BEL AND THE DRAGON

INTRODUCTION

BEL AND THE DRAGON forms the third of the Apocryphal Additions to Daniel, and was written originally almost certainly in Hebrew, though none of the Hebrew original has survived. The other two Additions are the Song of the Three Children and Susanna. In the Greek and Latin texts the three Additions to Daniel constitute an integral part of the canonical Book of Daniel, and were recognized as such, and therefore as themselves canonical, by the Council of Trent. The Song of the Three Children is, however, the only one of the three which has a necessary connexion with the Hebrew canonical Book of Daniel, standing in the Greek and Latin texts between Dan. iii. 24 and 25. The other two Additions are appended, and appear to have an origin independent of the book to which they are attached and also of each other, though in all three, as also in the canonical book, the name and fame of Daniel forms the principal theme.

§ 1. NAME AND POSITION IN THE CANON.

In the Greek Codd. Bel and the Dragon stands at the end of the canonical Book of Daniel, bearing therefore no distinct title. In Codd. A and B of Θ[1] it is, however, preceded by the words 'Vision (ὅρασις) xii'; i.e. it forms the twelfth and last of the series of visions into which this enlarged Book of Daniel is divided. In the LXX it is called 'Part of the prophecy of Habakkuk the Son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi': see note on v. 1. In the Vulgate Bel and the Dragon forms ch. xiv of Daniel.

In Syr W (see § 3) the Story of Bel is preceded by the heading 'Bel the idol', that of the Dragon having at its beginning the words, 'Then follows the Dragon.'

Bel and the Dragon is the title in all the Protestant versions of the Apocrypha, these versions keeping the books now known as Apocryphal apart as being, it was thought, deutero- or non-canonical. In a Nestorian list of biblical works mentioned by Churton[2] it is called 'The Lesser Daniel'.

§ 2. CONTENTS.

The two stories as told in common by LXX and Θ may be thus summarized.

1. *The Story of Bel, vv.* 1–22. There is in Babylon an image of Bel (Marduk, Merodach) which Daniel refuses to worship, though no form of worship is mentioned besides that of supplying the god with food. The king, identified in Θ with Cyrus, remonstrates with the delinquent Hebrew, pointing him to the immense quantity of food consumed daily by Bel as a proof that the god thus recognized is a living, true deity. Daniel denies that the food is eaten by the god, and asks permission to put the matter to a test. This request being granted, he is shown the lectisternia, the sacred tables, covered with food which it is alleged the god will consume during the night. It is agreed that the doors of Bel's temple shall be closed and sealed for the night after the departure of the priests. But in addition, Daniel takes the precaution of having, without the priests' knowledge, the floor of the temple strewn lightly with ashes. When the morning breaks, the doors are still closed and the seals intact, but the food has disappeared, evidence, the king thinks, that it has been consumed by Bel. Daniel, however, points to the tracks of bare feet on the ash-strewn floor as evidence that the priests have entered the temple by secret doors and removed the food. Angered by the trick which the priests had played on him, the king has them put to death and the image destroyed.

On the word 'Bel' see note on v. 3.

2. *The Dragon Story, vv.* 23–42. There is in Babylon a great live serpent (dragon) worshipped by a large number of the inhabitants, who feed it lavishly. In the present case the god is represented by a living creature which can be fed and which needs feeding. Daniel refuses to bow down before the serpent, and throws out a challenge to the king, that, if permission is given him, he will destroy the creature alleged to be a god. Receiving the requested permission, Daniel makes a mixture of

[1] i.e. Theodotion's version, see § 3.
[2] *The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures*, p. 398 f.

which pitch is the principal ingredient, and thrusting it down the serpent's throat this creature bursts asunder and dies. Infuriated at the death of their god, the populace demand the death of this god-murderer. The king yields, and has Daniel cast into the den of lions, the usual punishment of persons found guilty of capital charges. But though Daniel remained in the company of seven lions for seven days, he suffers no injury. On the sixth day Daniel, being naturally hungry, is miraculously supplied with food. The prophet Habakkuk has prepared the midday (?) meal for his reapers, and is on the way to the field where they are. An angel arrests him, telling him he is to carry the meal to Daniel in the lions' den in Babylon. On his alleging his ignorance of the location of the lions' den, and even of Babylon itself, the angel lays hold of the hair on the crown of his head and conveys the prophet to the den, where, seeing Daniel, he hands him the food, and seems as safe among the lions as Daniel himself. The angel then restores Habakkuk to his Palestine home. Seeing that Daniel was preserved (the Habakkuk incident is an evident interpolation), the king magnifies God, sets Daniel at liberty, and substitutes for him in the den Daniel's accusers, who are at once devoured by the lions.

The meaning of the word 'dragon'. The Greek word (δράκων) translated 'dragon' denotes originally a large serpent. Homer uses δράκων and ὄφις interchangeably without the least apparent difference. Even the *drakōn* of Greek mythology remains essentially a serpent. In the East the serpent came to be commonly used as a symbol of the principle of evil. In the LXX δράκων translates most frequently (twelve times) the Hebrew תנין (*tannin*), rendered in the A. V. generally (eight times) 'dragon', sometimes (thrice) 'serpent.' In two passages (Amos ix. 3, Job xxvi. 13) the usual Hebrew word for serpent (נחש) is represented in the LXX by δράκων. There is no good reason for departing from the simple impression which the narrative gives that in the present tale the dragon is a live snake worshipped as a god. Perhaps such worship is to be regarded as a survival of totemism. There is abundant evidence of snake worship in various parts of the ancient world, and there is good reason for believing that it obtained in Babylon. (1) The god Nina was worshipped in the form of a serpent.[1] (2) On Babylonian seals men are figured worshipping gods apparently serpentine in form, their lower parts consisting of serpent coils with worshippers in front. (3) Both Berosus and Helladius speak of gods worshipped as serpents in Babylon.[2] (4) Jensen, quoted by Baudissin (*PRE*[2], v, p. 6), says there was a serpent god called in Sumerian *Serah*. For traces of serpent worship among the Hebrews, see Num. xxi. 8 f., 2 Kings xviii. 4. There is no certain proof that in ancient Babylon the live serpent as in distinction from the image of a serpent was worshipped, but there is no conclusive evidence to the contrary, and the analogy of other countries favours a decision in the affirmative.

