

Theology begins with eschatology, so that everything is thought out from that future (ibid.). In fact, the medium of theology is eschatology (ibid., p.41). Future focus overlooks the past and present (ibid., pp. 283-288).

25 Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, vol. 2 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983), pp. 283-305.

26 See Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, pp. 17, 25, 204, 110, 111.

27 See Michael Green, *The Empty Cross of Jesus* (Downer's Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1984), p. 158.

28 Ibid., p. 157.

29 Trans. E.W. Leverenz and R. F. Norden (St. Louis: Concordia, 1977).

30 Ibid., p. 48.

31 Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, vol. 4 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1979), p. 387. Henry notes that Maier has returned to the doctrine of verbal inspiration, which seems a swing of the pendulum to another extreme, the opposite of the historical-critical method.

32 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 1/1, trans. G. T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1963), p. 119. In citing Barth we are not supportive of his equally devastating use of Scripture through theological presuppositions that impose on the objective Word.

33 C. S. Lewis, *Fern-Seed and Elephants and Other Essays on Christianity*, ed. Walter Hooper (Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1975), pp. 106, 107.

34 Ibid., pp. 108, 111.

35 Ibid., p. 114.

36 Ibid., p. 119.

37 Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, vol. 6 (Waco, Texas: Word Publications, 1983), p. 498.

38 George E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (London: S.P.C.K., 1966), p. 61.

39 Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, trans. Floyd V. Filson (London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 140.

40 Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 602.

41 Ibid., p. 613.

42 God's true people demonstrate loyalty to the Sabbath in the face of coercive international Sunday observance. In heaven Satan "began to insinuate doubts concerning the laws that governed heavenly beings, intimating that though laws might be necessary for the inhabitants of worlds, angels, being more exalted, needed no such restraint, for their own wisdom was a sufficient guide" (Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 37). "To every soul will come the searching test: Shall I obey God rather than men? The decisive hour is even now at hand. Are our feet planted on the rock of God's immutable word? Are we prepared to stand firm in defense of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus?" (White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 594).

43 White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 595.

44 Ibid., p. 599.

45 Ibid., p. 600.

46 Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons*, pp. 414-416

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 1/2 (1990): 37-49.
Article copyright © 1990, by Gerhard F. Hasel.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL CONFIRMED BY THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

By Gerhard F. Hasel
Andrews University

Two articles of sensational interest have been published recently by Professor Eugene Ulrich dealing with the Hebrew and Aramaic texts¹ of the Daniel manuscripts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls in Cave 4 at Qumran. These articles, entitled "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran,"² provide rich insight into these pivotal manuscripts.

From Discovery to Publication

Let me first allude briefly to the outrageous delay which has occurred in the publication of many of the Dead Sea Scrolls, discovery of which commenced as long ago as 1947. In the past few years certain scholars have begun to complain that the few privileged researchers who control access to the Dead Sea Scrolls have been sitting on them, delaying their publication all these years. During the past four years, and especially in 1989 and 1990, *Biblical Archaeology Review (BAR)*³ has played a major role in pushing for the publication of these manuscripts, pointing to the scandal that approximately "400 separate unpublished texts arranged on 1,200 different [photographic] plates" have been hidden for some 40 years from the scrutiny of the scholarly world. Hershel Shanks, the editor of *BAR*, says that "a reasonable guess is that 100 of these [unpublished texts] are Biblical texts on 200 plates."⁴

The accusations regarding the non-publication of these Dead Sea Scroll texts were taken up in the summer of 1989 by the public press, reinforcing the outcry raised by the *BAR* article. For example,

a July 9, 1989 editorial, "The Vanity of Scholars," in the prestigious *New York Times* complained that

The scrolls were discovered in 1947, but many that are in fragments remain unpublished. More than 40 years later, a coterie of dawdling scholars is still spinning out the work while the world waits and the precious pieces lapse into dust.⁵

Fortunately, there is at last some movement toward bringing about a resolution of this problem. A number of scroll fragments and texts have recently been reassigned to qualified scholars who have promised to publish them quickly.

The significance of some of the Daniel fragments among the Dead Sea Scrolls was first made public in 1958, when Professor Frank Moore Cross of Harvard University published the first edition of his book *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, a comprehensive survey of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the second edition (1961) Professor Cross made the epochal assertion that among the fragments of the Daniel scrolls which were found in Cave 4 of Qumran:

One copy of Daniel is inscribed in the script of the late second century B.C. . . .⁶

Here was astounding news, for the text of our present book of Daniel has long been considered suspect by many scholars, on grounds we'll be reviewing below. But Cross's news left many questions unanswered, such as precisely what portions of Daniel were preserved on this particular scroll and how they compared with the other extant texts of Daniel.

It is exciting to know that in the years 1987-1989, at least 35 years after Cave 4 was explored (in 1952) and more than a quarter of a century after Cross made his tantalizing announcement (in 1961), most of the Daniel texts have finally been published. We are told that a few scraps from Cave 4, "five tiny fragments [of the scroll designated 4QDan^a], all from the prayer in chapter 9 but none with more than one complete word,"⁷ are all that remain to be published.

The fragments of the Daniel scrolls from Cave 4 were assigned for publication to Cross⁸ as long ago as 1952.⁹ Cross became a member of the original group of editors of the Dead Sea Scrolls appointed in 1953.¹⁰ But some time ago Cross entrusted the Daniel materials from Cave 4 to Eugene Ulrich of Notre Dame University,¹¹ a former student of his. In 1987 Ulrich published the materials from

one scroll found in Cave 4, a scroll designated 4QDan^a. Now he has published the materials of the two other major scrolls, the ones designated 4QDan^b and 4QDan^c. It is 4QDan^c that Professor Cross proved was written in the late second century before Christ (around 125 B.C.) Now at last we are able to see these documents with our own eyes!

Contents of the Daniel Scrolls

Though our major attention in this paper is focused on these exciting new publications, we do need to mention the other previously published Daniel materials from Qumran.

Fragments of two scrolls found in *Cave 1* were published in 1955 by D. Barthélemy.¹² They are known as 1QDan^a and 1QDan^b. These fragments contain parts of 22 verses from Daniel 1:10-17 and 2:2-6 (1QDan^a) and from 3:22-30 (1QDan^b).

In 1962 M. Baillet published a papyrus fragment from *Cave 6*, possibly containing parts of Daniel 8:16-17, 21-22 and clearly containing 10:8-16 and 11:33-36, 38.¹³

From *Cave 4* the most extensively preserved Daniel scroll is 4QDan^a. It contains large portions of the book, notably parts of Daniel 1:16-20; 2:9-11, 19-49; 3:1-2; 4:29-30; 5:5-7, 12-14, 16-19; 7:5-7, 25-28; 8:1-5; 10:16-20; 11:13-16.

4QDan^b contains Daniel 5:10-12, 14-16, 19-22; 6:8-22, 27-29; 7:1-6, 11(?), 26-28; 8:1-8, 13-16.

4QDan^c, the copy made around 125 B.C., contains Daniel 10:5-9, 11-16, 21; 11:1-2, 13-17, 25-29.¹⁴

All told, we now have at our disposal from the Dead Sea Scrolls parts of all the chapters of Daniel except for chapters 9 and 12—and we're told that the unpublished 4QDan^c, soon to be published, contains a few words from various parts of Daniel 9.

There is duplication of a number of passages in Daniel 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11. Further, a reference to Daniel 12 appears in the remains of a scroll known as 4QFlorilegium, an anthology of midrashic materials on 2 Samuel and on Psalms 1 and 2.¹⁵

Significance of the Daniel Dead Sea Scrolls

It is joyously surprising that remnants of no fewer than eight manuscripts of Daniel have been identified among the materials discovered in three of the eleven caves at Qumran. In order to

appreciate the significance of this fact, we need to compare it with the manuscript finds of other Biblical books in the Qumran caves.

To my knowledge, the most recent listing of *published* Dead Sea Scroll materials appeared in 1977. It speaks of fragments of 13 scrolls representing the Psalms, of 9 scrolls representing Exodus, of 8 scrolls representing Deuteronomy, of 5 scrolls representing Leviticus, of 4 scrolls each representing Genesis and Isaiah—but of no fewer than 8 scrolls¹⁶ representing Daniel! Although we have no sure knowledge yet of the total number of Biblical scrolls that were preserved at Qumran, it is evident from this comparison that the book of Daniel was a favorite among the Qumran covenanters.¹⁷

At this juncture we need to make the point that according to current historical-critical opinion with its “Maccabean hypothesis,” the book of Daniel originated in its present form during the time of the Maccabees and the crisis brought about by Antiochus Epiphanes, that is between 168/7 and 165/4 B.C. It seems difficult to believe that such a significant number of Daniel manuscripts would have been preserved in a single desert community, if the book had really been produced at so late a date. The large number of manuscripts can be much better explained if we conclude that the book of Daniel had a much earlier origin.

Dates of the Daniel Scrolls and Their Significance

Dates for the Daniel scrolls that were published in 1955 were given by J. C. Trever as the Herodian period for 1QDan^a and the late Herodian period for 1QDan^b.¹⁸ In other words, *these* manuscripts can be dated around A.D. 60¹⁹ and somewhat earlier.

This dating for these manuscripts is significant because the Masoretic Text (MT), the main basis for our current Old Testament translations, is represented mainly by a manuscript dated as late as A.D. 1008.²⁰ This means that with the Dead Sea Scrolls before us, we are now able to compare the Hebrew and Aramaic of the MT book of Daniel with manuscripts that are about 1,000 years older than the MT. This presents a phenomenal opportunity.

Comparisons between the MT and “the Daniel fragments from Caves 1 and 6 [1QDan^a, 1QDan^b, and 6QDan] reveal on the whole that the later Masoretic Text is preserved in a good, hardly changed form. They are thus valuable witnesses to the great faithfulness with which the sacred text has been transmitted.”²¹ These fragmen-

tary textual witnesses demonstrate that the MT was in fact faithfully preserved. They thereby reassure us that the Hebrew and Aramaic text we possess in the MT book of Daniel is reliable.

The dates for the three Daniel manuscripts most recently published are of even greater importance than the dates of the ones published in 1955. Although 4QDan^b is about the same age (around A.D. 60) as the two we were just mentioning,²³ the date assigned to 4QDan^a is about 60 B.C.,²² and the date assigned to 4QDan^c, as we noted at the beginning of this article, is as early as around 125 B.C.²⁴

Scholars who theorize that the book of Daniel wasn't written until the Maccabean crisis (around 165 B.C.) are being compelled to admit that 4QDan^c comes from “only a half century later than the composition of the book of Daniel.”²⁵ This means that these scholars will now have to demonstrate that a mere forty or fifty years was sufficient time for all the editorial and other processes needed—according to their traditio-historical and redaction-critical theories—for the book to be developed into its present form *and* become canonical!

The Daniel Scrolls and the Original Hebrew-Aramaic Text

We have pointed out above that the Masoretic Text (MT) from which our Old Testament is basically translated is datable to the year A.D. 1008. Before the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered many scholars questioned the faithfulness of this text and took great freedom in emending and adjusting it. Their freedom has been curtailed significantly by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

In particular, many scholars have regarded the partly Hebrew, partly Aramaic MT of the book of Daniel as particularly suspect—indeed, as of no greater authority than the Septuagint, the oldest Greek *translation* of the Old Testament. In the Septuagint, which was translated apparently in the third and second centuries B.C., the treatment of Daniel is less literal, less closely related to the MT than is the Septuagint's treatment of most of the other Old Testament books. This fact has led some scholars to assume that the MT of Daniel is of relatively little value.

Incidentally, the Septuagint translation of Daniel—which is available in only two ancient manuscripts²⁸—contains considerably more material than the MT does, including “The Story of Susanna,”

“The Prayer of Azariah,” and “The Song of the Three Young Men.”²⁹

Around A.D. 180, another notable Greek translation of Daniel appeared, this one attributed to Theodotion, an Ephesian. This translation, which made use of some previous translated materials,³⁰ was widely regarded as superior to the Septuagint and enjoyed “the distinction of having supplanted the current version of the book of Daniel. . . .”³¹

Further, around A.D. 400 Jerome, who translated the Latin Vulgate out of the original languages, ventured the opinion that the Septuagint “differs widely from the original [Hebrew], and is rightly rejected.”³²

Professor Klaus Koch is a supporter of the hypothesis that no authoritative, original text of the book of Daniel is available. He suggests that, whereas we have a Hebrew-Aramaic text and two Greek translations, none of the three is original, making it essential that an original text be reconstructed with the best tools available.³³ L. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella hold essentially the same view—and point out ominously that there are “no iron rules or golden rules” to guide the process of textual reconstruction.³⁴ These and some other scholars assume that the entire book of Daniel was originally written in Aramaic and that the Hebrew parts of the book are translations from the Aramaic.³⁵ Other scholars, however, oppose this hypothesis.

It is evident that we are looking at a complex picture. It also seems evident that the newly published Daniel materials from Qumran shed important new light on the issue—for there is *great harmony between the MT and the Daniel texts found in Cave 4*. Thus it no longer seems permissible to dismiss the Hebrew-Aramaic text as unreliable.

We need to take the following points into consideration:

1. The eight Dead Sea Scroll Daniel manuscripts, for the most part, are quite close to one another when it comes to variants.

2. There is no significant abbreviation and no lengthy expansion in any of the manuscript fragments. “The text of Daniel in these [Cave 4] Daniel scrolls conforms closely to later Masoretic tradition; there are to be found, however, some rare variants which side with the Alexandrian Greek [Septuagint] against the MT and Theodotion.”³⁶

3. These manuscript fragments do *not* contain any of the additions we mentioned a moment ago, “The Story of Susanna,” “The Prayer of Azariah,” and “The Song of the Three Young Men.”

4. The shift from Hebrew into Aramaic that occurs in Daniel 2:4b in the MT appears in 4QDan^a, just as it does in the previously published fragment, 1QDan^a. Thus we now have two different Dead Sea Scroll manuscripts that give evidence of this shift. The reverse shift from Aramaic back into Hebrew, present in the MT of Dan 8:1, is clearly manifested in both 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b.³⁷

In view of the overwhelming conformity of these Qumran Daniel manuscripts to one another and to the MT (despite a few insignificant variants that agree with the Septuagint), it is evident that the MT well preserves the text of Daniel. An eclectic approach that uses the MT text and the Greek (and other) translations as if they were all on the same level without giving priority to the MT text, is no longer supportable, if it ever was. The Hebrew-Aramaic Masoretic Text of Daniel has stronger support now than at any other time in the history of the interpretation of the book.

The Daniel Scrolls and the Canonical Book of Daniel

When Professor D. Barthélemy in 1955 published the first fragmentary Daniel manuscripts from Qumran Cave 1 (1QDan^a and 1QDan^b), he ventured the opinion that “certain indications permit the thought that Daniel had perhaps not yet been considered at Qumran as a canonical book.”³⁸ His doubts was perpetuated for several years. But in 1964 F. F. Bruce stated that the book of Daniel “may well have enjoyed canonical status among them [the Qumran sectaries].”³⁹ And the most recent Daniel commentary, written by John Goldingay and published in 1989 before the newest publications of the Qumran Daniel manuscripts were accessible, states that “there are no real grounds for suggesting that the form of the Qumran manuscripts of Daniel indicates that the book was not regarded as canonical there, though neither affirming that it was.

...”⁴⁰

These doubts and uncertainties about the canonicity of Daniel among the Qumran people can now be laid aside for good. They have been based largely on the “roughly square proportions of the columns of 1QDan^a and because pap6QDan is written on papyrus.”⁴¹ But Professor Ulrich now says,

From Cave 4 we now have overriding evidence on both points from manuscripts of books indisputably authoritative or "canonical," including Deuteronomy, Kings, Isaiah, and Psalms. . . . However one uses in relation to Qumran the category of what is later called "canonical" the Book of Daniel was certainly in that category.⁴²

Canonicity is supported also by the fragment known as so-called 4QFlorilegium, which actually employs the quotation formula "which is written in the book of Daniel the prophet."⁴³ This formula is typical of introductions to quotations from canonical Scripture at Qumran. It is similar also to Matthew 24:15, where Jesus refers to "Daniel the prophet."

In 1969, based on the evidence available at that time regarding the Qumran Daniel texts, Roland K. Harrison concluded that the second-century B.C. dating of the book of Daniel is rendered absolutely impossible by the evidence from Qumran. There was, he said, insufficient time for Maccabean compositions to be circulated, venerated, and accepted as canonical Scripture by a Maccabean sect.⁴⁴

Harrison has since reiterated his conviction, based on the Qumran manuscripts:

There can no longer be any possible reason for considering the book [of Daniel] as a Maccabean product.⁴⁵

The Daniel Scrolls and Daniel 8:14

Daniel 8:14 has been of great importance to Seventh-day Adventists since the beginning of the Advent movement. From time to time the question has been raised in certain circles as to whether the Hebrew text of Daniel 8:14 has been well preserved. If not, those raising the question suggest, we should be cautious concerning using it to support the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary doctrine.

As far as the evidence from Hebrew manuscripts of the MT is concerned, there is no variation. As far as the number 2300 is concerned, there is no evidence in the MT or in the Greek versions for any variation.

Now we should be able to check the Daniel 8:14 against the fragment from 4QDan^b which contains parts of Daniel 8:13-16. Unfortunately only two Hebrew words are preserved from vs. 14 and the number 2300 is not among them. The two Hebrew words

that are preserved in Daniel 8:14 are *wnsdq qwds*,⁴⁶ the same words translated traditionally, "the sanctuary shall be cleansed."

The editor's statement concerning this fragment is decisive: "No variants are preserved on this fragment."⁴⁷ There is but one orthographical difference from the MT, in that the word for "sanctuary" (*qds* in the MT) has the longer spelling *qwds*, with a waw (*w*) between the first two letters. In Ulrich's edition such an orthographic difference, which does not change the word or its meaning in any way whatsoever, is not considered a variant worth listing.⁴⁸ In short, the two crucial words of the last part of Daniel 8:14, traditionally rendered "the sanctuary shall be cleansed,"⁴⁹ are now available from before or about the time of Christ. They are identical to the wording of the MT of 1000 years later. Here is extraordinary confirmation of the textual veracity of Daniel 8:14. Speculation based on anything else is now proven to be totally worthless.

The Daniel Scrolls and "the Saints of the Most High"

In Daniel 7 "the saints of the Most High" are referred to four times (in verses 18, 22, 25, and 27). The customary identification has been that these saints are God's people, but in 1955 a new hypothesis challenged this identification. A German scholar identified the saints of the Most High as angels in heaven and not as human beings on earth.⁵⁰ Some other scholars have followed his lead, particularly Roman Catholic ones.⁵¹ Obviously, when the "little horn" power attacks "the saints of the Most High" under the new hypothesis, its attacks can no longer represent a persecution of God's people on the earth! The implications are rather clear.

In 1975 I published a paper in which the identity of "the saints of the Most High" was discussed at length. I concluded that they have to be human beings.⁵² My conclusions have been confirmed independently by other scholars,⁵³ although the new hypothesis continues to be held by some.

A most important item for consideration is found in Daniel 7:27. There the term "people" is used in connection with the phrase "saints of the Most High" in the combined expression, "the people of the saints of the Most High." The term "people" (*am*) is brought into such a syntactical relationship to the "saints of the Most High" that the meaning is "the people consisting of the saints of the Most

High."⁵⁴ To circumvent this view, those who argue that the "saints" are angels have made a variety of proposals, one of which is that the word "people" is an insertion of an editor at a later time when he wanted to make the saints human beings.⁵⁵

This matter can now be cleared up. Among the Cave 4 discoveries there are fragments of two manuscripts that contain parts of Daniel 7:25-28. In both 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b the term 'am, "people," is present, harmonizing directly with the MT, which says, "the *people* of the saints of the Most High."⁵⁶ The opinion that it can "never be proved" that 'am, "people," is a part of this passage⁵⁷ has now been shown to be emphatically wrong. The Dead Sea Scrolls demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that the term "people" is part of the original text. This settles the question. "The saints of the Most High" are *people*.

Thus the Dead Sea Scrolls that are finally available give us reason to praise God for the new light they shed on the matters discussed in this study. These manuscripts give us ample reason to have solid confidence in the Hebrew-Aramaic Masoretic Text on which our current translations of Daniel are principally based. But even if we did not have these new discoveries, we should still believe that the Word of God has been faithfully preserved.

Endnotes

1 The book of Daniel was written in two languages. The Aramaic language appears in Dan 2:4b-7:28 and the Hebrew everywhere else.

2 Eugene Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Parts 1 & 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (BASOR)*, 268 (Nov. 1987): 3-16; 274 (May 1989): 3-26.

3 Hershel Shanks, "At Least Publish the Dead Sea Scroll Timetable!" *Biblical Archaeology Review (BAR)*, 15/3 (1989): 56-58; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls Scandal," *BAR*, 15/4 (1989): 18-21, 55; idem, "What Should be Done About the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls?" *BAR*, 15/5 (1989): 18-22; idem, "New Hope for the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls," *BAR*, 15/6 (1989): 55-56, 74-75; "Dead Sea Scroll Variation on 'Show and Tell'—It's Called 'Tell, But No Show,'" *BAR*, 16/2 (1990): 18-21.

4 Shanks, "What Should be Done About the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls?" p. 20.

5 Quoted in *BAR*, 15/5 (1989): 20.

6 Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (2d ed.; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961), p. 43.

7 Ulrich, "Manuscripts from Daniel. Part 2," p. 3.

8 Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran: Cave 4 of Qumran (4Q)," *Biblical Archaeologist*, 19 (1956): 86.

9 P. Benoit, "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran," *Biblical*

Archaeologist 19 (1956), p. 76, notes with precision that the Daniel fragments from Cave 4 were given to Professor Cross for future publication. The scientific excavations of Cave 4 took place on Sept. 22-24, 1952.

10 Shanks, "What Should Be Done About the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls?" p. 18.

11 Shanks, "The Next Generation of Scroll Scholars," *BAR*, 15/3 (1989): 57: "Ulrich received all of Patyrtick Skehan's unpublished plates after Skehan died in 1980. Ulrich has also received most of Frank Moore Cross's biblical manuscripts with the understanding that he could reassign them."

12 D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), pp. 150-152. The plates were published subsequently by John T. Trever, "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave I," *Revue de Qumrân*, 5 (1964-66): 523-44, pls. 5-6.

13 M. Baillet and J. T. Milik, *Les 'Petites Grottes' des Qumrân. 1. Texte. 2. Planches. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan 3* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), pp. 114-15, pl. 23.

14 Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 1," p. 18.

15 The most recent extensive publication of this material is in George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 29 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), pp. 84-128.

16 Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), pp. 11-39.

17 This holds even if Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, p. 43, is correct in asserting that in Cave 4 there are 14 MS copies of Deuteronomy, 12 MS copies of Isaiah, and 10 MSS copies of the Psalms. There are four MS copies of Daniel.

18 Trever, "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments," pp. 323-336.

19 Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, Anchor Bible 23 (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1978), p. 72.

20 E. Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979), p. 35.

21 A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*, Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien 12 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1971), p. 31. The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 4:477, comes to the same conclusion on the basis of a study of 1QDan^a and 1QDan^b: "The list [of variants] shows that the differences [between the MT and these two MS fragments] are so insignificant that they would not be noticeable in translation. This is a strong proof that the Hebrew text of Daniel is now in substantially the same form as it was at least in the time of Christ."

22 Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1," p. 17: "The date of 4QDan^a is about one century . . . later than the book's composition" (which he puts about 168-165 B.C.).

23 Ibid.

24 Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, p. 43.

25 Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1," p. 17.

26 A recent example is the commentary by Klaus Koch, *Daniel*, BKAT, 22/1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), pp. 20-24.

27 Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1," observes that 4QDan^a, with its very early dating, "is thus, for the Hebrew Bible comparable to the Rylands manuscript of the Johannine Gospel for the New Testament." The papyrus fragment of the Gospel of John (published in 1935) known as Rylands 457 and as P⁵² and dated to the first half of the second century A.D., was made about as few

years after John was actually written as 4QDan^c was made after Daniel was allegedly written—according to those scholars who insist that Daniel wasn't written till around 168-165 B.C., during the Maccabean period.

²⁸ Codex 88 (9th-11th centuries A.D.), as edited by H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (4th ed.; Cambridge: Clarendon, 1912) 4:498-593; and the Cologne fragments of Papyrus 967 from the early 3rd century A.D. published by A. Geissen, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel 5-12 sowie Esther 1-2, 15* (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1968); Winfried Hamm, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel 1-2* (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1969); idem, *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel 3-4* (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1977).

²⁹ See C. A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*, Anchor Bible 44 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977).

³⁰ A. Schmitt, *Stammt er sogenannte "Theodotion"-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

³¹ Sidney Jellico, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 84.

³² Quoted in *ibid.*

³³ Klaus Koch et al., *Das Buch Daniel*, Erträge der Erforschung 144 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), pp. 22, 23; idem, *Daniel*, pp. 16-21.

³⁴ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, p. 75.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 73; Koch, *Daniel*, pp. 16-18. Among earlier scholars who took this view are H. Preiswerk, R. H. Charles, and H. L. Ginsberg, as mentioned by Koch, *Daniel*, p. 16.

³⁶ Cross, "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran," p. 86.

³⁷ Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 2," pp. 3, 4.

³⁸ Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, p. 150.

³⁹ F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), p. 57.

⁴⁰ John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary 30 (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), p. xxvii.

⁴¹ Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 1," p. 19.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Cited in George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, p. 93.

⁴⁴ R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1969), p. 1127.

⁴⁵ R. K. Harrison, "Daniel, Book of," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979) 1:862.

⁴⁶ Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 2," p. 16.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴⁹ For the issues of translation and meaning, see Gerhard F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," *Symposium on Daniel*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series 2 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute/Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1986), pp. 426-461.

⁵⁰ This essay was translated and published in English under the title, "The Holy Ones of the Most High" in Martin Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 215-228. A similar suggestion had been made as early as 1927 by O. Procksch and subsequently by S.

Mowinckel in 1953, but Noth's essay brought it to the attention of the scholarly world.

⁵¹ J. Coppens, "Les Saints du Très-Haut sont-ils à identifier avec les Milices célestes?" *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 39 (1963): 94-100; L. Dequeker, "Daniel VII et les Saints du Très-Haut," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 36 (1960): 353-392; idem, "The 'Saints of the Most High' in Qumran and Daniel," *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, 18 (1973): 108-187; John J. Collins, "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 93 (1974): 50-66; idem, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 16 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 123-153.

⁵² Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Identity of 'the Saints of the Most High' in Daniel 7," *Biblica*, 56/2 (1975): 173-192.

⁵³ Among them are C. H. W. Brekelmans, "The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom," *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, 14 (1965): 305-329; R. Hanhart, "Die Heiligen des Höchsten," *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift für W. Baumgartner* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), pp. 90-101; A. Deissler, "Der 'Menschensohn' und 'das Volk der Heiligen des Höchsten' in Dan 7," *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Festschrift für A. Vögtle*, eds. R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg (Freiburg: Herder Verlag, 1975), pp. 81-91; V. S. Poythress, "The Holy Ones of the Most High in Dan VII," *Vetus Testamentum*, 26 (1976): 208-213; P. M. Casey, *Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1979); C. C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 38 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); P. R. Davies, *Daniel* (Sheffield: JOST Press, 1985), pp. 101-104.

⁵⁴ See my arguments for the explicative (epexegetical) genitive of this construct chain in Hasel, "The Identity of 'The Saints of the Most High' in Dan 7," pp. 186, 187. These arguments have been adopted by others, such as John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 146.

⁵⁵ Dequeker is followed in this by Otto Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1965), p. 119.

⁵⁶ Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 1," p. 33. "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran: Part 2," p. 15.

⁵⁷ Brekelmans, "The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom," p. 329.