hidden away in dungeons.   They
are become a prey, with none to rescue ; a plunder, with none to say,
Restore it !"   And again, in 47 : 6, 49 : 24 ff., 51 : 13 f., etc., he declares

each other very widely in point of *style*, would certainly have written obscure
Hebrew even if they had lived in the time of Amos. If they had composed
their writings in Aramaic, the Aramaic would have been precisely as bad
as the Hebrew.

[1] I have shown elsewhere that in the uniform Jewish tradition in the Greek
period *Darius Hystaspis was transposed to the place just before Cyrus,* as the
representative of the Median power ; cf. 9 : 1, 10 : 1, 11 : 1. See the *Am.
Journal of Sem. Languages,* xxiii, 178 f. ; xxiv, 29, 209 ff. The two authors
of the book of Daniel, like the Chronicler and his sources, certainly supposed
the reign of Cyrus to have been immediately followed by that of Xerxes
(Ezr. 4 : 5 ff., 24).

[2] It is useless to attempt to interpret 1 : 21 as meaning " Daniel contin-
ued even unto *the reign* of king Cyrus." The express mention of " *the first
year* " is conclusive.

that Babylonia " showed them no mercy," and speaks of " the prey of
the tyrant " (meaning the foreign King), and " the fury of the oppressor."
These were themes to arouse any story-teller who had even a spark
of imagination.[1] As for the details, the reasons for the persecution, and
the manner of it, these were all mere matters of course. There is not
a syllable, anywhere in the six chapters, that could reasonably suggest
the time of Antiochus Epiphanes to the unbiased reader. On the con-
trary, the kings described are altogether unlike him. Nebuchadnezzar
is a great and admirable monarch in the eyes of this narrator. He is
a tyrant, of course, and deals like one, but in the end he humbly con-
fesses the God of Israel. Belshazzar is represented as a weakling and a
voluptuary—naturally, since he was the one who lost the kingdom to
the Medes. He is introduced merely for the sake of the one great scene
in which Daniel predicts the fall of the city and the coming of the
Medes and Persians. As for Darius, he is pictured as a most admirable
king, a friend of Daniel, and in fact blameless except for his single act
of carelessness in signing the edict (6 : 7–9). He, too, confesses the
God of Israel, and recommends him to his subjects. Nowhere in the
six chapters is there any hint that the Jews in general are being perse-
cuted, either because of their religion or for any other reason. What
is more than all this, there is one passage in which the writer, in a
vaticinium ex eventu, manifestly brings the history down to his own
time ; and the time is *not* that of Antiochus Epiphanes, but (to all
appearance) considerably anterior to it.

It is immensely interesting to compare the two parallel visions, chaps. 2
and 7, in this regard. In both cases, the writer aims to put into
the mouth of the prophet a plain prediction of the future course of
history, in such a way that his hearers will recognize its truth. As in
all such cases, the most important part of the vision is the last part,
where the contemporary history is reached. Accordingly, in 7 : 8, 20,
24 f. the description becomes detailed as the writer reaches that crisis
of events which seemed to him and all his contemporaries one of the
most momentous in all history—as indeed it was—namely, the day when
the religion of Israel clashed for the first time with the purpose of a
great foreign power, and the Jewish church was compelled to fight for

---

[1] It is a mistake to suppose that such tales as these were produced only
in times of severe persecution. The literary art of that day was not alto-
gether unlike our own. The possibility of persecution was always present
to the Jews, from the time when they first came under a foreign yoke.
Even in a time of great prosperity (and perhaps especially at such a time)
the imagination of a writer could create scenes of peril and of suffering for
the Hebrew faith.

its life. He alludes to Antiochus Epiphanes, and to the desperate strait of
the chosen people, in unmistakable terms ; and in the subsequent chapters
he keeps returning to this theme in a way that shows the supreme place of
importance which it held in all his thought. But how different is the
case in chap. 2 ! There, when the vision reaches its lower end, and
the writer has occasion to present to his readers the most essential
and striking characteristics of the power under whose rule they lived
(vss. 40–43), the one interesting thing which he knows about the Greek
empire is this, that it is not holding together, but because of its geo-
graphical division and the heterogeneous character of its parts it is on
the way to complete disintegration, in spite of the great strength of one
portion of it, and the attempt to preserve its coherence by means of
marriage alliances (vs. 43)! It is perfectly plain that this writer had
never even dreamed of such a time as that of the Maccabees. In his
day, the Jewish people and the Seleucid ruler were only distantly in-
terested in each other.

The conclusion follows, from all this concurring evidence, that *the
book of Daniel consists of two entirely distinct parts, the work of
different authors, one of whom lived in the Maccabean period, and
the other some time earlier.* It is even possible to determine, within
a very few years, the time when the earlier author lived and wrote. The
important passage 2 : 43, of which mention has already been made,
alludes to events (unquestionably, *recent* events) which had seemed to
the narrator and his contemporaries to be of more than ordinary im-
portance. The empire of Alexander was in the process of breaking up,
but an attempt had been made to arrest the process by means of
marriage alliances. Our author and his fellows had witnessed the
failure of the attempt: " They shall mingle through the seed of men,
but shall not cleave together, even as iron does not mingle with clay."
The author of chaps. 7–12, also, in his remarkable summary of the
Seleucid history, mentions, in passing, this same royal wedding from
which much was hoped but little resulted. In 11 : 4 f., after speaking
of the division of the Greek empire upon Alexander's death, and the
might of certain of the rival kings, he proceeds in vs. 6 : "And after
certain years they shall be associated, and the daughter of the king of
the South shall come to the king of the North, to make an alliance ;
but she shall not possess power, nor shall he stand, nor his power ;[1]
but she shall be given up," etc. This, as is well known. is an allusion
to the marriage of Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy II Philadelphus

---

[1] The Greek of Theodotion renders here זַרְעוֹ, " his seed, " instead of וּזְרֹעוֹ
" his arm."

of Egypt, to the Syrian king Antiochus II Theos, which took place in the year 248 B.C. The alliance, following the long war with Egypt, promised a new era of prosperity for Syria and Asia Minor ; but the hope was vain, for a terrible tragedy was the almost immediate result. Laodice, the rejected first wife of Antiochus, poisoned the king in the following year, and murdered Berenice and her child, together with their retainers, a few months later. " The peace of Asia, so recently secured, suddenly vanished. The Seleucid power had ceased to be a unity " (Bevan, *House of Seleucus,* i, 180 f.). This, expressed in the imagery of Dan. 2, was the falling to pieces of the *clay* in the feet of the great statue.[1] The later author, writing in chap. 7, at a time when Syria and Palestine were held fast by the Seleucids, while the Ptolemies were powerful rivals on even terms, could never have thought of the king- doms of the Diadochi as a mixture of clay and iron. In *his* day, there were no obvious conditions that could have suggested such a comparison. But to one who lived and wrote soon after the ill-fated marriage alli- ance above mentioned, the figure would have described the situation exactly. Nor is there any other period, in the history of the Diadochi as it is known to us, when this would have been true in like degree. At that time, Asia Minor had been lost, and the provinces of the Eu- phrates and Tigris as well. After the sinister end of Antiochus II, his two sons were soon arrayed against each other, so that even this element of weakness was added to all the rest. In short, for nearly a whole generation the Seleucid power was reduced to a miserable remnant, in comparison with what it had once been, and with what it was very soon to become once more under Antiochus III the Great. And during just that time, as the most portentous fact of all, came the tremendous onslaught of the Egyptian forces, by land and by sea. Almost simulta- neously with the murder of Berenice, her brother, Ptolemy III Euergetes, the greatest conqueror among the Ptolemies, appeared before Antioch ; and during the greater part of his reign, which extended from 247 to 222 B.C., the dynasty of Seleucus seemed likely to lose even its last possession, Northern Syria. The shattering blows dealt by this Ptolemy, in repeated campaigns, continued to be felt long after his day, not only in Syria but also all the way from Cilicia to Iran. *He and his Egyp- tian armies were the ' iron ' of the image described in Dan. 2, as the Seleucid power was the ' clay.'* "As the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken " 2 : 42 . The use of these words in immediate connection with the mention of *the royal wedding* (vs. 43) makes the allusion as plain as day and places it quite beyond the reach of doubt. As for

---

[1] See also below, the note on 2 : 41.

the Jews, they were then under the Egyptian rule, and presumably favored the cause of Ptolemy Euergetes. The author of these popular tales of Daniel wrote during the reign of this king; at any later time, his comparison would have been pointless, for such a contrast of iron and clay was not seen again in the history of those lands. His book, then, the original "Book of Daniel," must be dated between 245 and 225 B.C.[1] This was simply a story-book, composed just as stories are composed in modern times, and published for the purpose of interesting and edifying the reading public, and the Jewish youth in particular, just as didactic tales are circulated at the present day. It included chaps. 1–6 of our book, in a form which probably differed but slightly from that which we have.

To this older collection of tales, the apocalyptist of the Maccabean time attached his "Visions of Daniel," chaps. 7–12, designed to encourage his compatriots in their desperate conflict with the Syrian king. He preserved the original story-book entire,[2] and we have the whole of

---

[1] This being the case, it may well be—and I myself believe it to be the fact—that the allusions to Daniel in Ezek. 14 : 14, 20, and 28 : 3 are based on this Aramaic story-book. I have for many years felt certain that the book of Ezekiel is a pseudepigraph, written in Judea in the latter part of the Greek period. Nearly all the evidence, external and internal (*all*, in fact, excepting the claim of the book itself), points to this conclusion. We have the best of reasons for believing that the fact of its very late origin continued to be a matter of tradition among the Jewish scholars until the first centuries A.D., namely their hesitation to admit it to the number of the sacred books. It is true that in still later times this hesitation was "explained" as due to the fact that "Ezekiel disagreed with the Pentateuch"; (!) but this is a characteristic obfuscation of the true state of things, just such a statement as we should expect to see made *after* the book had been admitted to the canon. If Ezekiel had disagreed seriously with the Pentateuch (which is not the case), any and every Jewish scholar who believed it to be really an ancient book—as old, say, as Haggai and Zechariah—would have clung to it and exalted it all the more because of its originality. When and where do the many discrepancies in the Old Testament cause the rabbinical mind any uneasiness? It took delight in just such things. The *only* thing that could possibly account for the temporary rejection of Ezekiel is the persistence of the tradition that it was written at a very late date. Judging from the manner of its allusions to the prophet Daniel, it cannot have been written much earlier than 200 B.C. It appears to be the work of a single hand. The statement is often made that it gives evidence of having been written in Babylonia ; but this is not at all the case.

[2] I have not the least doubt that the "Additions to Daniel," namely the Song of the Three. the Story of Susanna, and the tale of Bel and the Dragon,

the addition which he made. It must not be supposed that he simply appended his apocalypses, without giving them any close internal con- nection with the older narrative. On the contrary, it was his purpose to make the new Book of Daniel appear a unity, and he wrought skilfully to this end. His first Vision, contained in chap. 7, is based conspicuously on the first dream of Nebuchadnezzar, narrated in chap. 2. The con- nection between the two has never failed to attract attention. So far as the essential content of the revelation is concerned, chap. 7 is simply chap. 2 brought down to date. Further evidence of this wish to make an impression of unity may be seen in the way in which the Visions are dated. The original narrative covered the reigns of the four kings, Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius Hystaspis,[1] and Cyrus, all of whom received mention. The apocalyptic writer chooses dates from the reigns of three of these four in succession—and, as we have seen, commits a blunder in the case of the last one. Another, and still more obvious, point of attachment to the work of his predecessor is seen in the phrase : "Afterward I rose up, and *did the king's business*," in 8 : 27.