Fritzsche[3] holds that the story was composed in Egypt, where serpent worship is known to have existed in early times, but that the author inaccurately transferred it to Babylon. But since Fritzsche's time fresh evidence of such worship in Babylon has presented itself.

Modern writers generally maintain that the dragon in this story represents a mythical monster with a serpent's head and neck, an eagle's legs, a lion's body, and a unicorn's horn.[4] In this or some similar form a very large number of Babylonian inscriptions picture this monster or other monsters (we can never be quite sure as to this) as in conflict with Marduk or some other Babylonian deity. The monster has been very commonly identified with the mythological dragon, but no decisive proof of the identity has been furnished. W. Hayes Ward has made a careful attempt to bring together the various forms in which the 'dragon-myth' has been portrayed on Babylonian-Assyrian inscriptions,[5] and he assumes throughout that in all it is the Marduk-Tiamat conflict of the Babylonian Creation legend that is set forth, but he gives no proof of this, for the name Tiamat is not once connected with the representation. Indeed it seems now generally understood that Tiamat was a snake deity, and that the dragon of the story now under consideration is no other than Tiamat ; so Sayce, Ball, Gunkel, Marshall, Toy.

The present writer ventures with Jensen and Baudissin to dispute and even deny this, and for the following reasons :

1. There is no evidence in the Babylonian-Assyrian inscription that Tiamat was conceived as a serpent. The serpentine forms pointed out cannot be shown to be intended for Tiamat.

2. Berosus does not once translate the Babylonian Tiamat by dragon or by any word denoting serpent. He uniformly transliterates the word, though not as we should do now, but as *Thalatth*.

3. The idea embodied in Tiamat differs from that of the dragon or serpent. In Babylonian mythology Tiamat stands for the female principle, expressing itself in darkness and disorder, older

[1] See Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 282 f. [3] e.g. Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies*[4], i. 122 f., ii. 14.
[2] *Exeg. Handbuch zu den Apos.*, i, p. 121. [4] See figures in Gressmann, *Alter. Texte und Bilder*, ii. 90 f.
[5] See *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, xiv. 94-105.

than the gods themselves, since the birth of the gods took place through their separation from the primaeval chaos (= Tiamat). Tiamat is usually identified with the primaeval ocean, wild and rebellious, needing to be subdued. We are probably to see a reference to it in the תְּהוֹם rendered by English versions 'the deep': LXX ἄβυσσος: Vulg. *Abyssus*.

4. In the present story the dragon is a god alongside of Bel in the preceding story: there is not the remotest hint that he is regarded other than as a Babylonian deity worshipped in the form of a serpent or dragon.

The present writer would like to add that he does not now, as he once did (see Century Bible, *Psalms*, ii, pp. 50, 63, 112, 141, 177), agree with Gunkel and the bulk of recent Bible scholars in seeing reflections of the Marduk-Tiamat legend in innumerable passages of the O.T. Later writers have too blindly followed Gunkel (see his *Schöpfung und Chaos*).

§ 3. TEXTUAL AUTHORITIES: MANUSCRIPTS AND VERSIONS.

1. *Manuscripts.* The Greek text exists in two principal forms throughout the Book of Daniel including the Apocryphal Additions.

(1) 𝔊 (i.e. the LXX) has been preserved in but one MS., the Codex Chisianus (from the Chigi family which owned it), published in Rome in 1772, in Cozza's *Sacrorum Bibliorum Vetustissima Fragmenta Graece et Latine*, in Swete's 𝔊 (in parallel pages with Θ), and in Tischendorf's 𝔊. This unique MS. is quoted by Field and Swete as Cod. 87, which must be distinguished from that so designated by the Oxford editors, Holmes and Parsons.

(2) Of Theodotion's text (Θ) of Bel and the Dragon the following MSS. exist: B, A, Γ (*vv.* 2–4 only), Δ (from *v.* 21 to *v.* 41).

Besides the above majuscules (uncials) there also several valuable minuscules (cursives), as e.g. those numbered 34, 49.

For details and explanations, see Swete's edition of 𝔊 and his *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek.*

2. *Versions.* (1) *Greek.* It may not be strictly correct to speak of the two best known texts (𝔊 and Θ) as versions since no Hebrew or Aramaic original has come down to us. Yet according to the view of a Hebrew lost original advocated by the present writer (see below) these so-called versions are correctly thus described.

A careful comparison of 𝔊 and Θ of Bel and the Dragon has led the present writer to these conclusions. (*a*) That 𝔊 is a translation from a Hebrew original. This is made exceedingly probable by the presence of a large number of Hebraisms (see § 4, ORIGINAL LANGUAGE), though there is another possible explanation (see below, § 4, (*c*) 5). (*b*) That Θ contains a much larger number of Hebraisms than 𝔊: see on *vv.* 1 f., 5 f., 16, 18, 27, 28, 39, &c., suggesting what other considerations make likely that Theodotion corrected 𝔊 with the aid of a Hebrew original before him.

Yet, on the contrary, Θ corrects at times the Greek of 𝔊 (see on *vv.* 26, 40, 42), and it avoids the Hebraism Κύριος without the article (= Hebrew יהוה), preferring Θεός: see *v.* 5.

Theodotion's version of Daniel displaced that of 𝔊 at a very early time, for though in his Hexapla it is the true 𝔊 that he uses, yet in his own writings Origen almost invariably cites Θ. In his preface to Daniel Jerome points to the fact that in his own time the Christian Church had rejected 𝔊 in favour of Θ on account of the defective renderings in the former. Even Irenaeus (*ob.* 202) and Porphyry (*ob.* 305) preferred Θ to 𝔊. Field was the first to indicate clearly that what has for centuries been treated as 𝔊 of 1 Esdras, &c., including Daniel and its Additions, is really the version of Theodotion.

(2) *Syriac.* In this language there are two principal versions:

(*a*) The Peshitta, best preserved in the Cod. Ambrosianus B 21 (sixth century), reproduced in Walton's *Polyglot* and critically edited by Lagarde (Leipzic, 1861). In Bel and the Dragon this version follows Θ very closely, though at times (see on *vv.* 2, 18, 25) it agrees with 𝔊 against Θ. There are several cases where this version and Θ agree against 𝔊 (see on *v.* 21). In a few cases this version diverges from both the Greek texts (see on *v.* 27). In the notes Walton's *Polyglot* has been used, the version consulted being designated Syr W. But Lagarde's critical edition has always been compared.

(*b*) The Hexapla's Syriac version is that made by Paul of Tella in 617 from Col. VI (𝔊) of Origen's Hexapla. It exists in manuscript form (Cod. Ambrosianus, C. 313). This most valuable MS. has been edited, photographed, and published by Ceriani (Milan, 1874). In the notes it is quoted as Syr H. As might have been expected from its origin, it is in general agreement with 𝔊, rather than with Θ, and thus differs from the other Syriac version, which follows Θ closely.

(3) *Aramaic other than the Syriac.* For the Aramaic text of parts of Bel and the Dragon see § 4, ORIGINAL LANGUAGE.

There are no Targums on Ezra, Nehemiah, or Daniel, a lack easily explained if it could be assumed that all these books were written originally in Aramaic as portions of the existing books of Ezra and Daniel are.

(4) *Latin.* (*a*) Fragments of the Old Latin version occur in Sabatier's work, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*, 1743, &c., vol. ii. Judging from the specimens therein preserved it may be confidently stated that in Daniel and its Additions this version follows Θ closely.

(*b*) Jerome's version—Vulgate simply reproduces it—is also based on Θ, though in some parts (see on *v.* 42) it is independent of any other version or text known to us.

(5) *Arabic.* The Arabic version of Saadias (A.D. 892–942) was made from the Hebrew and therefore lacks the Apocrypha. The Arabic version of Bel and the Dragon in Walton's *Polyglot* has no critical value, being due to a priest living in Egypt in the sixteenth century; see Walton, *Proleg.* xiv. 17 f., and Cornill on Ezekiel, p. 49.

§ 4. THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE.

Until comparatively recent years the prevailing view was that Bel and the Dragon was composed and first edited in the Greek language: so Eichhorn, Ewald, De Wette, Schrader, Fritzsche, Schürer, and König.

(*a*) In favour of this conclusion the following reasons have been given:

1. No traces of any Semitic original with reasonable claims have been discovered. Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome distinctly say that no Hebrew (or Aramaic) form of this tract was known in their day.

2. It is denied that the Hebraisms are more numerous than can be accounted for on the assumption of a Greek original. See below, (*b*) 3, 4.

3. In the Greek of Susanna there are certain word-plays inconsistent with a translation: e.g. *v.* 54 f. ὑπὸ σχῖνον . . . σχίσει, and 58 f. ὑπὸ πρῖνον . . . πρίσαι. No such word-plays have been discovered in Bel and the Dragon, and where in Susanna they do occur they can be easily due to a translator. Why cannot a translator adopt alliteration? Moreover, it is noteworthy that Bel and the Dragon is more Hebraic than Susanna, though less so than the Song of the Three Children.

(*b*) On the other hand, the opinion has been growing among recent scholars that the work was written originally in Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic). Drs. Marshall and Gaster contend for an Aramaic original. But there is evidence conclusive to the present writer that the author of Bel and the Dragon wrote in Hebrew.

1. It has been pointed out (see § 3, 2 (1)) that Θ introduces Hebraisms which are absent from 𝔊, a change due undoubtedly to the fact that Theodotion had before him a Hebrew text as well as 𝔊, which latter he corrected by means of the former.

2. The extraordinary extent to which the syntactical construction called parataxy (co-ordination) exists points to a Hebrew, not an Aramaic original. The recurrence of the Greek καί with all the shades of meaning borne by the Hebrew *waw* and the Arabic *waw* and *fa* is characteristic of Hebrew very much more than of Aramaic. The latter is much richer than Hebrew in conjunctions and adverbs, so that in it hypotaxy (subordination) of sentences exists, very much in the manner of Greek; especially is this last true of Syriac which came under Greek influence.

3. There are many examples in the LXX and especially in Θ which imply the Hebrew 'waw consecutive' construction and cannot be otherwise explained. Thus sentences often begin with καὶ ἦν (= וַיְהִי) and also with καὶ ἐγένετο, followed in this latter case by a finite verb; see *vv.* 14 and 18. This *waw* consecutive construction is peculiar to Hebrew at its best, even late Biblical Hebrew has almost lost it (cf. Ecclesiastes, &c.).

4. There are many other Hebraisms: thus *v.* 14 in Θ begins with words implying וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם. In *v.* 27 (Θ) καὶ ἔθαυσεν is good Hebrew (וַיִּזְבַּח) but bad Greek, cf. 𝔊 ἐνέβαλεν. The use of θύρας, 'doors', in the sense of the singular is Hebraic, see note on *v.* 18. οὐδὲ εἰς (*v.* 18 Θ) is the Hebrew אֵין אֶחָד. The constant recurrence of καὶ εἶπεν with the various shades of meaning possessed by וַיֹּאמֶר is a Hebraism: see *v.* 20, &c.: ἄγγελος κυρίου = מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, the anarthrous ἄγγελος following the rule for nouns in the construct: see on *v.* 34; ἀναστὰς (קָם) followed by another verb: see on *vv.* 37 (𝔊) and 39 (Θ).

5. There are sometimes textual mistakes best explained on the assumption of a Hebrew original: see for examples the notes on *v.* 14 (𝔊).[1]

6. It is in favour of a Hebrew original that these two tales have been actually found in that language in a more or less complete form, as in the Midrash *Rabba de Rabba*.

[1] See Franz Delitzsch, *de Habacuce*, p. 82; Neubauer, *Tobit*, viii.

(c) Dr. M. Gaster discovered an Aramaic form of the Dragon story embedded in the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, a work of the tenth century, and he maintains that in this fragment we have a portion of the original text of Bel and the Dragon,[1] an opinion with which Dr. Marshall seems to be in sympathy. In that case the original text of the three 'Additions' was Aramaic, as these two scholars maintain. The present writer does not think that Dr. Gaster has proved his case.

1. There are constructions in all the 'Additions' which are not Greek and which can be explained from Hebrew but not from Aramaic. See above, (b) 2.

2. Two only of the three 'Additions' occur in the Aramaic version found by Dr. Gaster, and only a part (Dragon story) of the third; what has become of the rest?

3. This Aramaic form of the Dragon story differs from that in the Greek and Syriac in many particulars. In *v.* 24 the two Greek versions and Syr W have 'the king (said)', which the Aramaic text omits. In *v.* 35, after 'And Habakkuk said', the Aramaic document adds 'to the angel', which 𝔊, Θ, and Syr are without.

4. The compiler of the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* distinctly says that he had taken the Song of the Three Children and the Dragon story from the writings (i. e. the translation) of Theodotion, he having himself, it is implied, turned the Greek into Aramaic. Dr. Gaster lays stress on the compiler's words[2] that what he gives in Aramaic is that which Theodotion himself found, but the reference can be only to 𝔊, which Theodotion made the basis of his own translation, and not to an Aramaic original, though it must be admitted that the compiler does not express himself unambiguously. But when such ambiguity does exist the decision must be according to facts otherwise authenticated.

5. There is of course another explanation of the apparent Semiticisms in Bel and the Dragon. It is probable, as Wellhausen holds,[3] that the language of 𝔊 represents a Hebrew-Greek jargon actually spoken, as is the Yiddish of the present day. In favour of this are, in addition to the innumerable Hebraisms, many of them due to translation, the large number of Hebrew words transliterated instead of being translated even in cases where the sense is not obscure: e. g. βεδέκ for בֶּדֶק, 'breach', 2 Kings xxii. 5; χεττιείμ (χεττιείν) for a restored בתנים = כְּתֻנֹת, 2 Kings xxiii. 7; ἰαμείν for יָעִים, 'shovels', 2 Kings xxv. 14. These and other Hebrew words were perhaps taken over into the Greek spoken by these Jews, just as Polish-Russian-German Jews to-day talk in a German interlarded with Hebrew words.

§ 5. AUTHORSHIP, DATE, AND PLACE OF ORIGIN.

Nothing whatever is known of the author of this work and nothing that is definite of the place or date of composition. We have no Hebrew or Aramaic original from the style of which it might have been possible to draw conclusions as to date.

It is quite certain that Bel and the Dragon imply the canonical Book of Daniel and belong therefore to a later date, for they show subsequent developments of Daniel legends. The canonical Daniel is dated by modern scholars at about 160 B.C. The general character of this tract suggests that, like the canonical Daniel, it arose at a period when the Jewish religion was bitterly persecuted. Such a period was the reign of Antiochus VII (Sidetes) (139–128 B.C.). This Syrian monarch reconquered Palestine and did his utmost to suppress Judaism. At that time Hebrew was, even in Palestine, more a literary than a spoken language, and this might explain the fact that the use of the *waw* consecutive—a feature of the classical language—is preserved. It is assumed that the place of origin was Palestine, and not, as Bissel and most hold, Babylon. The references to Babylon are the same in the canonical Daniel, but they are only a literary device; and this can be said also of the mention of clay and bronze (*v.* 7), which Bissel cites as proof of a Babylonian origin.

It is to be noted that Judaism in the narrow technical sense is entirely absent from these two stories—what is taught is the absurdity of idolatry and the duty of worshipping the only true God —Yahweh. The Judaism of Babylon was of a definite orthodox kind and could hardly have given rise to a tract so vaguely religious as the one under consideration. The universalism of Bel and the Dragon stamps it as a product of the Wisdom school of Judaism, though the positive characteristics of the literature of that school (Ecclesiastes, &c.) are lacking.

Assuming a date of about 136 B. C. for the Hebrew text the LXX must be later. It may be taken for granted that when 1 Macc. ii. 59 f. was written (i. e. about 100 B. C.) the three Additions

---

[1] See *PSBA*, 1894, 280 ff. (Introduction), 312 ff. (text); and 1895, 75 ff. (translation and notes).
[2] *PSBA*, 1895, p. 83.
[3] F. Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Test.*[5], 535. Deismann, however, says (*Bible Studies*[2], 68) that in a private communication to him Wellhausen abandons the above view.

formed no part of the Book of Daniel and did not perhaps even exist in Greek. Yet these Additions exist in all extant MSS. of the Greek and Syriac texts. The character of the Greek in ᵷ and other considerations suggest that this version was made at Alexandria at a date not much later than 100 B.C. Yet the evidence for reaching such a conclusion is slight.

Theodotion is generally believed to have lived and to have completed his translation at Ephesus towards the close of the second century of our era. This accords with the fact that Irenaeus, who died A.D. 202, used Θ and preferred it to ᵷ.

§ 6. INTEGRITY.

With the exception of small parts to be indicated in the notes, and vv. 33-39, these two tales seem to have been written by one author, who, however, used pre-existing materials. The incident of the miraculous transportation of the prophet Habakkuk from his home in Palestine to the lions' den in Babylon (vv. 33-39) is certainly a later piece having no necessary connexion with the rest of the story.

§ 7. TEACHING.

These two stories teach the doctrines of the oneness and absoluteness of Yahweh, called Κύριος in ᵷ, a translation of the Hebrew word substituted by Jews from about 300 B.C. for Yahweh, which near that time took on a mystic and esoteric sense.

Little is told us of Yahweh's character. He is great, the only true God (v. 11), a living God in contrast with Bel (v. 5). Nothing is said of the nature of the demand He makes, ritual or ethical.

There is no allusion to any distinctively Jewish beliefs or practices. The law is not mentioned nor is the existence of a Divine revelation to man implied. This tract is silent as to sacrifice and temple, and even as regards priesthood, except that in ᵷ Syr W (not Θ) Daniel the prophet is spoken of as a priest; all this strong evidence of the low place assigned by the writer to the external side of the Jewish religion. We do, however, read of an angel, but in a part of the Dragon story (vv. 33-39) which is certainly introduced by an editor ab extra.

For further Introductory notes, including references to special literature, see 'Bel and the Dragon' (by the present writer) in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (Chicago), vol. i.

BEL AND THE DRAGON

The translation of Θ is that of the R. V., that of 𝔊 is by the present editor. See Introd., § 3, 1, 2.

I. THE STORY OF BEL, *vv.* 1–22

<table>
<tr><td>𝔊 87</td><td>(·)</td></tr>
<tr><td>

1   From the prophecy of Habakkuk the son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi.

2   There was a certain man a priest, by name Daniel, son of Abal, a companion of the King of Babylon.

3   And there was an idol Bel whom the Babylonians worshipped. And they expended on him daily twelve artabas of fine wheaten flour, and four sheep, and six measures of oil.

</td><td>

And king Astyages was gathered to his 1 fathers, and Cyrus the Persian received his kingdom.

And Daniel lived with the king, and was 2 honoured above all his friends. Now the Baby- 3 lonians had an idol, called Bel, and there were spent upon him every day twelve great measures of fine flour, and forty sheep, and six firkins of wine.

</td></tr>
</table>

1. Syr H begins the Story of Bel exactly as does 𝔊. But Θ and Syr W begin with a chronological notice which in the Vulg. closes Susanna.

Habakkuk. Greek Ἀμβακούμ, Syr. H Ἀβακούκ. So also in *vv.* 33 ff. It is certain that Habakkuk the prophet is meant (see on *v.* 33), though the tradition that he was a Levite, based on Hab. iii. 19 *b*, is probably inaccurate. According to *The Lives of the Prophets* he was of the tribe of Simeon. See Stonehouse, *The Book of Habakkuk*, pp. 61 ff., for this and other traditions regarding Habakkuk. This title in 𝔊 and Syr H (not in Syr W) owes its existence to the interpolated incident in *vv.* 33–39.

Cyrus . . . received his kingdom. According to this verse, identical in Syr W, Cyrus succeeded his grandfather Astyages immediately upon the death of the latter. But Herodotus (i. 130) says distinctly that Cyrus took the kingdom from Astyages by force. Ancient authors disagree on this matter, as also as to whether in fact Cyrus was the immediate successor of his grandfather or not. Recent cuneiform inscriptions confirm the testimony of Herodotus. That the incidents related in Bel and the Dragon could not have occurred during the reign of Cyrus goes without saying.

the Persian. On these words see Century Bible, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther*, pp. 19, 41.

2. **a priest, by name Daniel.** That Daniel was a priest is stated in 𝔊 and in Syr W, one of the rare instances in which the Peshitta agrees with 𝔊 against Θ. Dan. i. 3, 6 proves that Daniel could not have been a priest. That he is so described is due to priestly influence, and belongs to the period of priestly domination.

Abal. Ἀβάλ (so Fritzsche, Tisch., and Ball) for Ἀβιήλ (God my father) or Ἀβιχαίλ (= strong one, lit. father = possessor of strength, Num. iii. 35). But probably we should write with Swete and Rothstein Ἀβάλ for Hebr. הֶבֶל, Gen. iv. 2. According to Epiphanius (*Adv. Haeres.* lv. 3) Σαβαάν (שׁבעין, שׁמעין) was father of the prophet Daniel.

a companion. The Greek word συμβιωτής denotes strictly one that lives (βιόω) with another. Cf. Vulg. *conviva*. Plutarch (*Julius Caesar*, 211) employs the word for the confidants of the emperors.

lived with the king. Render, as in 𝔊 above (the same Greek word being used), ' And Daniel was a companion of the king.' Syr W ' And Daniel's glory equalled that of the king, and he dwelt with the king and was more praised than any of the king's friends'.

King of Babylon. In 𝔊 and Syr W the particular king of Babylon meant is not named.

3. **Bel.** The Hebr. word בֵּל, a short form of בַּעַל, occurs in the O.T. in Isa. xlvi, Jer. l. 2, li. 44, in all which passages it stands for Marduk (Merodach), chief of the Babylonian deities. Originally it denoted any one of the Babylonian local gods, and in particular the principal one worshipped at Nippur. Cf. the generic use of בַּעַל (Baal).

worshipped. That the Babylonians worshipped Bel is in 𝔊 distinctly stated: in Θ and Syr W it is implied. The word translated 'worship' (σέβομαι) = ' to revere ', especially as God.

artabas (in 𝔊 and Θ ἀρτάβαι): R. V. (Θ) renders 'great measures'. The artaba (ἀρτάβη) was a Persian measure = about half a hectolitre.

four. So 𝔊 and Syr H. But Θ Syr H^{mg} Fri τεσσαράκοντα (forty), which gives a better proportion. In Syr W ' forty rams '.

measures. The Greek μετρητής (R.V. 'firkin') = about nine gallons. Note the large quantity supposed to be consumed by Bel.

oil. So 𝔊: but read (with Θ Syr W Syr H^{mg}) οἶνου (wine). Cf. *vv.* 11, 14, 21 in 𝔊. Note the three kinds of sacrifices: meat offering (מִנְחָה), animal offering (זֶבַח), and drink offering (נֶסֶךְ), which accord with the regulations of the Priestly Code.

658

𝕲 87

4 The king also used to worship him, and the king used to go daily to do homage to him ; but Daniel used to pray to *the* Lord. So the king said to Daniel, Why bowest thou not down to
5 Bel? Then Daniel said to the king, None do I worship save *the* Lord, the God who created the heaven and the earth, even Him who has sovereignty over all flesh.
6 Then the king said to him, Is this then not a god? Dost thou not see how much is
7 spent on him daily? Daniel therefore said to him, Let no one by any means mislead thee by false reasoning, for this is within of clay and without of bronze: and I swear by *the* Lord the god of gods that this never did eat anything.
8 So the king became angry and summoned the overseers of the temple, and said to them, Show me who eats the things prepared for Bel, other-
9 wise ye shall die. Or (if ye do show that Bel devours them), Daniel, who alleges that these things are not eaten by him, (shall die). But they said, It is Bel himself who devours these things. Then Daniel said to the king, Let it be thus. If I shall not show that it is not Bel who devours these things, let me suffer death together with
10 all my friends. Now Bel had seventy priests besides (their) wives and children. So they conducted the king into the idol temple.

Θ

And the king did honour to it, and went daily 4 to worship it : but Daniel worshipped his own God. And the king said unto him, Why dost thou not worship Bel? And he said, Because I 5 may not do honour to idols made with hands, but to the living God, who hath created the heaven and the earth, and hath sovereignty over all flesh.

Then said the king unto him, Thinkest thou 6 not that Bel is a living God? or seest thou not how much he eateth and drinketh every day? Then Daniel laughed, and said, O king, be not 7 deceived ; for this is but clay within, and brass without, and did never eat or drink anything.

So the king was wroth, and called for his 8 priests, and said unto them, If ye tell me not who this is that devoureth these expenses, ye shall die. But if ye can show me that Bel devoureth them, 9 then Daniel shall die: for he hath spoken blasphemy against Bel. And Daniel said unto the king, Let it be according to thy word. Now the 10 priests of Bel were threescore and ten, beside their wives and children. And the king went with Daniel into the temple of Bel.

4. **worship.** The Greek verb (σέβομαι) means to revere, usually as one does a god. The imperfect tenses in this verse denote habitual actions.

him. Rather than ' it ', as the Greek has the masc., though εἴδωλον, for which the pronoun stands, is neuter.

the Lord. The anarthrous Κύριον translates the word (אדני) read for the tetragrammaton (יהוה) from about 300 B.C. Θ and SyrW have ' God '. Here, as in the foregoing Hebraism in 𝕲 (' used to go and bow down '), Θ corrects in the direction of classical Greek. Theodotion often does this, though in other cases he corrects 𝕲 according to the Hebrew. It is quite according to the usual policy of the early Persian kings to fall in, at least outwardly, with the worship of the peoples they conquered. See Century Bible, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther*, p. 40.

5. idols made with hands. This description of idols is not in 𝕲. SyrW gives ' I worship not images or sculptured things or idols because they are the work of men's hands '. In Θ and SyrW there is a contrast drawn between man-made idols and the God who is Himself the *Maker* of heaven and earth.

all flesh = every human being. See Gen. vi. 12.

6. The proof that Bel is a true, living god is the immense quantity of food he is able to eat daily !

7. Let no one . . . reasoning. It is difficult to account for the differences between 𝕲 and Θ in this verse. The words in 𝕲, ' Let no one . . . reasoning,' would be in Hebr. רמה אל־יַרְמֶךָ אישׁ ; the Greek παραλογίζομαι standing in 𝕲 generally for the Hebr. רמה, ' to deceive '. Θ has simply μὴ πλανῶ, ' deceive not thyself '. Probably the two texts represent independent attempts to translate the above Hebrew, Θ as usual avoiding a peculiarly Hebrew construction, the absolute infinitive before a finite verb strengthening it.

I swear. Not in Θ. Probably in the original Hebrew no such verb was employed, but the conjunction אם, which implies a negative oath. This Hebrew construction might easily give rise to the construction in 𝕲 and to that in Θ, though in 𝕲 ביהוה אל אלים (see Dan. xi. 36) is also implied.

laughed. So v. 19 (𝕲 and Θ) : 𝕲 here omits this verb.

brass (Θ). Render ' bronze '. Brass was unknown in the times when this tract was written.

eat. Θᴬ has, as 𝕲, simply ' eat '; Θᴺ add ' or drink '.

8. **the overseers of the Temple.** In Θ ' his priests '. Probably 𝕲 translates the Hebrew freely, Θ literally.

these expenses. Better ' this outlay ', i. e. the things on which money has been expended. The Hebrew word thus rendered is perhaps the late הוֹצָאָה (see Ezra vi. 4, 8). 𝕲 seems to translate freely.

9. **(if ye . . . them).** The words bracketed in the translation are added because implied in the Greek 𝕲, or at least are necessary for the sense.

Let it be thus, &c. 𝕲 ascribes more words to Daniel than Θ.

for he hath spoken blasphemy against Bel. Θ and SyrW give the reason, 𝕲 does not.

10. With the seventy priests of Bel cf. the four hundred of Baal in 1 Kings xviii. 22.

children. Θᴬ παιδίων, ' little children '.

the idol temple. Greek εἰδώλιον, as in 1 Esdras ii. 9; 1 Macc. i. 47 ; 1 Cor. viii. 10. Θ has ' the house ' (τὸν οἶκον), i. e. ' temple ' (see 1 Kings vi. 1 ; 2 Kings xix. 33) ' of Bel '. It is probable that Θ follows the original Hebr. (הבית).

𝕲 87

Θ

11   Then the food was laid out in the presence of the king and of Daniel, and mixed wine was 12 brought on and set out for Bel. And Daniel said, Thou thyself seest that these things are in 13 their places, O king. Do thou therefore seal the bolts of the temple, when it is shut. And the utterance pleased the king.

14   Then Daniel ordered those with him to put out of the temple all (the rest) and to besprinkle the temple with wood ashes, none of them outside the same knowing (it). And then he shut the temple and gave orders to have it sealed with the king's signet ring and with the signet rings of certain priests of high rank: and this was done. 15 And it came to pass on the morrow that they came back to the place, but the priests had, in the meantime, entered through secret doors and devoured all that had been placed before Bel 16 and drunk up the wine. Then Daniel said, O priests, look at your seals, whether they remain (intact); and do thou, O king, mark well whether anything has happened of which thou disapprovest.

17   And they found (the state of things) as it was

So Bel's priests said, Lo, we will get us out: 11 but thou, O king, set on the meat, and mingle the wine and set it forth, and shut the door fast, and seal it with thine own signet; and when thou 12 comest in the morning, if thou find not that Bel hath eaten up all, we will suffer death: or else Daniel, that speaketh falsely against us. And 13 they little regarded it: for under the table they had made a privy entrance, whereby they entered in continually, and consumed those things.

And it came to pass, when they were gone 14 forth, the king set the meat before Bel. Now Daniel had commanded his servants to bring ashes, and they strewed all the temple *with them* in the presence of the king alone: then went they out, and shut the door, and sealed it with the king's signet, and so departed. Now in the night 15 came the priests with their wives and children, as they were wont to do, and did eat and drink up all. In the morning betime the king arose, and 16 Daniel with him.

And the king said, Daniel, are the seals whole? 17

11–17. These verses differ in 𝕲 and Θ considerably. How can we account for this if both the Greek versions were made from one Hebrew original?

11. **the food**, lit. 'things eaten'.

mixed wine. What is meant is probably that the wine was mixed with certain aromatic spices which gave it a more pungent flavour. See Isa. v. 22; Ps. xvi. 2. This is according to common Oriental custom; many, however, think that the allusion is to the Greek and Roman practice of diluting wine by water. See Isa. i. 22.

signet, i.e. δακτυλίῳ, 'finger-ring signet'. Θ^ δακτύλῳ, 'finger'.

13. **bolts.** The Greek word (κλεῖδας) means primarily 'keys'; then, as here, 'bolts', 'locks'.

they entered in, &c. Cf. 1 Kings xviii. 25, 'put no fire under.' Such deceptions were, according to Chrysostom, common in heathen temples (*Hom. in Petrum et Helicum*, Opp. (Ben. ed.), vol. ii, p. 880. Syr W adds to *v.* 13 in Θ, 'and carried away what remained.'

14. **besprinkle.** 𝕲 καταστῆσαι, a Hebrewism (שׂים); Θ^B and Syr H^mg κατέσησαν, 'they shook through a sieve' (Θ^ κατέσεισαν, 'they shook'), implying וַיְנַפֵּף (= וַיְנִיפׂ)—this yields no sense. Read, with Θ 34 49 κατέστρωσαν, representing the Hebr. וַיָּזֹר, which might easily have been misread as either of the above Hebrew words.

temple. The Greek word ναός is used in 𝕲 and N.T. for the temple building proper in distinction from the temple and its enclosures (ἱερόν).

wood ashes. The word σποδός in 𝕲 denotes specially wood ashes. τέφρα is the word used in Θ. See Tobit vi. 17, viii. 22.

sealed. 𝕲 σφραγισάμενος. Read κλείσας; the sealing followed the shutting. The Hebr. verb סָתַם ('shut') could easily be read חָתַם ('seal'). We have in this confusion, as well as in that in the verbs noticed above, strong evidence of a Hebrew (not an Aramaic) original. The temple door was sealed, according to Θ, with the signet ring of the king. Syr W adds, 'and with Daniel's signet ring'; 𝕲 adds, 'and with the signet ring of certain priests of high rank' (see Dan. vi. 17).

set the meat before Bel (Θ). Syr W + 'and filled the vessels with wine according to the custom'; probably this should be added.

15. Verse 15 *b* in 𝕲 corresponds to *v.* 15 in Θ, 15 *a* answering to 16 in Θ.

it came to pass . . . that. Note the Hebrewism. In good Greek, as in English, the usual expression would be, 'On the morrow they came back.' Θ avoids the Hebrewism.

secret doors. ψευδοθυρίδων, lit. 'false doors'. See *v.* 21.

16 foll. In Θ it is the king who takes the initiative—rises early, asks about the seals. In 𝕲 it is Daniel that speaks, the priests (not Daniel) testing the seals.

16. **remain.** The Greek word (μένουσιν) perhaps to be understood absolutely 'remain *as they were*', the Hebr. for which would probably be יַעֲמׂד; but it is most likely that the original Hebr. word was יִשְׁלָמוּ (are intact, literally 'complete'), misread as above. Θ (σῷοι in *v.* 17) favours this.

17. This verse in 𝕲 has been variously rendered: 'they found that the seal had lasted' (lit. 'was'), and 'they found how the seal *really* was'. But we should have expected 'seals'—the plural—as in *v.* 16, and as in Θ, *v.* 17. Fritzsche is probably right, therefore, in regarding (ἡ) σφραγίς as an interpolation. In the second part of the verse

G 87

Θ

(the day before); so they cast away the seals.
18 But on opening the door they saw that what had
been set out for Bel had been consumed and that
the tables were empty. The king accordingly
rejoiced, and said to Daniel, Great is Bel, and
19 with him is no deception. And Daniel laughed
heartily and said to the king, Come, see the
deception of the priests. Then Daniel said, O
king, whose footprints are these?
20 And the king said, (Those) of men, women,
21 and children. Then he went to the house in
which the priests resided, and found Bel's food
together with the wine. And Daniel showed
the king the secret doors through which the
priests entered for the purpose of consuming
22 what had been set before Bel. The king there-
fore led them out of Bel's temple and delivered
them up to Daniel; and what had been provided
by purchase for him he gave to Daniel, but Bel
he destroyed.

And he said, Yea, O king, they be whole. And 18
as soon as he had opened the door, the king
looked upon the table, and cried with a loud
voice, Great art thou, O Bel, and with thee is no
deceit at all. Then laughed Daniel, and held 19
the king that he should not go in, and said,
Behold now the pavement, and mark well whose
footsteps are these.

And the king said, I see the footsteps of men, 20
women, and children. And then the king was 21
angry, and took the priests with their wives and
children, who showed him the privy doors, where
they came in, and consumed such things as were
upon the table. Therefore the king slew them, 22
and delivered Bel into Daniel's power, who over-
threw him and his temple.

THE DRAGON STORY, vv. 23-41.

G 87

(-)

23 Now there was a dragon in the same place,
24 and the Babylonians worshipped (it). And the

And in that same place there was a great 23
dragon, which they of Babylon worshipped

we are to read 'seals' (plural). Translate then as above. Syr H has 'that the seal remained', reading, perhaps,
ὡς ἔμενεν.

    And the king. So Θᵛ Syr W Fritzsche. But Θᵃ (Swete) om. ὁ βασιλεύς.

    18. Note the double Hebraism with which Θ begins v. 18, though G has the regular classical construction. This
suggests that Θ corrects G from the Hebrew original. See Introd. § 3, 2 (1).

    door. Greek has 'doors', plural, a literal rendering of the Hebr. דְּלָתַיִם, a two-leaved door. For such a door
see *H. D. B.* iv. 700 b. Another confirmation of a Hebrew, not an Aramaic, original. Syr W has the singular (tar'a),
as has Θ in v. 14.

    tables. So G: Θ 'table'. After the latter word Θ needs, and seems to have had, words similar to if not
identical with those in G. Probably we should restore according to Syr W, which usually follows Θ closely: (after
'door') 'the king looking upon the table and seeing that what had been set for Bel had been consumed, cried
out,' &c.

    with thee is no deceit at all. This last clause of v. 18 in Θ is a literal translation of a Hebraism absent from
G : 'there is no deception, . . . not one', אֵין מִרְמָה . . . אֵין אַחַת. Cf. Prov. xiv. 3.

    19. That Daniel laughed *heartily* (σφόδρα) is stated in G, not in Θ. It represents probably the Hebrew absolute
infinitive. On the other hand, that Daniel held back the king from looking in appears in Θ, not in G.

    see the deception of the priests. Referring probably to the king's acclamation (v. 18), 'there is no deception
in him' (Bel). His priests deceive if *he* does not, and indeed cannot.

    and said. Θᵃ Syr W G; >Θᵛ.

    whose. Θᵛ om. τίνος; render then, 'find out these footprints.' Θᵛᵐᵍ, Θᵃ, G, Syr W +. The sense requires it.

    20. The ὁρῶ ('I see') of Θ translates probably the Hebr. הִנֵּה. It is not represented in G.

    21. Θ and Syr W omit the words in G in the beginning of v. 21, but they are necessary for the sense and should
probably be restored. Verse 21 in Θ would in that case read: 'Then the king, becoming angry, went to the house
in which the priests resided, and found Bel's food together with the wine. He thereupon seized the priests and
their wives and children, so that (καὶ) they showed,' &c.

    found. Syr H εὗρον ('they found').

    secret doors. In G the doors are lit. 'false doors' (ψευδοθύρια); see on v. 15. In Θ the doors are literally
hidden' (κρυπτάς).

    22. **Bel's temple.** τὸ Βήλιον = 'the temple of Bel' only here; but cf. Πύθιον. See the reference in Fritzsche.

    delivered them (G). G says the king delivered up the priests to Daniel: Θ and Syr W say he delivered
up Bel. Syr W Arab., translating the Greek ἔδωκεν of Θ as 'gift', render 'gave Bel as a gift to Daniel'. G adds
that what had been expended on Bel (the residue) was also delivered up to Daniel.

    destroyed, lit. 'overthrew' (κατέστρεψεν).

    23. **dragon,** or 'serpent'. See Introduction, § 2, 2. Θ Syr W have 'great dragon'.

    in the same place. Θᵃ om., reading simply, 'and there was a great dragon.' ἐν τῷ τόπῳ Θᵃᵛ: ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ
τόπῳ Θᵛᵐᵍ.

    worshipped. See on v. 4.

    it. Θ Syr H Syr W; > G.

𝕲 87

Θ

king said to Daniel, Thou wilt not, wilt thou, say of this also that it is bronze? Lo, he liveth, eateth, and drinketh: do homage to him.

26 But Daniel said, Give me the power and I will destroy the dragon without sword or staff. So the king conceded this to him, and said, It is
27 granted thee. Then Daniel took thirty minas of pitch, fat, and hair, and boiled them together, and made a cake (out of them) and threw (it) into the dragon's mouth; and after it had eaten (the cake) it burst asunder. And he showed it to the king, saying, Is it not the case that ye worship these (fragments)?

28 Then there assembled against **the king** all the inhabitants of the country, and they said, The king has become a Jew; Bel he has overthrown and slain the dragon.

30 And when the king saw that the mob from the country was gathered against him he called his companions, and said, I give (up) Daniel to be destroyed.

31 Now there was a den in which seven lions were kept to which those who plotted against the king used to be delivered up, two bodies of

And the king said unto Daniel, Wilt thou also 24 say that this is of brass? lo, he liveth, and eateth and drinketh: thou canst not say that he is no living God: therefore worship him. Then said 25 Daniel, I will worship the Lord my God: for he is a living God.

But give me leave, O king, and I shall slay 26 this dragon without sword or staff. The king said, I give thee leave. Then Daniel took pitch, 27 and fat, and hair, and did seethe them together, and made lumps thereof: this he put in the dragon's mouth, so the dragon did eat and burst in sunder: and *Daniel* said, Lo, these are the gods ye worship.

When they of Babylon heard that, they took 28 great indignation, and conspired against the king, saying, The king is become a Jew, and he hath pulled down Bel, and slain the dragon, and put the priests to the sword. So they came to the 29 king, and said, Deliver us Daniel, or else we will destroy thee and thine house. Now when the 30 king saw that they pressed him sore, being constrained, the king delivered Daniel unto them: who cast him into the lions' den: where he was 31 six days. And in the den there were seven lions, 32 and they had given them every day two carcases,

24. **Daniel.** + μη και τουτον ερεις οτι χαλκους εστιν· ιδου ζη και εσθιει και πινει (this is translated in the R.V. (Θ) above; Θᴴ (Swete) and Vulg. om.) