

## QUMRAN AND THE DATING OF DANIEL

Robert I. Vasholz\*

The current situation on the implications of the philological contributions of the Aramaic documents from Qumran (1QapGen and 11QtgJob) needs to be stated. This is especially so regarding the dating of the canonical Daniel.

From about the turn of the century, a number of scholars have endeavored to date the book of Daniel by analyzing its Aramaic.<sup>1</sup> S. R. Driver's second-century date for Daniel paved the way for the majority of critical scholars as a fixed certainty: Daniel is a second-century-B.C. document.

More recently, however, the possibility of a pre-second-century dating for the Aramaic in Daniel has been offered. "The Aramaic of Daniel" by K. A. Kitchen has, in our opinion, updated this issue and should be the current focal point for modern study on the subject.<sup>2</sup> To understand the present state of affairs we must summarize Kitchen's conclusions.

The first point of his discussion concerns vocabulary. Kitchen notes that about ninety per cent of the Aramaic vocabulary in Daniel occurs in fifth-century texts or earlier and maintains that words appearing in the fifth century presuppose their existence in the sixth century. Akkadian loan words in Aramaic are of no significance for dating since Aramaean migration into Mesopotamia from southern Babylonia persisted from the twelfth century B.C. All Persian words in Daniel are from Old Persian and therefore certainly plausible (even suggestive)

\*Robert Vasholz is assistant professor of Old Testament language and literature at Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

<sup>1</sup>A. A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1892); S. R. Driver, ed., *The Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1905) xlvi-lxxvi; R. D. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," *Biblical and Theological Studies: Faculty of Princeton Seminary 100th Anniversary Edition* (New York: Scribner's, 1912) 262-306; W. St. Clark Tisdall, "The Book of Daniel: Some Linguistic Evidence Regarding Its Date," *Journal of the Transactions of the Victorian Institute* 53 (1921) 206-255; C. Boutflower, *In and Around the Book of Daniel* (London: SPCK, 1923); G. R. Driver, "The Aramaic of the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 45 (1926) 110-119; W. Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische in Buche Daniel," *ZAW* (1927) 81-133; R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929); H. H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament* (Oxford: University Press, 1929); H. H. Schaefer, *Iranische Beiträge* 1 (Halle: Spole, 1930); J. Linder, "Das Aramäische in Buche Daniel," *ZKT* 59 (1935) 503-545; J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927); E. G. Kraeling, ed., *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953) 7; C. Brockelmann, "Das Aramäische, einschliesslich des Syrischen," *Semitistik* 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1954) 135-162; H. H. Rowley, "Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon," eds. D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy, *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to G. R. Driver on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963) 116-129; F. Rosenthal, *Die aramäische Forschung seit Th. Noldecke's Veröffentlichungen* (Leiden: Brill, 1964); K. A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale, 1965) 31-79; G. L. Archer, "The Aramaic of the 'Genesis Apocryphon' Compared with the Aramaic of Daniel," *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (Waco: Word, 1970) 160-169; M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974).

<sup>2</sup>K. A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," pp. 31-79.

for a pre-second-century dating.<sup>3</sup> As far as the Greek loan words are concerned, an insinuation that their appearance demands a date posterior to Alexander the Great is now absurd. An avalanche of evidence has demonstrated the presence of the Greek language in the Semitic milieu long before the sixth century B.C.<sup>4</sup> Therefore since almost all of the vocabulary in Daniel is attested in the fifth century B.C. or earlier, and since the influence of foreign loan words may also precede the fifth century B.C., it is not reasonable to exclude a pre-second-century-B.C. date for the Aramaic of Daniel on the basis of vocabulary.

With regard to the orthography of Daniel, especially in comparison with the Elephantine papyri, the latter demonstrate lapses into phonetic spelling and false archaisms. The Elephantine papyri, therefore, are not a reliable source for making judgments on dating the orthography of Biblical Aramaic.<sup>5</sup> Secondly, the book of Daniel has a history of transmission unlike that of the Elephantine papyri.<sup>6</sup> Natural revision by scribes using their own customary spelling conventions is not to be unexpected and can easily explain why Daniel, though stated to be earlier than Ezra, may appear to have a later orthography. Thus there should be no inherent rule that assumes that the orthography of Daniel requires a second-century date for the composition of that book.

With respect to morphology, mostly negative evidence has been adduced. However, with the discovery of the Elephantine papyri and Old Aramaic treaty-texts from Sefire, many morphological forms that were deemed "late" (because they had formerly appeared only in Daniel and in the Palmyrene texts) have been established as early as the eighth to the fifth century B.C. In addition, little consideration has been given to significant differences between Daniel and the targums and material found only in Biblical Aramaic and older sources.

Syntax contains few differences between Old Aramaic, Elephantine papyri, Biblical Aramaic and the targums. (This has not been contested.) Therefore syntax is of no consequence as far as evidence is concerned. It only demonstrates that a measure of syntactical aspects survived many centuries. There are some forms, however, present in Daniel that did not (as far as the evidence goes) survive beyond the fifth century B.C. The preposition *l<sup>e</sup>* before a king's name in dates is an example. Another would be the word order of the Assur ostrakon (sev-

<sup>3</sup>W. Tisdall, "The Book of Daniel," p. 224, states: "It should be observed that the Persian words used in Daniel belong in every case to the Achaemenian rather than the Avestic form of the tongue. The Achaemenian inscriptions are dated nearly exactly as are the Assouan-Egyptian papyri, for they bear the name of the king who in each instance commanded them to be inscribed." In contrast, we note two Sassanian words in a Palmyrene document. See C. Boufflower, *In and Around*, p. 250.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. also E. M. Yamauchi, "The Greek Words in Daniel in the Light of Greek Influence in the Near East," *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (Waco: Word, 1970) 170-200.

<sup>5</sup>K. A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," pp. 50-67. This points out the particular weakness of W. Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische," pp. 81-133, and H. H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament*. They give no consideration to the possibility of historical spelling in their conclusions. They also assume, in our opinion, that the rate of change of the Aramaic language in the Imperial period was uniform throughout the Persian empire!

<sup>6</sup>Kitchen is duly critical of Rowley here. Rowley gives no consideration to the commonplace practice in the ancient near East of modernizing orthography. On this point see also C. Brockelmann, "Das Aramäische," p. 140, and J. Linder, "Das Aramäische," pp. 503-545.

enth century B.C.), which agrees with the word order of Daniel.<sup>7</sup>

What then is Kitchen's conclusion? There is "nothing to decide the date of composition of the Aramaic of Daniel *on the grounds of the Aramaic* anywhere between the late sixth and the second century B.C." <sup>8</sup> The differences between Daniel and the Elephantine papyri are orthographic due to an updating of the phonetic changes of spelling in or after the third century B.C. The history of orthography is not identical to the history of the language and therefore the language cannot exclude a pre-second-century Daniel, nor does it prove to the contrary.

Let us state the case somewhat differently. In our opinion the strength of the argument for a pre-second-century Daniel comes from Daniel's proximity to both the Elephantine papyri and the Aramaic of Ezra. In this there appears to be a general consensus among the scholars.<sup>9</sup> Without question the majority of the Elephantine papyri are fifth century B.C., and the majority of modern scholars agree that the original composition of Ezra is no later than the fourth century B.C.<sup>10</sup> If Daniel is so similar to the Elephantine papyri and Ezra, is it not reasonable to think that the composition of Daniel is prior to the second century B.C.?

Since no clearly dated Aramaic materials are available from Palestine or Babylon to argue against this view, no *a priori* position should be assumed that asserts that the Aramaic of Daniel cannot be earlier than the second century B.C.

Presently we have the advantage of having editions of the Dead Sea corpus that many past authors on this subject did not have. Kitchen's article, for example, was published in 1965, and while he was aware of the discovery of 11QtgJob the first edition of that targum did not appear until 1971. Do Aramaic documents from the Dead Sea corpus tend to corroborate the point of view that Daniel is a pre-second-century composition?

There are several considerations to observe before answering this question. The Dead Sea materials have only a *terminus ante quem* date (A.D. 70). The Aramaic documents, 11QtgJob and 1QapGen, are most likely older than the first century A.D., but we must admit that extant copies are not dated. It is necessary,

<sup>7</sup>For the word order of this ostrakon see A. Dupont-Sommer, "L'Ostrakon Araméen D'Asour," *Syria* 24 (1944-1945) 57-58.

<sup>8</sup>K. A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," p. 79. F. Rosenthal, *Die Aramäistische Forschung*, p. 62, had come to a similar conclusion from a different angle.

<sup>9</sup>C. Boutflower, *In and Around*, pp. 236-237; Leander, *Laut- und Formenlehre*, p. 3; H. H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament*, p. 154; A. A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary*, p. 35; W. Tisdall, "The Book of Daniel," p. 237 (quoting E. Sachau); F. Rosenthal, *Die Aramäistische Forschung*, p. 67; R. D. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," p. 270; C. Brockelmann, "Das Aramäistische," p. 141; R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, p. lxxvii. G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (trans. D. E. Green; Nashville: Abingdon, 1968) 473 states that the language of Daniel is Imperial Aramaic. C. F. Kent, *The Student's Old Testament: Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives* (New York: Scribner's, 1905) 30, follows C. C. Torrey's idea, which claims that the Chronicler depended on the Aramaic sections of Ezra, putting Ezra clearly in the Persian period. H. H. Schaefer, *Ezra der Schreiber* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1930) 39, states that Ezra lived during the Persian era. And W. Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische," p. 140, states this concerning the third person personal pronoun in Daniel and Ezra: "Das Schnitt zwischen E und D scheint selten so scharf zu sein wie hier." The differences he speaks of are those between *y* for *h*, *n* for *m*—hardly grounds for making a vast distinction between the two books.

<sup>10</sup>For discussion see O. Eissfeldt, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 52-55.

therefore, to suggest an opinion on the dates of the composition of each of these works.

In preparation of my doctoral dissertation I have been persuaded that the Aramaic of 11QtgJob is older than the Aramaic of 1QapGen.<sup>11</sup> Since our dating of the Aramaic of 11Qtg Job is dependent on 1QapGen, it is first necessary to arrive at a date for the latter. Two authors, J. Fitzmyer and E. Y. Kutscher, have completed research on this matter.<sup>12</sup> The consensus is that the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon permits a first-century-B.C. date. (The palaeographical evidence itself permits a first-century-B.C. dating even if the scroll is an original composition.) In addition N. Avigad and Y. Yadin have suggested the possibility of a literary dependency of the Book of Jubilees (100 B.C.?) on 1QapGen.<sup>13</sup> This tends, of course, to push the dating of the scroll further back than the first century B.C. Other indications of the scroll's antiquity are that 1QapGen does not show the tetragrammaton omission of the later and well-known rabbinical surrogates. Also, Melchizedek is called "a priest." (Melchizedek was deprived of his priesthood in favor of Abraham. It seems that the rabbis attempted to remove support from the comparison between the priesthood of Jesus and that of Melchizedek by discrediting the priesthood of the latter.) In addition, words present in the scroll are found in the targums but not in Biblical or Egyptian Aramaic, and previously used words occur with changed meanings.<sup>14</sup> Finally, in the opinion of Fitzmyer the Aramaic from the Wadi Murabba'at, Seiyal and Habra (second century A.D.) is a much greater developed Aramaic than that of the scroll.<sup>15</sup>

If, therefore, a first-century-B.C. (or earlier?) date for 1QapGen is a reasonable assumption we may proceed to our targum. A. York asserts that 11QtgJob is "roughly contemporaneous with the Genesis Apocryphon."<sup>16</sup> His conclusion is based on not wanting to abuse the small amount of evidence available to make judgments. While we respect this position we feel that the material our work has analyzed warrants a cautious verdict of what, at least, the material from 11QtgJob appears to demonstrate.<sup>17</sup> For example, York's position that the pronoun *dy* dominates in Biblical Aramaic, 11QtgJob and the Genesis Apocryphon is correct.

<sup>11</sup>R. I. Vasholz, "A Philological Comparison of the Qumran Job Targum and Its Implications for the Dating of Daniel" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, 1976). Cf. also T. Muraoka, "The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI," *JJS* 25 (1974) 425-433.

<sup>12</sup>E. Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958) 1-35; "The Genesis Apocryphon," *Or* 39 (1970). Cf. also H. H. Rowley, "Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon," p. 129, and T. Muraoka, "Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon," *RevQ* 8 (June 1972) 7-51. For a thorough discussion of the editions, literary genre, palaeography, date, language and text of 1QapGen see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* (2nd ed.; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971) 1-30.

<sup>13</sup>N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956) 38.

<sup>14</sup>G. L. Archer, "The Aramaic," pp. 163-167.

<sup>15</sup>J. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, pp. 24-25.

<sup>16</sup>A. York, "A Philological and Textual Analysis of the Qumran Job Targum (11QtgJob)" (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1973) 332.

<sup>17</sup>R. I. Vasholz, "A Philological Comparison."

But to say that this means little or nothing is to disregard *d* for *dy*, which occurs in 1QapGen and then later in Palestinian Jewish Aramaic. Does this not suggest that 1QapGen gives evidence of a later morphological development not present in Biblical Aramaic and 11QtgJob? It is the differences among the Aramaic texts that distinguish them, not their similarities.

The next consideration, then, is whether 11QtgJob is older than 1QapGen. Our opinion is that 1QapGen is the later of the two, based on (1) the scroll's affinity with certain Palestinian Jewish Aramaic traits not present in 11QtgJob or Daniel; (2) the decided preference for *plene* writing; (3) the change of certain pronouns in 1QapGen unattested in 11QtgJob or Biblical Aramaic; (4) the omission of Aleph in the Pe-Aleph verbs of the scroll; (5) the absence of *haphel* forms in 1QapGen, which forms appear frequently in both 11QtgJob and Biblical Aramaic; (6) the change in meaning of words and expressions in the scroll as against 11QtgJob and Biblical Aramaic; (7) the dominance of the vowel letter Aleph over He, whereas 11QtgJob and Biblical Aramaic are to the contrary; (8) the absence of *shaphel* forms in 1QapGen; and (9) the particle *'ry*, occurring only in the Genesis Apocryphon and never in 11QtgJob.

The above evidence indicates that 11QtgJob is anterior to the Genesis Apocryphon. If so, how much older? This is difficult to determine. We have little enough material for comparison and, to complicate the matter, historical spellings and archaisms seem to abound in Aramaic, such as in the Nabataean and Palmyrene documents. Yet many phonemes were not changed for centuries. Some changed and then seem to have reverted to an older form, and forms in eighth-century Syrian texts have been rediscovered in the Qumran corpus.<sup>18</sup> Our opinion is that the Aramaic language prior to the first century B.C. was a slowly developing language. Change was not rapid. Our targum, if it is representative of a post-Persian document, shows little variance with examples of Imperial Aramaic. For this reason we suggest that 11QtgJob is at least a century older than the Genesis Apocryphon. We claim, therefore, that the targum may originally have been composed in the late third century or early second century B.C.<sup>19</sup> As T. Muraoka says, "The Hebrew of Job is notoriously difficult." An early attempt to translate Job would not be surprising, especially since it was believed to have been written by Moses (at least according to later traditions; *B. Bat.* 14b).

<sup>18</sup>See particularly this phenomenon with regard to assimilation and nonassimilation of Nun. T. Muraoka, "The Aramaic," pp. 426-427.

<sup>19</sup>Of interest is that T. Muraoka, "The Aramaic," p. 443, came to the same conclusion—i.e., 250-150 B.C. for date of composition. I had come to this conclusion prior to my access to his article, which he later generously supplied. I now understand that his article was originally presented at the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 1973. I also accept the possibility of the targum being even earlier. If we accept the original composition of Daniel as sixth century, as the book claims, then the targum could well have been older than the third century B.C. It would also mean that an "orthographic updating" of Daniel in the second century is not necessary if the targum were indeed quite early. However, an original scribal attempt to uniformly present some of the latest orthographic features of Daniel (*d* for *z*) could well explain why Daniel appears to be later than Ezra. It is reasonable to suspect that differences between Daniel and Ezra may only be dialectical. Against an earlier-than-second-century date for 11QtgJob is the possibility that the targumist consulted the LXX of Job (100 B.C.?): cf. A. York, "A Philological and Textual Analysis," p. 270. The author himself states, however, that we cannot be conclusive. See also J. Gray, "The Massoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the Light of the Qumran Targum," p. 339.

Finally, our studies indicate that Biblical Aramaic is older than 11QtgJob. The linguistic phenomena from our research that have influenced our opinion are (1) the absence of the *ithpael* in Old Aramaic, Biblical Aramaic and the Elephantine papyri, yet present in 11QtgJob; (2) the presence of *'lw* in Biblical Aramaic and its changing form clearly demonstrated in 11QtgJob; (3) the noun object always following the infinitive in 11QtgJob as it does in the Genesis Apocryphon; (4) the pronoun *dn* in 11QtgJob as in the Genesis Apocryphon; (5) the elision of the middle He in *bhl* in both 11QtgJob and the Genesis Apocryphon against Biblical Aramaic; (6) *'nun* as an attached suffix in 11QtgJob as it is in later targums; and (7) the order of the position of verb and object where 11QtgJob does *not* follow the Hebrew as in greater agreement with the Genesis Apocryphon than with Biblical Aramaic. The above phenomena suggest that Daniel was written before 11QtgJob and lead us to believe that the evidence now available from Qumran indicates a pre-second-century date for the Aramaic of Daniel.<sup>20</sup>

What then are the implications of a pre-second-century date for the Aramaic of Daniel? If we hold to a dual authorship of Daniel, the consequences of a pre-second-century date for the Aramaic portion are slight; the Aramaic section is simply older than the Hebrew section. But those who have held to a literary disunity have produced no common consensus. In fact, views on the division of the book have widely varied.<sup>21</sup> There is such a variance of opinion that one suspects that the literary techniques used to section the book are improper, or else why would there be such divergence? For us, the arguments advanced for the division of the book by two or more authors do not seem compelling. We find in both parts (chaps. 1-7; 8-12) no concrete reason for questioning its unity. In both sections there is the same aim and historical background. It is difficult to understand how the Aramaic section could have stood without the Hebrew section, especially Dan 2:1-4a, preceding it. Daniel 7 belongs to the Aramaic section, yet it is clear that its contents belong to the Hebrew following it (cf. 8:1). A division of the chapters is artificial and forced. The Aramaic section is linked with the Hebrew both at the beginning and ending.

As for those who would hold to the composite authorship of Daniel, it means that the Hebrew sections of the book must also be older. No century exists between the first and last sections of Daniel. If the Aramaic of Daniel suggests a pre-second-century dating, then the Hebrew section must be given this same consideration. This is not unreasonable. Daniel was greatly employed at Qumran, both in its Hebrew and Aramaic parts, without the expansions found in the Greek as is

<sup>20</sup>Other indications that Daniel is earlier than 11QtgJob are: (1) The spelling of Darius, *Drywš*, is in Biblical Aramaic as it is in the earliest Aramaic papyri (494 B.C.) and the Meissner contract (515 B.C.), as opposed to later where the name Darius was spelled with a He (*Dryhwš*); (2) the LXX of Daniel has many words that seem to have perplexed the Greek translators; (3) all Persian words in Daniel are Old Persian words; (4) the Lamedh prefix is found with the jussive in Biblical Aramaic (cf. R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, pp. lxxvii-xcv).

<sup>21</sup>Modern scholarship is far from being agreed on the literary unity of Daniel. For a rather complete resume (with bibliography) see O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, pp. 516-522; R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 1105-1112; G. Fohrer, *Introduction*, pp. 760-766. Though many critics hold to the unity of Daniel, it is done on the assumption that Daniel is from the Maccabean period.

evident in 1Q72.<sup>22</sup> These fragments suggest that there was more than one Hebrew recension of Daniel prior to the LXX translation. This is rather strange if the date of the composition of Daniel is held to be in the middle of the second century B.C.

In addition, more attention should be given to the "Prayer of Nabonidus" (150 B.C.?) from Qumran cave four. It is not necessary to hold that Daniel is dependent on this prayer as a literary source.<sup>23</sup> "It is not necessary to think of the Prayer of Nabonidus as a literary source of the canonical Daniel, or even to give the prayer priority in terms of its written composition."<sup>24</sup> The evidence either way is sparse, but without the a priori that Daniel must be second-century there is no more reason to believe that Daniel is dependent on the "Prayer" than that the "Prayer" is dependent on Daniel. We have no precedent, however, of a canonical Jewish book dependent on an intertestamental noncanonical literary source, while there is abundant evidence that the reverse is true. The "Prayer" too, of course, is uncomfortably close to the alleged date for the canonical Daniel. Finally, A. York has pointed out that 11QtgJob corresponds to MT 40:10-11 and reflects indisputably the vocabulary of Dan 3:13, 19; 4:33, 34; 5:20. "The numerous resemblances to the Daniel passages can hardly be coincidental."<sup>25</sup> Can these be allusions to the Nebuchadnezzar so described in the canonical Daniel? Though we cannot be conclusive, the possibility of such an allusion to the Aramaic portion of Daniel would be remarkable.

<sup>22</sup>E. Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. Knight; London: Nelson, 1967) cxc-cxxx, with illustrations, has already demonstrated that additions in the LXX of Job against the MT do not necessarily demand a different *Vorlage* for the LXX. In our opinion it is still a moot question and the possibility should not be discounted.

<sup>23</sup>R. Meyer, *Das Gebet Des Nabonid* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962), and J. T. Milik, "Priere De Nabonide," *RB* 63 (1956) 407-415. (It is of interest to note that Milik, p. 115, holds that similar Qumran fragments of the "Daniel Cycle" were probably written subsequent to the canonical Daniel.)

<sup>24</sup>F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York: Doubleday, 1958) 124.

<sup>25</sup>A. York, "A Philological and Textual Analysis," p. 306.