One very important feature of the composition of the book has thus far been left out of account, though it contains what is perhaps the strongest single argument for the correctness of the conclusions just stated ; I mean, *the very singular alternation of the two languages, Hebrew and Aramaic.* No satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon has ever been given, nor could be given so long as it is assumed that the book is the work of a single hand. But when the fact of composition and the aim of the later writer, as above described, are recognized, the solution of the riddle of the two languages is at once manifest, to the very last detail. We have here a very natural and very effectual device for concealing the fact of dual authorship. What Kamphausen says (though with quite a different intent in his article " Daniel " in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 1005, is eminently true : " The change of language serves to bind the different parts of the book into a firmer unity." The original story of Daniel was written *in Aramaic*, chap. 1 as well as chaps. 2–6. The Maccabean author wished to write his Visions *in Hebrew*, for reasons which are sufficiently obvious. If he had simply affixed his Hebrew composition to the Aramaic book—which so plainly came to its end in 6 : 29 !—the two parts could never have had the appearance of a unity ; nor could they have held together long, especially

were originally written in Aramaic or Hebrew, and that the Greek which we have is a translation. These formed no part of the original book, how- ever, but were added to one of the early recensions. See further the note on 3 : 23.

[1] See the explanation given above.

since the Aramaic book had already been in circulation. He accordingly
made a dove-tail joint which was both as simple, and as effective, as
anything of the kind that can be found in all literature. He wrote *the
first* of his Visions, chap. 7, *in Aramaic* ; it is thus inseparable, on the
one hand, from the preceding chapters, while on the other hand its
contents and necessary connection with the following visions of the series
render it quite inseparable from chaps. 8–12. But even this was not
enough ; the dove-tailing process had need of another step, in order to
be absolutely finished. *He translated into Hebrew the introductory
part of the older narrative.* By so doing he united the beginning of
the book most securely to the later chapters which he himself had
written, while on the other hand this introduction was indispensable to
the stories which immediately followed it ! This is all very well planned ;
but his skill appears to the best advantage in the way in which he
effects the transition from Hebrew to Aramaic. Where could he finish
with the one, and begin with the other, with the least detriment to the
appearance of literary unity ? His answer to this question is the best
possible, and a very obvious one—now that we have it before us. He
continues the Hebrew to the point where the " Chaldeans " begin their
address to the king, in 2 : 4. From that point on, he leaves the Aramaic
as he found it.[1]

---

[1] We could not expect to find in the Hebrew of chap. 1 traces showing
that it is translated from the Aramaic. The writer was at home in both
languages, the narrative was of the simplest, and he was under no obligation
to render closely. Nevertheless, I believe that slight traces of the process
can really be seen. Aramaic idioms abound, of course, in all the Hebrew
of Daniel, but there is no chapter, nor extended passage, in the book in
which the Aramaisms are so heaped upon one another as in chap. 1. See,
in support of this statement, the list of noteworthy words and constructions
in the Hebrew of Daniel collected by Driver in his *Introduction*. Most noticeable
of all, perhaps, is the barbarism אֲשֶׁר לָמָּה, in vs. 10. Regarded as an exact
transfer of the common Aramaic דִּי לְמָה, " lest " (e. g. Ezra 7 : 23), it is at
once fully explained. I do not believe that a writer who was composing in
Hebrew *a simple, popular prose narrative* of this nature would ever have used
this phrase. But the translators of that period often stuck ridiculously close
to their originals, as we know. Another phrase which may be mentioned is
in vs. 9 : וַיִּתֵּן הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת דָּנִיֵּאל לְחֶסֶד וּלְרַחֲמִים לִפְנֵי שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים
" And God gave Daniel favor and compassion before the prince of the eunuchs "
(notice especially the use of the preposition לְ). We know that this was a
stock idiom in the Aramaic of the Persian period, for in the copy of the letter
from Elephantine, published by Sachau *(Drei aramäische Papyrusurkunden,* p. 7),
line 2, we find words which exactly correspond to those in Daniel : וּלְרַחֲמִין

After the union had once been effected, in this manner, it was not at all easy to break it. Even if the attempt had been made to maintain the authority of the old Aramaic Daniel of our first six chapters, the claim could at once have been made on the other hand—and it would have been made successfully—that *the original Daniel* had twice that extent, as proved by its Hebrew beginning and by the Aramaic seventh chapter. And so in modern times, in spite of all the plain evidence of dual authorship in the book, scholars have felt compelled to maintain its unity simply because the alternation of the two languages defeats every ordinary attempt at analysis ; and the idea that an ancient Hebrew redactor might have exercised some ingenuity has not been seriously considered. The composition of Daniel is very much like that of Zechariah. There, also, a series of striking pictures, connected with a Hebrew prophet and dealing more or less with prophetic visions, was taken as the basis to which to attach a series of predictions composed in the Greek period. In that instance, the addition of the later writing, effected by some editorial hand, was presumably more difficult, since the older book had been much longer in circulation. The composite character of Zechariah is now quite generally recognized ; but the evidence of composition there is hardly stronger than in the case of Daniel, and is certainly not as many-sided.

The Aramaic of the book of Daniel is the Palestinian dialect of the second and third centuries B.C. The discovery of the Jewish Aramaic papyri of Assuan and Elephantine has at last enabled us to declare with certainty what hitherto had only seemed probable. The language of the Aramaic passages in Ezra, which were all composed in the third century, is identical with that of Daniel. For a more extended statement of some of the peculiarities of the dialect at this stage of its development, I would refer to my article in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, April, 1908, pp. 232–237 ; reprinted in my forthcoming *Ezra Studies*, pp. 161–166.

The text of our massoretic recension of Daniel has suffered considerably from carelessness in transmission. In a large number of places, some of which will be noticed below, words or phrases necessary to the sense have been dropped out by accident, so that it is certain that the book passed through the hand of at least one copyist who transcribed hastily and without collating his copy after it was made. On the

---

ישׂימנך ואלהא] קדם דריוהוש מלכא ; " And may God give thee compassion before Darius the king." The idiom is also found (though rarely) in Hebrew however, and it can therefore not be allowed much weight.

other hand, the massoretic *pointing* of the Aramaic text is of the greatest
value. The more carefully it is studied, the more certain becomes the
conclusion that it has preserved with great fidelity an old and generally
trustworthy tradition. At the time when the vocalization was fixed, it
was not only the case that Aramaic of this same general type was the
native tongue of the men who did this editorial work, but it was also
true that many forms and modes of pronunciation which had passed
out of ordinary use were still perfectly well understood by these Jewish
scholars. Illustration of this will appear in the sequel. It must also be
borne in mind—and the fact is generally not appreciated—that in the
many cases of disagreement between *qerē* and *ketib* the massoretes are
generally not *correcting* the consonant text, but simply preserving a
parallel reading. They neither misunderstood the forms which they have
given us in the *ketib*, nor disapproved of them ; they merely wished, in
each case of the kind, to record also another tradition which seemed
to them worthy of preservation, and this was the only way in which
they could do so. I do not see how it can be doubted that in all such
instances as שְׁלָה, 3 : 29 ; אָחֳרִין, 4 : 5 ; רִבְיַת, 4 : 19 ; מְטָת, 4 : 21 ;
those who first introduced the variant pronunciation understood perfectly
the meaning of the *ketib* (see the notes, below, on the passages cited).
I also believe that in all of *the cases just named* we may take it for
granted that they regarded the consonant text as giving the better reading ;
that is, *if they had been obliged to choose between the two readings,*
rejecting absolutely the one or the other, they would have adopted the
ketib.

Our Aramaic text is of an old and excellent type. It is better than
that which lay before Theodotion, though the difference is not great,
and is far superior to that which was rendered by the old Greek trans-
lator. The date of this last-named version [1] was not far from the middle
of the second century B.C. (*Ezra Studies,* pp. 82–85). The text which
we have, preserved in the single cursive and the Syro-Hexaplar version,
follows in chaps. 1–3 and 7 a recension which differs only slightly from
that of the massoretes ; in chaps. 4–6, on the other hand, it embodies
a widely different and much inferior recension ; see the note on 4 : 12,
the footnote at the end.

The following scattered notes may help to determine the original text
in some places, and will perhaps be found to throw some light on certain
notoriously difficult passages.

---

[1] Of the first six chapters only, in its original form ? There are several
questions here which call for further investigation.

2 : 4 נֵחְוֵא. It is preposterous to "emend" this to the *hafel*, as Marti does in both grammar and commentary. The *pael* is the usual stem in Syriac, and there is no reason why the Jews should not have used both forms, as in so many other verbs. We know very little about the Palestinian Aramaic of this period, and here is a precious opportunity to learn something. It is a somewhat similar case when the *hafel* of הְלִךְ, found in 3 : 25 and 4 : 34, is altered simply on the basis of our ignorance to the *pael*, by Marti, Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, and others. These instances are typical of a mode of procedure which is unfortunately very wide spread at present.

2 : 5, 8 אַזְדָּא. This is an *adjective* with the feminine absolute ending, and it has the meaning "*sure*." So much is made certain by the comparison of these two passages with the Strassburg Aramaic papyrus, published by Euting in the *Mémoires présentés . . . . à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres*, Paris, 1903, and since then discussed by numerous other scholars. The word was given this meaning by Kern, in the ZDMG, vol. xxiii (1869), p. 220, but he supposed it to be the simple transfer of the Persian *azdā*, and the אָ to be the Persian ending. This is the view which has been held by the most of those who accept the theory of foreign origin. Recently, another explanation of the word has been given. Andreas, in the Glossary of Marti's *Grammatik der biblisch-aramäischen Sprache* (1896), interprets it as the Persian *noun*, with the meaning "Kunde, Nachricht"—although this results in mere nonsense in both of the passages in Daniel.

In the Jewish papyrus from Elephantine which is now in Strassburg the same word occurs, by good fortune, in the form אזד, without the final *ā*. The phrase in which it occurs is this (col. ii, lines 3–5):
הן אוד יתעבד מן דינא · · · · יתידע למראן לקבל זנה זי אנחנה אמרן
"If it [the matter just stated] shall be *certified* by the judges, ... then our lord will know that it was just as we have said." In this case also, Andreas holds to his interpretation of the word as a noun (*Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik*, ii, 214, note 2), and Lidzbarski, who accepts his guidance, renders thus: " Wenn zuverlässige Nachricht seitens der Richter . . . . gegeben wird, dann wird sie (die Nachricht) sich unserm Herrn als übereinstimmend mit dem herausstellen, was wir gesagt haben " *ibid.*, pp. 216 f.). But the comparison of the passages in Daniel makes it certain, on the contrary, that we have here also *a predicate adjective*. It is an adjective, not a noun, that the sense demands : " If it shall be made *sure*;" [1] and since in this case the

---

[1] With a noun meaning " Nachricht, Kunde," etc. the verb יתעבד would not have been used.

gender required is masculine (not feminine, as in Dan. : מלתא מני אזדא '),
the word is written without the feminine ending.

Whatever the prevailing use of the word may have been in the original
Persian, we have now conclusive evidence that in the Jewish Aramaic
of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries B.C. it was used *as an adjective*
with the meaning " sure "; and that it was inflected like any native
word, the absol. masc. sing. being אזד (pronounced אַזַד, or אָזָד?) and
the absol. fem. sing. אזדא. How extensively, or for how long a time,
the word was used, we have not the means of knowing. It was quite
obsolete, certainly, at the time when that massoretic tradition arose
which pointed it as a participle, אָזְדָא, in the Daniel passages. In all
probability, the verb אזד (= אזל) which occurs a few times in late Jewish
Aramaic (see Levy, *s. v.*) and at least once in Syriac (Payne Smith, col.
105) had its sole origin in this newly created participle in Daniel.

2 : 5 הדמין תתעבדון. Compare μέλη ποιήσαντες, ii Macc. 1 : 16.
I have no longer any doubt that the two letters prefixed to ii Macc.
are genuine letters sent from Jews in Jerusalem to their brethren in
Egypt (see my defence of their authenticity in the *Zeitschrift für die
alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* xx (1900), 240 ff.); and it seems to me
now probable that the original language of both letters was Aramaic
rather than Hebrew, in view of such words and idioms as וּכְעָנֶת, καὶ
νῦν, 1 : 6 ; לפום פרנא, εἰς φερνῆς λόγον, 1 : 14 ; הדמין עבדו, μέλη
ποιήσαντες, 1 : 16. So also the copyist's error in the original of 1 : 10,
יהודיא for יהודיא, whence καὶ 'Ιούδας instead of τῶν 'Ιουδαίων, would
have been easier in Aramaic than in Hebrew.[2] The character of the
legends contained in these two letters, ii Macc. 1 : 1–9 and 1 : 10–2 : 18,
which were composed in Aramaic *and sent* (officially) *from " the
Jews of Jerusalem and Judea " to the Jewish church in Egypt* suggests
that the stories of Daniel were probably taken more seriously among
those who first heard and read them, than we might be inclined to
suppose.

2 : 6 לְהֵן. This word has remained a puzzle. Scholars have generally
agreed that it must be distinguished from the compound of לֹא and
הֵן, corresponding to the Hebrew אִם לֹא and having the same series

---

[1] Observe that in vs. 8, where the phrase is repeated, the adjective is
put first for the sake of added emphasis.

[2] My identification (*ibid.* pp. 231 f.) of the "Antiochus" of 1 : 13–16
with Antiochus VII Sidetes receives strong additional support, as I believe,
from *Megillath Taanith*, xi, end (see Dalman's comment, *Aramäische Dialekt-
proben*, p. 34). The day when Antiochus Sidetes withdrew from Jerusalem
(134 B.C.) *was celebrated as a feast day for at least two centuries.*

of meanings : " unless, except, but, only, however "; the word which occurs, for example, in Dan. 2 : 11, 30. 6 : 6, 8. Ezr. 5 : 12, and very frequently elsewhere. There are a few passages in which the hypothesis of *this* compound has seemed to serve with difficulty, if at all. The most important of these is line 10 of the Aramaic inscription from Teima (CIS. ii, 113 ; Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epigraphik,* p. 447 ; Cooke, *North Sem. Inscriptions,* p. 195). The first part of the inscription tells how Salmšezeb, the priest, honored the gods of Teima. The text then proceeds : " *Therefore* להן) the gods of Teima made a grant to Salmšczeb and to his seed," etc. A similar meaning of the same word, vocalized לָהֵן, seems to be called for in Ruth 1 : 13 (twice), this time in a *Hebrew* text : " Even if I should bear sons, could ye *therefore* wait till they were grown ? could ye *therefore* refrain from having husbands ? " The rendering might be weakened to " then " (German " also "), but it is at least plain that no use of the Hebrew אִם לֹא would do here. And finally, there are three passages in Daniel, namely 2 : 6, 9, and 4 : 24, in which אִם לֹא in any of its recognized meanings would be out of place, and the natural translation of לָהֵן is " therefore."

Those who understand the word thus have explained its origin in various ways. Gesenius-Buhl. *Handwörterbuch*[12] : " Zusammengesetzt aus לְ und הֵן " (highly useful information ! . Stade, *Grammatik,* p. 210, regarded it as compounded of the preposition and the suffix pronoun of the fem. third plural. Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epigr.,* s. v. הֵן, supposes the second part of the compound to be the interjection " behold." Similarly Marti, *Grammatik.* § 96[d] : " eine Verstärkung von הֵן in der ursprünglichen Bedeutung von *siehe.*" Cooke, *North Sem. Inscriptions,* p. 197, has : " הֵן *if* + לְ, *then, therefore,*" but omits to explain how this remarkable development of meaning could have taken place. Kautzsch, *Grammatik,* Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Lexicon,* Bevan, *Comm.,* and most others, venture no explanation.

Marti quite overlooks the fact that his theory of the word fails to account for its vocalization. " Eine Verstärkung von הֵן " could not possibly produce in Aramaic !) לָהֵן, but only לְהֵן. Nor is the combination of the preposition with the interjection at all probable on general grounds. I believe that the vowel-pointing in the Biblical passages represents the actual pronunciation ; that the word לָהֵן " therefore " in Hebrew is a borrowing from the Aramaic, and not *vice versa*; and that the word in *all* cases, whether meaning " except " or " therefore," originated in the same combination of the negative לֹא and the conditional particle הֵן. That is, I believe that the use of this compound

covered more shades of meaning in western Aramaic than elsewhere,
extending through the whole series : " unless, except, but, only, however,
then, accordingly, therefore." By supposing this looseness of usage it
is possible to account for all the facts connected with the history of
the word. The difficulty of the supposition is very much lessened by
the fact that in western Aramaic the form of the word has concealed
its origin, making the case quite unlike that of Heb. אִם לֹא and Syr.
אֶלָּא, in both of which the compound is obvious and the range of
meaning necessarily restricted.

2 : 7 וּפִשְׁרָהּ. This might, of course, be pointed הַ_, as in most of
the ancient versions. But the preference should always be given to the
massoretic tradition in such cases, because of what we know of its
relative excellence in the Aramaic of Daniel. As for the occasional
writing of final *ā* with ה instead of א, that is one of the many interesting
characteristics of this period in the history of the written language.
Thus even לָהּ for לָא, for example, in 4 : 32.

2 : 8 כָּל קְבֵל. It is the universal custom, in grammars, dictionaries,
and commentaries, to speak of this as a division of the word " mistakenly "
made by the massoretes. It is true that the original was כ + לָקְבֵל,
as has been (or might have been) known ever since Luzzatto's grammar
(1865) ; but the shifting of the vowel was a most natural phonetic change,
and we have no reason to doubt that it was actually made in the popular
speech. As for the custom of dividing the word in writing, those who
object to it must refuse to allow בְּשֶׁל אֲשֶׁר, Eccles. 8 : 17, the Arabic

مِلْ أَشْيَاءَ, etc., and a hundred similar cases in various living languages.

2 : 8, 9. The interpreters, ancient and modern, have failed to see
that the massoretes have made the verse-division in the wrong place.
The last word in vs. 8 should be דתכון, which now stands at the end
of the first clause in vs. 9. The whole sentence from כל קבל to דתכון
is parenthetical. The translation : " The king answered and said, I know
of a certainty that ye would gain time—since ye see that the word from
me is sure, (namely) that if ye do not tell me the dream, one fate is
for you all ;—and ye have planned to speak lying and corrupt words
before me till the time be changed."

2 : 10 יוּכַל. This form and תוּכַל, 5 : 16 *ketīb*, are very likely Hebra-
isms ; but this is by no means certain, even in view of יְכֵל, 3 : 29, etc.
In any case, by what right is the text " emended " here (as in Kittel's
Biblia Hebraica)? Is it inconceivable—or even unlikely—that the
popular speech of that time should inconsistently have mixed Hebraisms
with pure Aramaic forms? It is better to interpret the text which

we have than to rewrite it according to our ideas of good Aramaic usage.

2 : 16 וּפִשְׁרָא לְהַחֲוָיָה לְמַלְכָּא. There is a characteristic gerundial construction of the infinitive preceded by *waw*, which is frequent in the Palestinian dialect (both Aramaic and the later Hebrew) and is sometimes misunderstood by modern interpreters. It may be rendered by the passive voice, or by supplying some such phrase as " *it was intended.*" This verse reads : " Daniel entered and asked of the king that he would grant him time, and the interpretation *would be shown* to the king." Marti, Grammar, *in loc.* but not in his commentary) says : " Wahrscheinlich ist hier חֶלְמָא ausgefallen," namely, just before the word וּפִשְׁרָא. But the text is right as it stands. A similar case is 1 : 5, וּלְגַדְּלָם. The passage reads : " And the king appointed them a portion for each day, from the dainties of the king and from the wine which he drank ; and *they were to be educated* for three years, at the end of which time they should stand before the king." Here Marti, *Comm.*, Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, and others, propose to transfer this infinitive, together with all of that part of vs. 5 which follows it, to the end of vs. 4 ! This is merely one variety of the idiom described in Nöldeke, *Syrische Gramm.*[2], p. 216, below ; Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Gramm.*, § 114, h, k, etc.

2 : 17 מִישָׁאֵל. If I am not mistaken, this name, which occurs several times in the later parts of the Old Testament, was originally מִישַׁע-אֵל, " Help of God." Similarly, I believe that the name Samuel, שְׁמוּאֵל, is in its origin a contraction of שְׁמוּעַ-אֵל, " Heard of God," cf. ישמעאל etc. If this is true, these names furnish early examples of that occasional suppression of the guttural ע which is so noticeable in the later dialects, especially in Aramaic. I hope to discuss this subject at some length elsewhere.

2 : 24. Of the two verbs, עַל and אֲזַל, given in this verse by MT, one is manifestly superfluous. The former was not in the text rendered by Theodotion ; the latter has no equivalent in the old Greek version.[1] Evidently the preposition עַל was dittographed by mistake. The original had אֲזַל only.

2 : 29 רַעְיוֹנָךְ סְלִקוּ, " Thy thoughts *arose.*" This Palestinian idiom (cf. Isaiah 65 : 17 and the citation in i Cor. 2 : 9), which is both Hebrew and Aramaic, plainly underlies the Greek of Luke 24 : 38 and Acts 7 : 23.

2 : 31. It is obvious that the word שַׂגִּיא is impossible where it stands. It does not mean " great " (in size),[2] and even if it did, it could not

---

[1] Marti, *Gramm.*, and Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, are mistaken in supposing that the old Greek did not render עַל.

[2] In 2 : 6 and 4 : 7, the two other passages which are cited in Brown-Driver-Briggs in support of this meaning, the correct-translation is "exceeding," and the word is an exact synonym of יַתִּיר.

thus stand side by side with the unqualified רב‎ which immediately follows. We have here the result of a copyist's error, which was caused by the twofold mention of the image, coupled with the resemblance of the two words רב‎ and הד‎. The original text was certainly: ואלו צלם‎ שגיא‎ the adverbial ‎הד, צלמא דבן רב שגיא וזיוה יתיר, קאם לקבלך‎ following the word רב‎. This seems to be what actually stood before the old Greek translator: καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰκὼν μία, καὶ ἦν ἡ εἰκὼν ἐκείνη μεγάλη σφόδρα, καὶ ἡ πρόσοψις αὐτῆς (reading רוה‎ for זוה‎) ὑπερφερὴς ἑστήκει ἐναντίον σου. "Thou, O king, didst behold, and lo, an image—that image was very great, and its splendor exceeding—standing before thee, and its appearance was terrible."

2:33 מנהון‎ (twice), also vss. 41 (twice) and 42 (twice). It is better to follow the consonant text and write מנהון‎ in all these cases, since the evidence is so abundant that *in the popular speech,* both in Aramaic and in Hebrew, the personal pronoun of the third person plural was epicene.

2:38. The English version reads: "And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee to rule over them all. Thou art the head of gold." This would be a glorious kingdom, certainly, but not glorious enough for this context. Nor has any plausible explanation of the verse ever been given. The trouble lies in the misunderstanding of the idiom בכל די דארין‎, which is merely a translation of the Greek ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ. The word דארין‎ illustrates *the use of the indefinite third person plural in place of the passive voice,* which is so characteristic of the Aramaic of this time; cf. יהודיעון‎ in vs. 30, the participle מצבעין‎ in 4:22, and many other passages. "In all which *they* inhabit" is the current way of saying "In every (place) which *is inhabited.*" At the time when the story of Daniel was written, this phrase must have been in such common use that no one would have made the mistake of connecting בני אנשא‎ with the preceding rather than with the following words. The passage should be rendered: "And in all the world (or, more literally, ' the inhabited world') he hath given into thine hand the sons of men. the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven, and hath made thee to rule over them all."

2:40. This verse has caused much unnecessary difficulty, chiefly because of the massoretic accentuation (that miserable substitute for punctuation, as modern scholars try to use it). The verse should read: ומלכו רביעיא תהוא תקיפה כפרזלא, כל קבל די פרזלא מהדק וחשל‎ כלא; וכפרזלא די מרעע, כל אלין תדק יתרע‎ "And a fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron, inasmuch as iron breaketh and crusheth all

things ; and like the iron (implement) which shattereth, it shall break and shatter all these." כָּל אִלֵּין refers of course to the other kingdoms. This is the text which lay before the old Greek translator (though he seems to have made the last word, וְתֵרַע, contain some form of אַרַע, "earth"). The text rendered by Theodotion (followed by Marti, *Comm.*, Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*) and the Vulgate is later and inferior.

2 : 41 חֲסַף טִינָא. The second word of this compound describes the *kind* of " clay," of which there were doubtless several well known varieties. As I have shown in the introduction, the author represented by the " iron " of the toes the victorious power of Egypt, which under Ptolemy III Euergetes was showing some of the portentous strength (מִן נִצְבְּתָא) of Alexander's own kingdom, and was just then shattering and crushing what seemed to be the last remnants of the Seleucid " clay," in Northern Syria. In all probability, the word טִינָא was intended to designate 'an *inferior,* " miry " sort of clay, and the writer thus' expressed his low opinion of the weak and crumbling West-Asiatic kingdom, whose utter annihilation he may well have expected to see. So the old Greek translator, whose interpretation is always likely to be valuable because of its age, renders ἄμα τῷ πηλίνῳ ὀστράκῳ.[1]

2 : 42, 43. As has already been remarked, the style of this writer is somewhat repetitious. In these verses 41—43, however, the reason for the reiteration is very obvious. Every detail here must be given extraordinary emphasis, for this is the all-important point where the prediction reaches events of the writer's own day (cf. the corresponding verses, 23—25, in chap. 7).[2]

2 : 45. Here, again, the massoretes have divided the verses incorrectly. All the first part of " vs. 45," as far as וְדַהֲבָא, belongs to vs. 44. The rest, from אֱלָהּ on, ought to have been set apart as distinctly as possible.

2 : 48 מְדִינַת בָּבֶל, " the *province* of Babylonia." It is an interesting question, at what time the prevailing use of the word מְדִינָה passed over from the signification of " province, district " to that of " city." In the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra, and also in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, including Esther, Koheleth, and Dan. 8—12, the word seems to mean

---

[1] Theodotion (or, more probably, the man who had edited the text which Theodotion rendered) did not understand the phrase, and left out the word טִינָא. Hence De Goeje, Marti, Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, and others, would omit the word, both here and in vs. 43. (They do not seem to have noticed that they would then further be obliged to change כָּחֲסַף to כְּחַסְפָּא, in both verses.)

[2] According to Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, vss. 42 and 43 are " probably a later addition "!

uniformly " province." On the other hand, the old Greek translation of Dan. 11 : 24 renders it by πόλις; and this version, as I have shown elsewhere,[1] was made not long after the middle of the second century B.C. By the second century A.D., the meaning " city " was the usual one, in Jewish Aramaic as well as in the northern (Syriac) dialect. Thus we have מדינת כלקים in the *Megillath Taanith*; and the translator Symmachus even corrects the χώρα of the older Greek versions of the Old Testament to πόλις, in i Kings 20 : 14, Dan. 8 : 2 , and (presumably) the conflate Hexaplar text of Neh. 1 : 3, ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἐν τῇ πόλει.[2] It must be borne in mind that πόλις is a flat mistranslation in these cases, especially noticeable in Dan. 8 : 2, " In the city ! Elam," showing that the signification " province," for מדינה, was then nearly or quite obsolete. Hence also, probably, the corruption of the text of Ezra 6 : 2 (apparently omitting די במדי' which lay before Theodotion. But the most important mistranslation of this sort, marking the vanishing use of מדינה = " province," is found in the New Testament Gospels, in Luke 1 : 39. The Greek reads: ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὴν ὀρεινὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ζαχαρίου, κ.τ.ἑ. " And Mary arose in those days and went into the hill country with haste, *to the city (?) of Judah (?)*; and entered into the house of Zachariah," etc. This cannot be " to *a* city of Judah," which would be εἰς πόλιν τῆς Ἰουδαίας, cf. vs. 26. The only permissible rendering is " to the city named Judah ;" but this will not do, for there was no city which could be referred to in this way. Nor has any commentator been able to suggest a plausible explanation of this phrase. But when we compare vs. 65, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ὀρεινῇ τῆς Ἰουδαίας; 2 : 4, ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσὴφ . . . . ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρὲθ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, etc., it is obvious that the Greek of 1 : 39 contains another mistranslation of the obsolescent מדינה = " province." What the evangelist wrote was either (Hebrew) אֶל מְדִינַת יְהוּדָה, or else (Aramaic) לִיהוּד מְדִינְתָּא; and the translation should have been: εἰς τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας, " *to the province of Judea.*" Cf. the occurrences of this phrase in Ezra 5 : 8, Neh. 1 : 3, 11 : 3, and in ii Macc. 1 : 1, ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας. This is absolutely certain proof that the first two chapters of Luke were originally written in a Semitic language, and it is the only sure proof which has thus far been rendered.

2 : 48 " And he gave him authority over all the province of Baby-lonia, and [*appointed him*] chief prefect over all the wise men of

---

[1] See above, at the end of the introduction ; also *Ezra Studies*, pp. 82–85.

[2] See the *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in memory of W. R. Harper*, vol. ii, pp. 104 f.

Babylon." The text may be right as it stands, though the zeugma is an awkward one. Perhaps, however, some such word as שָׂמֵהּ has accidentally fallen out after רַב סַגְנִין. The old Greek ἀπέδειξεν αὐτὸν may be allowed a little weight, since the translator was not obliged to insert another verb here (cf Theodotion).

3 : 2. The word תִּיפְתָּיֵא, as an official title, has now been found in the Egyptian papyri.

3 : 2, 3. The threefold repetition of the phrase, "which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up," within the compass of two verses, is intolerable ; and it may be doubted whether even this writer, with all his fondness for repeating himself, should bear the whole blame. It is not likely that he himself wrote the phrase *both* times in vs. 3 ; and when it is observed how in its first occurrence there it immediately follows the words לַחֲנֻכַת צַלְמָא, exactly as in vs. 2, the conjecture becomes very probable that in this case its presence is due to an ordinary scribal error. The ancient versions give no help, for they all render a text identical with MT in these verses.[1]

3 : 4 כָּרוֹזָא. It has often been asserted, most recently by Marti, *Comm.*, that "the root כרז" is found in an Aramaic inscription of the pre-Grecian time. The inscription in question is CIS. ii, 86. It is a seal, the provenience of which is unknown, dating from the fifth or sixth century, or even earlier. It reads : לכרזי, i. e., "(the seal of KRZI." This is the proper name of the owner, presumably a non-Semitic name ; there is no likelihood at all that the idea of "heralding" was ever contained in it.

3 : 5 קַתְרֹס. This vowel-pointing. *qathros* for Greek κίθαρις, is precisely as valuable as that of אַפֶּתֹם, *appethos*, for ἐπίθεσις, in Ezr. 4 : 13. See the *Am. Journ. of Sem. Languages*, xxiv (1908), p. 247 ; *Ezra Studies*, p. 175.

3 : 13 הֵיתָיוּ. So also 6 : 18, הֵיתָיִת. "Emending" such forms as these as most of our commentators and editors do, is like melting down unique and priceless ancient coins in order to make modern jewelry.

3 : 14 הַצְדָּא. The ה is the interrogative particle, and it is prefixed to a noun in the adverbial accusative, namely the infinitive of the verb יְצַד. The phrase means "*Is it true?*" and Theodotion's εἰ ἀληθῶς is an exact rendering.

---

[1] Marti, *Gramm.*, asserts that Theodotion omits the phrase at the end of vs. 2 ; and in the apparatus of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* we are told that he omitted it at the end of vs. 4. But both statements are mistaken. Whoever leans on Codex B leans on a broken reed.

The root יצר is found elsewhere only in Arabic, in the verb وَصَدَ,
imperf. يَصِدُ. This is said by the native lexicographers to be a syno-
nym of ثبت "to be sure, firmly established."[1] The verbal noun צְדָה
is the customary old form, like עֵטָא (2 : 14) from יעט, *חֲמָא (חֲמָא,
3 : 19; נֶחֱמָא, 3 : 13) from יחם, *שְׁנָה (שִׁנְתָּה, 6 : 19) from ישׁן, etc.[2]
The shortening of the initial vowel is a well known practice, both in
Aramaic (notice the forms of חֲמָא. above ; one in the verse immediately
preceding !) and in Hebrew (מֶרְדָה in Gen. 46 : 3). And, following the
usual tendency, הַצְדָא was pronounced הַצְדָא. The massoretic pointing
is, as usual, based on a genuine old tradition. Everything about the
word is perfectly regular, and both form and meaning suit the context
exactly. Nor is any other treatment of the word possible, while the
text is left unaltered.

3 : 16. I have no doubt that in the original text of this verse the
words מלכא and נבוכדנצר were transposed. "They answered and
said *to Nebuchadnezzar, O king,* we have no need to answer thee in
this matter " (cf. vs. 9, etc.). They would not have been represented
as addressing the king by his name.

3 : 16 חַשְׁחִין. The pointing of this word with short $\breve{a}$ in the first
syllable does not mean at all that it was regarded "as an adjective "
(Marti) ; it is simply an instance of the (later) popular *pronunciation* of
certain words and forms which originally contained the vowel $\bar{a}$. The
massoretic tradition has given us, sporadically and quite inconsistently,
a good many examples of this sort. Such are הֲוָת, Dan. 2 : 25, Ezr.
4 : 24, 5 : 5 ; מְחָת, Dan. 2 : 34 f. ; מְטָת, Dan. 4 : 19 ; עֲנָת, Dan. 5 : 10 ;

---

[1] We know only a small part of the vocabulary of the Aramaic speech,
and we are very far from being acquainted with all the roots which were
in common use in the other North-Semitic languages. I have shown, for
instance (*OT. and Sem. Studies in memory of W. R. Harper*, ii, 79, note ; *Ezra
Studies*, p. 85), how the old Greek version of Dan. 2 : 5, 3 : 29 and of Ezr.
6 : 11, bears sure testimony to the existence of a Syro-Palestinian verb נול,
"take, obtain "; a root which (aside from the last line of the Tabnit in-
scription, where it has remained unrecognized) is known elsewhere *only in
Arabic.*

[2] The use of this class of verbal nouns was already vanishing from the
Aramaic speech. See Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 111, and notes 3 and
4. "Nur das Bibl. Aram. gebraucht die in ihm vorkommenden Bildungen
dieser Art ganz nach der ursprünglichen Weise."

[3] The word רְבָה. Dan. 4 : 19 *(qerē)*, is *not* an example of the kind : see
the note there.

חֲבַל, Dan. 3 : 25 ; עֲקַר, Dan. 4 : 12 ; שְׁעָתָא, several times in Dan. ;
יְקָר, Dan. 4 : 33 ; כְּתַב, Ezr. 7 : 22 ; יְרַךְ, Ezr. 6 : 5 ; מֶהֵךְ (some texts),
Ezr. 7 : 13 ; אֲדְרַע, Ezr. 4 : 23 ; שְׁלְטָן, Dan. 4 : 31 ; שְׁנָיָא, Dan. 7 : 19 ;
and finally חֲשַׁחָן, Ezr. 6 : 9 ; these (and some others less well supported)
were pronounced with *ă*, instead of the usual pointing with ָ . At the time
when these texts were written, all the words above mentioned were
probably pronounced with the long vowel. At the time when the vocali-
zation was fixed, however, the use of the short vowel was becoming
customary, at least in some localities ; and as a witness to this important
fact it is well to keep in our standard texts the best-attested examples
of the kind.

Observe especially that this same participle, חַשְׁחִין, with the short
vowel, occurs in Ezr. 6 : 9 in the fem. third plural, in the phrase וּמָה חַשְׁחָן,
"And whatever things are needful " (see my forthcoming *Ezra Studies*,
p. 194).

3 : 16 פִּתְגָם. I have already, in editing and annotating the Aramaic
text of Ezra, expressed the opinion that this word is most probably the
Greek φθέγμα. The fact that in Greek it is used chiefly in poetry and
high style is not a weighty argument against the derivation, since it is
notoriously the fact that word-borrowing often proceeds in unexpected
ways. In both Western and Eastern Aramaic פתגם always means simply
" *word* " (or " thing," etc., like דבר) ; never " message," nor " answer,"
nor " command," as is so often said.

3 : 17 הֵן אִתַי. The word הן cannot be rendered " Behold " (Vulgate ;
Ewald ; margin of English Revised Version) ; nor, on the other hand, is
it correct to translate : " If our God, whom we serve, is able," etc., as
is done by nearly all modern interpreters. הֵן אִתַי is used here exactly
like וְיֵשׁ in ii Kings 10 : 15 (with which cf. וְלֹא in 5 : 17). That is, it
contains within itself the whole protasis ; what follows is the conclusion.
" *If it be so* (i. e., if the sentence of the king is executed), our God,
whom we serve, is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace ;
and he will deliver us from thine hand, O king. But even if he shall not
do so, be it known to thee, O king," etc. If we possessed an Aramaic text
punctuated with reference to the logical division of sentences,[1] it would

---

[1] It is a pity that the help which we find indispensable in our Greek and
Latin Bibles (as in all other modern editions of ancient classical texts) should
be denied us in our Hebrew Bible, where it is at least equally necessary ;
while the obsolete and intolerably burdensome *accentuation*—which never was
a system of " Punctuation " in our sense of the term, and if thus used is
almost always misleading, the only question being how great the degree in
each case—is still retained even in our latest editions. A Hebrew Bible

read in some such way as this: הֵן אִתַי; אֱלָהָנָא· דִי אֲנַחְנָא פָלְחִין· יְכָל
·לְשֵׁיזָבוּתַנָא מִן אַתּוּן נוּרָא יָקִדְתָּא; וּמִן יְדָךְ· מַלְכָּא, יְשֵׁיזִב

3 : 23. In the apparatus of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, the attempt is
made to show that the long version of the chapter, containing at this
point the Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Men, is the
original, and our massoretic recension an abridgment. In the two Greek
versions, vs. 91 = Aramaic vs. 24, the king is said to have been " aston-
ished " *when he heard the men singing their hymn.* Accordingly, in
a note on תְּוַהּ in vs. 24, the *Bibl. Hebr.* asks: " *cur N. turbatus?* "
Does this question mean to imply that Nebuchadnezzar was accustomed
to see men walking about in his burning fiery furnace, and that only
their singing could surprise him?[1] And again, the note *(ibid.)* on vs. 23
suggests that it is a later addition, made " in order to fill the gap between
vss. 22 and 24 ;" i. e., the gap which resulted from the supposed *excision*
of the long passage. But the answer to this suggestion is as conclusive
as it is obvious, namely, that this very same vs. 23 is also found in the
text of Theodotion![2] Moreover, there is no discrepancy nor incongruity
in these verses, 21—25, as they stand in our massoretic recension. The
narrative here is both natural and effective, and I see no reason for
doubting that its author originally wrote it in just this way. He certainly
seems—judging from the manner of his other work—to have been far
too good a narrator to spoil his story at this point by inserting this
intolerable and interminable episode.

3 : 24 עָנֵין וְאָמְרִין. The former of these two participles has been
quite generally challenged, in recent years. Nöldeke, *Gött. gel. Anzeigen,*

---

edited and printed as though it were literature, and not a mere archæological
curiosum, would be a great blessing.

[1] As for the testimony of the Greek itself, it is perfectly evident in the
older recension that the episode of the prayer and the hymn has been inserted
as a secondary element. Vs. 91 begins as follows: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι
τὸν βασιλέα ὑμνούντων αὐτῶν καὶ ἑστὼς ἐθεώρει αὐτοὺς ζῶντας· τότε Ναβουχοδονοσὸρ
ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐθαύμασε, καὶ ἀνέστη σπεύσας καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς φίλοις αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. ἑ., the word
τότε beginning an exact rendering of *our* Aramaic vs. 24. Here, beyond question,
we have the original juncture, with its ill-fitting edges. The insertion was made
in an Aramaic text, and the interpolator, as usual, preferred not to alter the
original, but simply put his own clause beside the other, in this verse. The
Greek is a faithful translation. The Aramaic recension which lay before
Theodotion, on the other hand, had been smoothed into shape.

[2] It may be remarked here, in passing, that in the Aramaic text of vs. 22
which was translated by Theodotion, the whole second half of the verse had
fallen out by an accident of transcription, the cause of the error being the
twofold occurrence of the words נְבְרִיָּא אַלֵּךְ.

1884, pp. 1021 f., observing that in the book of Daniel " *he* answered and said " is pointed everywhere עֲנָה וְאָמַר, while " *they* answered and said " is except in this one passage, 3 : 24᾽ עֲנוֹ וְאָמְרִין, drew the conclusion that in *all* cases, whether the subject be singular or plural, the correct form of the phrase is the perfect tense followed by the participle. This was reiterated by Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi, p. 192 ; and accordingly Marti, *Gramm.*, and *Comm.* on 2 : 5, Strack, *Gramm.* § 13 g, and others, change עָנִין to עֲנוֹ here, and עֲנֵה to עֲנָה wherever the phrase occurs. As Wellhausen *l. c.* states the case : "Aus *anō vāmrīn* im Daniel folgt, dass auch im Singular *anā vāmar* zu sprechen ist." But the question is hardly to be settled so easily ; these are things which are determined by the custom of living speech, not by any rule of uniformity. The use of the participle of the verb אֲמַר in narrative is customary, in Syriac as well as in Biblical Aramaic.[1] It was most natural, then, that in that extremely common phrase, " *he* answered and said," the use of the participle of עֲנָה should also have become customary, at some time and place, by virtue of a very common kind of *phonetic attraction*. That this actually did take place in Biblical Aramaic is attested not merely by the uniform tradition of the vowel-pointing (eighteen passages , but also by *the consonant text* in this verse. The reason why the plural participle עָנִין is used here and not elsewhere is plainly this : over against " *he* answered and said " is placed almost immediately, with only a few words intervening, " *they* answered and said ; " and the form of the phrase was naturally kept unchanged in its second occurrence. We know, that is, that the double participle was used here in *both* cases. Ordinarily, as we can see, the participle of עֲנָה was *not* used in the plural, in narrating ; it was introduced this time merely for a rhetorical reason.[2]

It should be added, in this connection, that the participle is used

---

[1] It is by no means universal, however. Thus, in Dan. 5 : 10, " The queen answered and said " is עֲנַת מַלְכְּתָא וְאָמְרֶת. And in the Assuan papyri various forms of the perfect tense are used.

[2] The ease with which this purely rhetorical attraction could be brought to pass is illustrated in just the other direction, if I am not mistaken, in Syriac. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*[2], § 274, after remarking that the *participle* of ܐܡܪ is the form commonly used in narrative, adds : " Danach wird auch das im NT. häufige ܟܠܕ ܥ̇ܢܐ eigentlich ܟܠܕ ܥ̇ܢܐ gewesen sein." On the contrary, this is a similar example of attraction of the grammatical form ; occurring this time also *only in the third person singular masculine*, because of the great frequency of that combination. In the NT. also, as in the OT., the traditional pronunciation of the phrase is true to the actual usage.

with especial frequency in the book of Daniel, for narrating, because of the highly imaginative character of the narrative. The same is true of the imperfect tense (see below). In the excitement of such narration, the writer sees the events actually take place before him. It is mistaken editing, for instance, when Strack (*l. c.*) and others alter קְרָא in 5 : 7 to קְרָא, on the ground that the participle would not be used in this way in ordinary Syriac or Hebrew narrative.

3 : 29 שֵׁיזֵה. Here. is one of the few cases where the alternative reading preserved in the massoretic vowel-pointing gives us a word which is altogether different, in origin and meaning, from that in the consonant text. It is not easy to see why so many of our modern interpreters should hesitate in regard to the word originally intended, especially in view of 4 : 14 and i Sam. 1 : 17.[1] Besides, nouns meaning " thing, matter," derived from verbs signifying " ask, seek, wish " are common in Semitic; thus we have Arabic مَسْأَلَة, مَطْلَب, Syriac ܒܥܘ, etc.

3 : 31-4 : 34. I am unable to see any probable connection between this account of Nebuchadnezzar's humiliation and the legend contained in the fragment from Abydenus. The one point of interest in the latter is the prediction, by the king, of the subjugation of his kingdom by Cyrus, " the mule." The words in which he curses the Persian monarch contain nothing unusual, nothing striking, nothing which would be likely to remain in the memory of any one who had. read them. He does not even carry out the figure of "the mule," as we might expect that he would ; does not even hint, for instance, at the wish that Cyrus might *be treated as a beast* (to say nothing of his being transformed into one !). All that he wishes is, that the Persian might miss his way to Babylon, and be led off into the trackless desert (a most natural wish, and expressed in quite ordinary language). The resemblance to the story of Nebuchadnezzar's experience—so far as it is permissible to speak of any resemblance [2]—is purely accidental.

---

[1] Beyond any doubt, those who introduced the vowels of שֵׁיזֵן here knew that the older reading before them was שֵׁיזָה, that it was derived from שְׁאַל, and that it meant " thing." It was a familiar noun, and they were probably not in the habit of writing it with א (in 4 : 14 the א is required by the *rhythm*).

[2] The points of contact, out of which our recent commentaries make so much, are the following : (1) Nebuchadnezzar has a divine revelation. (But this is the merest commonplace. All kings of whatever sort, have revelations and see visions, in these popular histories.) (2) The king stands on the roof of his palace. (Where else could he stand, for either of the

4 : 5 וְעַד אַחֲרִין. This phrase has never been satisfactorily explained, so far as I am aware. It means simply "But *at last:*" The word אַחֲרִין, "afterwards," is an adverbial accusative plural, the absolute state corresponding to the construct אַחֲרֵי, which occurs in a few places, namely Dan. 2 : 29, 45, 7 : 24, and once or twice in the Egyptian papyri. The singular number, אַחַר, likewise originally adverbial accus., is also found as an adverb with the same meaning, " afterwards," in the papyri (Sayce and Cowley, *Egyptian Papyri*, C 8, H 8, 15, K 10, and in at least one Gentile Aramaic inscription (Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, i, p. 67). Since we have thus attested both the occurrence of the plural (in the constr.) and the adverbial use in the singular, there is no reason for hesitation as to the nature of the form in our text. Cf. especially the exactly corresponding קַדְמִין in the Jewish Aramaic adverbs בְּקַדְמִין, " at first," מִלְקַדְמִין, " from the beginning," etc. The use of the word (whether singular or plural), both as adverb and as preposition, was rapidly disappearing at this time ; whence, doubtless, it came about that in another textual tradition which was current the reading was אָחֳרָן, " another." By incorporating both, the massoretes have saved for us a precious relic.

The word עַד, expressing the idea of *continuance up to certain point,* is used here precisely as it is occasionally used, in connection with other adverbs of time, where it is best rendered by the word " yet " (though in some cases it is better to leave it untranslated). Thus, עַד אַרְגִיעָה " for a moment," Prov. 12 : 19 ; עַד מְהֵרָה, " speedily," Ps. 147 : 15 ; and the common Syriac ܒ݁ܳܬ݂ܰܪ ܩܰܠܺܝܠ, " after a little, almost,"etc.

4 : 6. In view of Theodotion's ἄκουσον there can be little doubt that his Aramaic text contained the word שְׁמַע just before חֶזְוֵי. Such a translator as he would not have inserted the word on his own authority. There may be some doubt, indeed, as to the advisability of emending accordingly, for the text which we have is not impossible. But because of all the other instances of words accidentally omitted in Daniel through the haste or the mental peculiarity of a certain copyist (see above), it seems to me preferable to insert the שְׁמַע. So Marti in his *Gramm.*, but not in the *Comm.* I am unable to appreciate the difficulties which some of our commentators find in the remaining words of the verse.

4 : 7. If I understand the notes in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica,* it is

---

purposes described in these two stories?) (3) Mention is made of places uninhabited by human beings, but the abode of beasts and birds, whither the king may be brought, against his will. (This is only a coincidence, and unworthy of any special notice.)

proposed there to cancel vss. 3–6! As a specimen of present-day
" criticism " this is worthy of attention.

4 : 7 וְהָזְיָ. This is the only natural reading here. The program laid
down in the preceding verse is now carried out; first the dream, then
(see vs. 15) the interpretation. The suspended construction, resulting
in a sort of paragraph-heading, is the regular thing; cf. for example
2 : 42ᵃ.

4 : 8 הֲזוֹתֵהּ, " the sight of it." This word, which has troubled
some scholars, is quite right as it stands. The second part of the
verse describes, in a very picturesque and effective way, the stupendous
size of the tree. Its top encroached on the heavens, and there was no
part of the earth where it could not be seen.[1] Marti, who thinks that
the *width* of the tree ought to be described, says of this word: " Für
die Bedeutung *Weite, Ausdehnung* darf viell. an מָחוֹזָא *Gebiet* im
Midr. Echa bei Dalman aram. Textproben S. 15 erinnert werden."
But the word מָחוֹזָא is simply a borrowing of the Assyr. *maḫāzu*, just
as מָתָא Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 5, line 5 is the Assyr. *mâtu*.

4 : 11 תַּהְתּוֹהִי. This form has generally been pronounced a Hebra-
ism. Nöldeke, for example, in the *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, 1884, l. c.,
pointed to the disagreement between the vocalization here and that in
תְּחוֹתוֹהִי, vss. 9 and 18, as an instance of the unstrustworthiness of our
massoretic punctuation; and many scholars in recent times have pro-
posed to emend the form in vs. 11, or at least have denied that it is
Aramaic. But the pronunciation תַּחַת belongs also to Aramaic; of this
the Syriac adverb ܬܚܶܬ found also, apparently, in Palmyrene is
sufficient evidence; and as for the twofold pronunciation in these verses,
has any one taken due account of the *rhythm* here? It is perfectly
obvious, as soon as the question is raised, that the form תְּחוֹת, and
not תַּחַת, suits the rhythm in vss. 9 and 18; while the pointing תַּחַת,
and not תְּחוֹת, is demanded in vs. 11. And this rhythm is not a creation
of the massoretes, but a part of the literary art of the original author
himself. Would any one have been more likely than he to care for

---

[1] Whoever speaks of the phrase τὸ κύτος αὐτοῦ, in the Greek translations
of this verse, as " Theodotion's " rendering of חֲזוֹתֵהּ (thus e. g. Marti *in
loc.*). ought to add. that phrase originated in the *old* Greek version ; see not
only vs. 8 but also vs. 19. " The top of the tree reached the sky, and its
circumference (?) touched the clouds." It is not by any means certain that
the word rendered κύτος was חֲזוֹת, see especially vs. 19 (old Greek). On
the other hand, it *is* certain that the older translator had חֲזוֹת before him
in vs. 17, where he rendered it by ὅρασις. As for Theodotion, he proceeds
here in his usual timid way, adopting the phrase from the older version.

the rhetorical effectiveness of the passage? To my own way of thinking, therefore, the twofold pointing, so far from being an evidence of the irresponsible proceeding of the massoretes, is another proof of their trustworthiness. And even if the evidence were less satisfactory than it is we are limited, unfortunately, to the testimony of this very small amount of *vocalized* Aramaic, is it not fair to insist, in all such cases, that the massoretes should be given the benefit of the doubt? We know, in fact, very little about the Aramaic of that time, whether Jewish or Gentile.

4 : 12. It may be that the notorious difficulties of this verse are due simply to the accidental omission of a word or two from the original text. When vss. 22, 29, and 5 : 21 are compared, it seems probable that the word יְטַעֲמֻנֵּהּ originally stood just before בְדִתְאָא. The transformed king is *to be fed* "with the grass of the field, and wet with the dew of heaven." It is true that herbage is also mentioned, as his destined food, at the end of this same verse; but it should be noticed that the clause in which the words appear corresponds to the clause וְעִם חֵיוַת בָּרָא מְדֹרֵךְ in the other passages. What is more, the words בְּעֵשַׂב אַרְעָא *do not occur in vs. 20*, which is a mere repetition of v. 12; for which reason, as well as because they disturb the otherwise regular rhythm, they have already been expunged in Marti's *Comm.* and Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*. It seems to me also that they are a late addition, caused by the fact that after the word יְטַעֲמֻנֵּה had fallen out the prediction that the king should eat grass seemed to be missing. The old Greek version is unfortunately of little use as a witness here; for although it seems to support the conjecture of the verb " feed " before בְדִתְאָא, its Aramaic original differed considerably from ours (as so often happens); and, moreover, in the text which we now have, a long passage has been omitted by some accident of transcription, namely, the translation of the last six words of vs. 12 and the first three words of vs. 13. It might seem, at the first glance, that the evidence of vs. 20 could be cited against the conjecture that the verb has fallen out before בְדִתְאָא. But on the contrary, *the greater part of vs. 20 (namely, all that follows the word וְהַבְלוּהִי) is secondary,* and was added after the time when the loss of the word had occurred in vs. 12. The proof of the fact that this passage in vs. 20 is merely a scribe's repetition from vs. 12 is found not only in the remainder of verses 20–23 where it is evident that the plan of the original writer was to refer in a few words to each of the main features of the dream— divine command; destruction of the tree; the stump left in the ground— and not to repeat the original wording, but also, and especially, in the old Greek translation, in which this part of vs. 20 is lacking. The

original text of vs. 12, therefore, probably read as follows : ברם עקר
שרשוהי בארעא שבקו׳ ובאסור די פרזל ונחש ֹ יטעמנַה בדתאא די
ברא׳ ובטל שמיא יצטבע׳ ועם חיותא חלקה ; " But leave in the earth
the stump of his roots, even with a bond of iron and brass. He shall
be fed with the grass of the field, and wet with the dew of heaven,
and his portion shall be with the beasts." Both rhythm and sense are
now perfectly restored. It is barely possible, but hardly probable, that
another word was lost in company with יטעמנה ; thus, the imperative
אסורו׳ following the word ונחש, would make the phrase less obscure.
But it may well be that the author deliberately aimed at obscurity here.
As for the meaning of the " bond of iron and brass," those who dis-
cuss it should not leave entirely out of account the exegesis preserved
for us in the *old* Greek translation. In vs. 14 a (not in our Aramaic)
Nebuchadnezzar describes how, in his dream, the tree was actually cut
down before his eyes ; its branches were broken and scattered ; it 'or
rather, *he!*) " ate the grass of the field, and was cast into prison, and
was bound by them in fetters and in brazen shackles." So also vss. 22,
εἰς φυλακὴν ἀπάξουσί σε; 29, ἀντὶ τῆς δόξης σου ὁψουσί σε; 30 a, ἐγὼ
Ναβουχοδονοσὸρ . . . . ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἐπεδήθην; these rendering passages which
are not in our Aramaic. This is the (probably faithful) translation of
a text which was current near the middle of the second century B.C.[1]
I believe, nevertheless. that Marti is right in concluding (*Comm. in loc.*)
that the original intent of the " bond of iron and brass " was to sym-
bolize the absolute security in which the king's throne was kept for
him ; see especially vs. 23.

[1] It may, of course, have been a good deal older than that date. Any
one who came across an old and interesting version of the Daniel stories
(i. e., chaps. 1–6) might have felt at liberty to substitute it, or a part of
it, for the " standard " version, in making up a copy of the expanded book.
As for the origin of this edition of the stories, namely that one which
appears in the old Greek of chaps. 4–6. the probability is that it was made
from memory only, without the aid of any written text. No one who com-
pares it carefully with our Aramaic recension can doubt for a moment that
the latter stands very much nearer to what the author himself wrote. Our
Biblical text, that is, comes straight from the original through the usual
process of manuscript transmission; and the numerous changes and losses
which it has suffered are probably all due to the usual mechanical accidents.
The Aramaic text underlying our older Greek version of chaps. 4–6. on
the other hand, was the creation of a narrator who wrote it out from mem-
ory ; sometimes omitting, or transposing, often repeating, expanding, and
adding altogether new material. In all probability, this edition from mem-
ory included the whole of the original book (chaps. 1–6); and from it the
three chapters named were excerpted, near the middle of the second century

4 : 13 אִנְשָׁא, so also vs. 14. There is no sufficient ground for calling this a Hebraism; since the form is known to be good Aramaic, in use among Gentiles as well as Jews, and there is no reason why *both* forms, אֲנָשָׁא and אֲנוֹשָׁא, should not have been used side by side.

4 : 18. It may be doubted whether this verse stood in the original text. See the note on vs. 20.

4 : 19 רְבַיִת. Kautzsch. *Gramm.*, p. 79, writes : " Ganz unbegreiflich ist Dan. 4 : 19 die Verwandlung des *Kᵉthîbh* רביַת (רְבַיָת) in רְבַת, welche Form nur als 3. Sing. fem. betrachtet werden könnte." So also Brown-Driver-Briggs, Gesenius-Buhl, Marti, Strack ("רְבַת nihil est"), Bevan, and the rest of the commentators. But the form thus added, as a variant reading, by the massoretes is not difficult to explain, and it is a legitimate one. The idea that the tradition could have adopted here the *feminine third person* (!) is simply ridiculous ; the history of the OT. text, with all its whimsical *curiosa,* contains no parallel to such folly. In the high-sounding sentences of such impressive scenes as this one, it frequently happens, of course, that single words are given an unusual pronunciation (whether by the original author or by a later editor) merely for the sake of the rhetorical effect. This very verse contains certainly one other case of the kind (see below), and probably two. Knowing this fact, and being extremely ignorant of the old Palestinian ideas of rhetoric, desirable phonetic effects, rhythm, poetic license, contrast between popular and lofty style, and so on, it behooves us to be cautious in condemning well attested tradition. The massoretic רְבַת is simply a second pers. sing. masc. of רְבָא formed after the analogy of the strong verb בְּתַבְתָּ, etc. With רְבַת instead of רְבִת compare the Hebrew 2 pers. fem. forms גָּלִית, מָלֵאת, etc., as well as בַּת, עֵת, בַּת, and the phonetic tendency in all such cases. I have no doubt whatever that this is the remnant of a pronunciation which was used to a considerable extent—we have no means of knowing how extensively. The choice of this form here hangs together with that of תְּקֵפַּת. To whom we owe the more usual reading, רְבִית וּתְקֵפַתָּ, which was intended by our consonant text, whether to the author of the Daniel stories or to some later editor, we shall never know certainly ; in view of the general excellence of the consonant text the presumption must be given to it, as the original. But even in that case, the massoretic vocalization is of great value.

4 : 19 רְבַת וּמְטָת. The reason for the divergent vocalization, which has perplexed all interpreters, lies in the fact that the verb רְבַת belongs

with the words *preceding*, while מְטָת (exactly parallel in form) belongs
with the *following*. This method of separating them phonetically is
effective, and perfectly legitimate. We do not know how old it is, and
ought not to alter the reading (as all our text-books do). In any case
it embodies ancient ideas of rhetoric which have historical worth.

It is probable, as some have observed, that the form of the word
רְבוּתָךְ was determined by the assonance with רְבַת.

4 : 20.   Cancel all that follows the word וְחֲבָלוֹהִי.   See the note on
vs. 12 in this chapter.

4 : 21 מְטָ֫ת.   This is another word which has been universally mis-
understood.   So far from being the result of a scribal error (as it has
always been considered), it is one of the rare and valuable old forms
belonging to *stative* verbs of this class.   In all branches of the Aramaic
language, these forms with י, which were originally regular in the *peal*
stem of intransitive ל"א verbs, began at an early date to disappear.   In
one verb after another, the stative forms are gradually replaced by the
corresponding active forms, before our very eyes.   חֲדִי becomes חֲדָא,

ﭯ imperative) is replaced by ﭯ, and so on.   In the numerous
verbs in which intransitive and transitive forms had stood side by side,
the former are generally seen to vanish altogether.   See Nöldeke,
Syrische Gramm., § 176 A, D ; *Mandäische Gramm.*, pp. 256 f ;
Dalman, *Gramm. des jüd.-palästin. Aramäisch*, § 72, 2 ; Brockel-
mann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, § 271, H, b.   By good fortune, this
very verb מְטִי, alongside of מְטָא, affords one of the best illustrations
of the process.   Aside from this example in Biblical Aramaic, we have
a few solitary remnants of the intransitive pronunciation in the oldest
classical Syriac, and in Mandæan ; while in the Samaritan dialect מְטִי
is the usual form.   Thus, in the Peshitta version of Jer. 32 : 23,
ﭯ, "and all this evil came upon them "—
a sentence which is strikingly parallel to this one in Daniel! ; also (the
same form, with a similar meaning) in i Cor. 10 : 11, and i Pet. 4 : 7.
In all three of these passages, the later native editors, grammarians,
and lexicographers have wished to " modernize " the vowel-pointing (see
Payne-Smith) ; that is, they would do the very same thing which the
massoretic variant does in Dan. 4 : 21.   And finally, this identical form,
fem. third sing. of the stative *peal* perf., happens to be found once more
in Mandæan, מיטיאת, Nöldeke, *Gramm.*, p. 257.

As for the pronunciation of this Biblical form, מְטָת, the choice lies
between מֶטְיָת and מְטָיַת.   The former corresponds to the type followed
in the Syriac verbs of this class ; but the latter pronunciation seems to

have prevailed everywhere else, and especially in Jewish Aramaic. In
view of such examples as אִתְכְּרִיַּת, Dan. 7 : 15, the later Jewish Aramaic
בכיית ,סְנִיאַת, etc., and the Mandæan form mentioned above, we
cannot hesitate to adopt the vocalization מְמִיַּת.[1] The occurrence of
both forms, active and stative, in close proximity, is one of those things
which show that we are dealing with a living speech, not with a mere
learned idiom. In all living languages, just such variations abound.

4 : 22 "*They shall wet thee* with the dew of heaven." This is the
best possible example of this use of the indefinite third person plural
as a substitute for the passive voice, "thou shalt be wet."

4 : 23. The use of the word שְׁמַיָא, " Heaven," in this verse, as a
substitute for " God," gains fresh interest from the earlier date (the third
century B.C.) here assigned to the book. In the *second* century it is
very well known, and was probably very wide-spread. Notice, for in-
stance, how the *old* Greek translator renders מִן שְׁמַיָא, in vs. 20 of this
same chapter, by παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου.

4 : 27 תְּקָף (construct state). Kautzsch, *Gramm.,* § 57 a α, Marti,
Gramm., p. 89*, and the dictionaries, all describe this as a noun of the
qatāl type, and expressly distinguish it from the תָּקְפָּא of 2 : 37. But
this is a mistake ; we have in both cases the very same *qutl* noun.
There is nothing remarkable, or irregular. in this manner of writing the
short vowel (*ŏ* as a variation of *ŭ*).[2]

4 : 31 יְתוּב. Marti, in his explanation of this imperfect (*Gramm.*
p. 103, and *Comm.*), fails to appreciate the vividness of the Semitic
imagination, and also overlooks one or two other cases of this same
usage. He renders : " und *nach und nach* kam ich wieder zu Ver-
stand." But would he translate 6 : 20, " then the king *arose gradually*
יְקוּם in the early morning " ? The two cases are precisely similar. This
imaginative imperfect is completely interchangeable with the perfect tense,
in such compositions as this. אֶצְבָּא in 7 : 16 is another example.

---

[1] It is out of the question to propose the pointing מְמִיַּת, for, aside from
all the testimony in favor of the intrans. *peal*, there is no evidence that the
pael of this verb was ever used in any Western Aramaic dialect.

[2] It is a matter of indifference grammatically, for instance, whether we
write תְּקְפָּא or תָּקְפָּא. The *hofal* form הָנִיחַת stands side by side with the
similar form הֻצַּל. And there is certainly no reason why any one should
expect a long vowel in the last syllable of this noun *in the construct state.*
The slight variation in pronunciation is a matter of small concern. It seems
to be a similar case of misunderstanding when Marti writes in his *Gramm.*,
p. 91. " שָׁלְטָן *Herrschaft* (vielleicht ist aram. שִׁלְטָן zu lesen)." This is
rather mystifying, inasmuch as the two forms are identical, and the manner

4 : 31, 32. This is one of the numerous places where Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* prints the text in metrical form, in this book. Even if it were a desirable thing to do, the attempt is more than precarious. It would be easy to find similar successions of rhythmically regular clauses even in the classical orators, for example, or in the writings of certain modern essayists; but to print such passages in the form of verse would not be a happy thought. As for the Old Testament, wherever a Hebrew writer rises to rhetorical heights he inevitably falls into the three-beat rhythm. To search out the cases of this sort, however, in such a book as this, and make them into verses, in sharp contrast with their prose context, is sure to do more harm than good. And who is to determine what is " poetry " and what is not ? Vs. 14[b] in this chapter, for example, has the same right to be included in the metrical scheme as have the verses immediately preceding it. Leaving out the superfluous עד דברת[1], all the rest, to the end of the verse, is as regular—four lines of three beats each—as anything in the Psalms or the Prophets. To mention a few more instances, in the latter part of this same chapter : The words of Nebuchadnezzar in vs. 27 have as truly metrical a form as those in vs. 32. The whole of the oracular utterance in vss. 28 f. ought certainly to be printed in stichoi, *if anything* in Daniel is thus printed. And why miss the obvious opportunity in vs. 34 ?

כען אנה נבוכדנצר

למלך שמיא	משבח ומרומם ומהדר
וארחתה דין,	די כל מעבדוהי קשוט
יכל להשפלה	ודי מהלכין בגוה

It is true that all the instances of the kind—both those which are designated in Kittel's text and those which are not—ought to be recognized and appreciated by the reader. In a properly edited text, the marks of punctuation would be amply sufficient for this purpose ; this is, in fact, one of the chief reasons why a punctuated text of the Old Testament is sorely needed. But it is following a false principle to print these passages *in the form of verse* (and in an edition loaded with the massoretic accentuation, into the bargain !), especially since there is not even the smallest likelihood that any of them were ever written thus in the ancient time.

4 : 32 כלה חשיבין. The best parallel from the Old Testament is the phrase באין עינים, " like (those who have) no eyes," Is. 59 : 10.

---

of speaking and writing the first vowel is merely a matter of local and temporary custom.

[1] Why not? Superfluous (i. e. metrically superfluous) clauses are frequently emended away in this edition ; for example, in this very passage, vs. 32.

4 : 33. It might seem, at first sight, that something has fallen out after the word מלכותי, but the supposition is not necessary. In vs. 27 of this same chapter, ליקר הדרי means *"for the sake of my glorious honor,"* and it is therefore most natural to render similarly here : "At that time my reason returned to me ; and, for the sake of my royal honor, my splendor and my kingly appearance were restored. Then my ministers and my nobles made eager search[1] for me, and I was restored to my kingdom." The king tells, in the first part of the verse, *in what condition his ministers found him.* It would not be fitting, "for the sake of his royal honor," that they should find him in rags and filth and looking like a madman. On the contrary, his reason was perfectly restored ; his royal apparel הדר, as elsewhere) was returned to him ; and his personal appearance (זיו, as elsewhere) was again worthy of his rank.

The verbal repetitions in vss. 31–33, which have been objected to by some recent commentators, and because of which extensive alterations of the text are proposed in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica,* are eminently characteristic of the author of these Daniel stories.

4 : 33 התקנת. This best attested, pointing probably belongs to one of those" alternative readings " which are frequently encountered in the massoretic text. That is, there was an attempt to embody *both* the reading : " and over my kingdom I was established (התקנת' " and the other : " and *to me* (ועלי) my kingdom was restored " (compare especially the old Greek, ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ βασιλεία μου ἐμοί).

4 : 34. Kittel's *Biblia* prefers the text of the old Greek version. See on the contrary the remarks on vs. 12, above, the footnote at the end.

The unusual phrase " King of Heaven " (cf. 5 : 23, " Lord of Heaven ") is found also in i Esdras 4 : 46, 58, in each of the two editorial patches which were composed, *probably at just about the time when the Daniel stories were written,* in order to unite the Story of the Three Youths to the Chronicler's history. See my *Ezra Studies,* p. 49, 57, 59.

5 : 5 נברשתא. This hitherto unexplained word is of good Semitic origin, if I am not mistaken. It is compounded from נבר " place, put, stand," and the feminine noun אשת (אשא, אשתא, etc.), " fire." The word meant originally " fire-stand " or " lamp-stand," and is probably ancient. The root נבר is the most common of all roots in Ethiopic to signify " put, place ;" we have no need, however, to suppose that the Aramæans borrowed the term from the southern Semites, for the verb may once have been in common use in the north.

---

[1] Notice that the unusual *pael* stem is used here, obviously for its added effect in the picture.

5 : 5 פּס . For the meaning of the word, cf. the Peshitta version of Is. 60 : 14, and both the Peshitta and Syr.-Hex. of ii Sam. 14 : 25. יד and רגל may include the forearm and lower leg, respectively. The narrator wishes to make it plain that only the *hand* (not the wrist and forearm) appeared.

5 : 12 אָחֲרָיָת. Another old form, which it has been customary to "emend" to אחרית. See Ezra 4 : 22, and my *Ezra Studies,* pp. 165 f.

5 : 20 רם. It is, I think, best to treat this as *passive* ; not merely because we have no other evidence of a stative pronunciation of this verb, but also and especially because in the Semitic languages generally, and more particularly in the popular speech, there is a strong tendency toward the use of the passive voice in speaking of *affections of the mind.* Compare, e. g., עשית, "minded," 6 : 4 ; דכיר, "mindful ;" עציב, "sorrowful," 6 : 21 ; and so a great many others. It would be easy to multiply examples.

5 : 25 The writing on the wall. According to our massoretic tradition here (which, however, be it noted at the outset, is contradicted by every other witness, including the testimony of the Aramaic text itself in the following verses) the words written on the wall were מנא מנא תקל ופרסין, MENĖ, MENĖ, TEQEL, UPARSIN. But this is not the original reading of the Aramaic text of this verse. What the author of the book wrote, as is attested by an overwhelming array of evidence, is simply מנא תקל פרס, MENĖ, TEQEL, PERES.

According to the interpretation which has been most widely current in recent years, among the exegetes of the more advanced school, the words of the inscription on the wall are the names of Babylonian weights : *mina, shekel,* and *half-minas.* Thus, Clermont-Ganneau (*Journal Asiatique,* 1886), Nöldeke, Hoffmann, Bevan, Haupt, Prince, Marti, and others. The "mina" is supposed to stand for Nebuchadnezzar, and the "shekel" for Belshazzar. It was customary, it is said, to speak of the inferior son of an excellent man as "a shekel, the son of a mina." The "half-minas" would then naturally suggest the division of the power or property represented by the mina. That is, according to this theory, the sole difficulty of the inscription was that of the characters in which it was written. The words which were inscribed on the wall were perfectly familiar to all those who were present ; and, what is more, their typical significance was obvious. No one of the "soothsayers," if he had only been able to read the script, could have had reason for hesitating, for he must at once have had suggested to him interpretations which would have satisfied himself, his companions, and (with a little ingenuity) even the king.

But the theory is untenable, and even absurd, for the following reasons.
(1) The man who wrote this tale *must* be supposed to have known
what the solution was. It is quite necessary that Belshazzar and his
magicians should have been mystified by the inscription ; but it certainly
requires desperate courage to reject the interpretation given us by the
author of the story, and defend another in total conflict with it. The
advocates of the theory assume, it is true, that the narrator found the
mystical sentence somewhere, but failed to find the explanation with it !
But this assumption is altogether too great a tax on our credulity,
especially when the perfect transparency of the " mina-shekel " riddle
is borne in mind. (2) The word תְּקֵל does not mean " shekel." The
shekel was as well-known among the Babylonians as among the Jews,
and the technical term appears frequently on weights and in documents,
always in the same form, Babylonian *šiqlu*, Aramaic שְׁקֵל.[1] The
standard shekel also appears in the Jewish Aramaic documents from
Egypt; and there, too, the word is written with שׁ.[2] (3) " Half-minas "
would be פַּרְסִין. That is, the advocates of the theory must alter the
vowel-pointing of the word. (Marti, *Gramm.*, p. 73, pronounces the
ending *-in* of this word a *dual* ending !) (4) The original text of vs. 25
did not contain the word פַּרְסִין at all, but פְּרַם, as will be shown.
(5) There is no difficulty or discrepancy in the interpretation which the
author himself gives us.

First, as to the original form of the text. Theodotion had before him
in this verse, as the writing on the wall, the *three* words מְנֵא תְּקֵל פְּרַם,
and nothing else. The word מְנֵא was *not* repeated, and פְּרַם was
not in the plural number. Of this we can be absolutely certain, knowing
Theodotion as we do. And this text, again, was precisely what Jerome
had before him when he made his Latin translation. In this case also
we know our man. He was a faithful translator, and one who never
could have committed the folly of deliberately altering the words of
this God-sent inscription, which he was professing to *transliterate !* The
old Greek translator is another witness who tells the same straight story.
In the summary account (whatever its history) which is prefixed to
chap. 5, the words of the ominous legend are given, and the inter-

---

[1] See, for example, the weights described in the ZDMG., vol. 61, p. 949.

[2] The word תִּקְלָא, " weight," was used to some extent among the Jews
at a later date to designate a definite weight, as certain passages in the
Targums and the Talmud show. This weight was the *half-shekel* (formerly
called בֶּקַע), as the Targum of Gen. 24:22 and Ex. 38:26 proves. The
term was used at the time when סִלְעָא had supplanted the older שִׁקְלָא
as the name of the full-weight shekel.

pretation is added : μανή, φαρές, θεκέλ. ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἑρμηνεία αὐτῶν· μανή, ἠρίθμηται· φαρές, ἐξῆρται· θεκέλ, ἔσταται. And in vs. **17**, which belongs to *another* (also much abridged) *recension of the Aramaic text*, we see the reading again confirmed, though this time only the interpretation is given : ἠρίθμηται, κατελογίσθη, ἐξῆρται, the words standing once more in the usual order. As we have already seen, there were various recensions current even in the middle of the second century B.C. The testimony of Josephus is of unusual importance here, for the recension which he follows is altogether distinct from those represented in the old Greek which we have. It is plain from his account of the event (*Antt.* x, 232–247) that the text before him—whether Greek or Aramaic—agreed pretty closely with our own massoretic recension ; see for instance §§ 241 and 242. He gives the words of the inscription as μανή, θεκέλ, φαρές, and interprets them as *nouns*, meaning respectively ἀριθμός, σταθμός, and κλάσμα. In view of the perfect coincidence of this varied testimony, and the very unusual nature of the case (the importance of the divine oracle making *exact* transcription obviously necessary), there can be no question whatever that in all of these (five) distinct texts, dating all the way from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D., the reading of the inscription in vs. **25** was just the same ; the word *mene* was not repeated, and the reading *uparsin* (instead of *peres*) was quite unknown.

But this is not all. *Our own massoretic text* bears plain witness to the correctness of the reading attested by all the others. If the finger of God wrote וּפַרְסִין (vs. **25**), by what right is this altered, without any explanation, into the quite different word פְּרֵס, in vs. **28** ? And whence can this פְּרֵס have come ? The case is so clear, and the explanation so certain, that there is hardly need of argument. The וּפַרְסִין, *uparsin*, of our massoretic text was originally a marginal gloss (whence the וּ, as in so many similar cases). The reason why it was inserted in the text was the ever-working and praiseworthy motive, ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται, which has preserved for us so many valuable things, and often made us so much trouble, in the tradition of the Old Testament text. It could have been argued in this case, of course, that nothing was *lost* through the insertion, since the reading פְּרֵס, *peres*, was preserved in vs. 28.[1] The gloss *parsin* had its origin, of course, in some one's innocent attempt at interpretation. As for the repetition of the word מְנֵא, *mene*, that is due to one of the easiest and most common of all transcriptional errors.

---

[1] Compare, for example, what was said above regarding the pointing of הִתְקֲנַת· in 4 : 33.

the eye of the copyist strayed to the מנא מנא in the next following line.[1]

In regard to the *grammatical form* of the three words of the enigma, there has been no agreement among scholars, nor any plausible explanation. Behrmann (*Daniel*, 1894) and Kamphausen (1896), like many of the older exegetes, hold that תקל and פרס are passive participles " in meaning, though not in form," ,!' the last syllable having been conformed to that of מנא. On the contrary, if this had been intended, we should have had rather מני תקל פרם. Margoliouth (article " Daniel " in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*) believes that the three words are verbs. This is even worse than the other explanation. Peters (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1896) suggests that the words were left unpointed and unpronounced, both in vs. 25 and in the following verses where they are repeated. But the tradition is very ancient, and perfectly uniform, that they *were* vocalized. The old Greek version, Josephus, Theodotion, and the Latin of Jerome all attest precisely the pronunciation given in our Aramaic text.[2] And it seems to me certain that the author of the stories himself, in his mental picture of the scene, thought of the words as pronounced in just this way, *when Daniel read them,* and gave their interpretation to those who were present. What the narrator thought in regard to *the form of the writing on the wall* is of course another matter. He may have thought of it as in characters quite unknown— until then—to human beings ; or as in some occult signs which could be known only to the most learned of men, such as Daniel was. The narrative says plainly that the wise men of Babylon were not even able to read the writing, to say nothing of interpreting it. If it had been in unpointed Aramaic letters, they would have read it at once—why not ? Were they not in the habit of reading unpointed texts ? But the question of the characters is not a matter of consequence, for it does not affect the story. The question of the pronunciation, on the other hand, *is* important, as I believe. Some of the mystifying character of the divine utterance lay in just this particular. It was not simply a question of reading strange writing ; the words themselves, when they were read, presented something of a puzzle. The author of the story did not wish the interpretation of the mystical writing to be too obvious,

---

[1] Here, again, it may be that the wish *to preserve everything*, in this most important passage, led the massoretes to adopt this inferior reading from some manuscript.

[2] The vowel in the first syllable of the Greek or Latin transliteration is determined here in each case by the original nature of the reduced vowel, as usual, the three words being treated as substantives (of course !).

as soon as its sound was heard;—and if the three words had been
verbs, or passive participles, or names of weights, the inscription would
certainly have been as easy as it could have been made. There was,
in fact, no such obvious inter-relation of the words as there would have
been in any one of the other supposed cases. They did *not* form a
sentence, and, so far as we are able to judge, could not even have
formed a comprehensible series. They were *vocalized uniformly*, after
the pattern of the simplest Aramaic noun-form *qeṭēl*; the most natural
form for the narrator to choose, if he wished them to be non-committal.
The reason why the less usual root פרס was chosen was (as Peters
and others have pointed out) because it could stand for both "dividing"
and "Persians." We can imagine how the hearers may have thought,
when they heard the first word of the riddle, *MENĒ*: "This means
counted." And as the second, *TEQĒL*, was pronounced, they must
then have hastened to add: "No; the first was perhaps *mina,* and this
is *weight.*" But as the third was uttered, they could only have said to
themselves in despair: "The whole thing is meaningless, for *PERĒS*
signifies nothing that is possible here!" But Daniel was ready with
his interpretation. It might well have seemed to the others to be
unwarranted, but so much the better; its correctness was very soon put
beyond all question. "In that night Belshazzar the Chaldean king was
slain, and Darius the Mede received the kingdom."

6 : 1–3. "Darius the Mede" is Darius Hystaspis, who (in the Jewish
tradition) immediately preceded Cyrus. His age at the time of his
receiving the Babylonian kingdom is given as "sixty-two" for the sake
of the chronology, in order to make up the "seventy years" of the
Babylonian captivity. We have in vss. 2 and 3 a real reminiscence of
the great reforms actually instituted by Darius I. On the other hand,
these two verses probably rest on i Esdras 3 : 2, 9, as their source,
and *there* the deeds of this Darius are transferred to Darius III Codo-
mannus. In Dan. 6 : 2, the old Greek version is probably right in
giving the number of the satraps as 127, the word וְשִׁבְעָה having fallen
out of our massoretic text by accident; cf. i Esdras 3 : 2. The
word טַעְמָא is used in vs. 3 to mean "official report," exactly as in
Ezra 4 : 7 (the title בְּעֵל מְעֵם, ὁ γράφων τὰ προσπίπτοντα), 5 : 5. In
support of the statements contained in this note, see my *Ezra Studies,*
pp. 41, 48, 135 f., 141 note 7, 200.

6 : 19 שְׁנָתֵהּ נַדַּת עֲלוֹהִי. This must not be confused with the phrase
which is found in 2 : 1. שְׁנָתוֹ נִהְיְתָה עָלָיו cf. 8 : 27, אֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל נִהְיֵיתִי.
The text is sound in all three of these passages. Kittel's *Biblia
Hebraica* proposes to omit the verb in 8 : 27, "with the old Greek
version"; but it is on the contrary obvious that the latter has lost by

accident at least one word in this clause, namely, the rendering of this very verb ; the present text is grammatically incomplete.

6 : 27. From the phrase חַיָּא וְקַיָּמָא comes the old Mohammedan

الحَّيِّ القَيِّوم, in which the second adjective is a loanword from the Aramaic.

6 : 29. This verse formed the close of the original book of Daniel (see above). The aged prophet lived to see the reign of Cyrus, living in high honor at the court, but died in the first year of that monarch (1 : 21, the verse which was forgotten by the author of 10 : 1 !).

7 : 1. It seems to me quite certain that the word וִיבַהֲלֻנֵּהּ has accidentally dropped out after מִשְׁכְּבֵהּ. There is no other plausible way of explaining this first sentence. This phrase was repeated several times by the author of chaps. 1–6, and it is now adopted (see also vs. 15) by the later writer. In regard to the probability of the omission, see what was said, above, concerning the frequency with which such accidents as this have taken place in the Daniel text.[1]

7 : 1, 2. Theodotion's Aramaic text did not contain the last three words of vs. 1, nor the first three words of vs. 2. The Aramaic which lay before the old Greek translator 'did not contain the *last word* of vs. 1, nor the first three words of vs. 2. This makes it practically certain that the phrase רֵאשׁ מִלִּין was originally a marginal gloss ; literally, " *Beginning of words* "; i. e., " Here begins the ' personal memoir ' of Daniel, told by himself in the first person." And in fact, the first person is maintained (saving the single lapse in 10 : 1) from this point on to the end of the book.[2] After the gloss had been incorporated in the text (as in that which lay before the old Greek translator), the addition of at least a verb (like אֲמַר' was necessary, and the other words of our MT followed very naturally. The ordinary translation here is impossible ; how could מִלִּין be rendered " *the* matters," or " *die* Sache ?" The two verses should read : " In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream, and the visions of his head upon his bed troubled him. Then he wrote down the dream: I saw in my vision by night." etc.

7 : 9. With the phrase עַתִּיק יוֹמַיָּא, " aged man " ,English Bible, " ancient of days "), cf. *John of Ephesus*, ed. Cureton, p. 450, line 2,

---

[1] It is instructive to compare the similar omissions, through hasty transcription, in the two copies of the official letter preserved in the Elephantine papyri published by Sachau.

[2] רֵאשׁ is the usual word for the " beginning " of a new paragraph of any sort. So, for instance. constantly in the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary.

where the very same phrase, ܠܟܣ̈ܐ ܣ̈ܒܐ, is used in speaking of certain " old men. "

7 : 13. The preposition עַם ought not to be " emended " from the text. It is characteristic of this writer; see also vs. 2 of this chapter.

7 : 15. Instead of בְּנוֹא נְדֵנָה, " in the midst of its sheath," read בְּנוֹן דְּנָה, " by reason of this." נוֹן is a Persian word, meaning " color," then " appearance, fashion," and the like; used somewhat similarly in Syriac. For traces of its later use (with the pronunciation נוּן) in Jewish Aramaic, see Dalman, *Grammatik*², pp. 221, 226 f., 239. The common Rabbinical בְּגִין, " because of," I suppose to be merely a late phonetic variation of the older בְּנוֹן. Perhaps the pronunciation בְּגִין became differentiated from בְּנוֹן in this particular usage.

7 : 20. Instead of וּקַרְנָא דְכֵן, the original reading must have been simply קַרְנִין, " three *horns*;" after which came the principal pause in the verse. The impossible reading of our text is due to the carelessness of a copyist, who got the words from the beginning of vs. 21.

Yale University.   CHARLES C. TORREY.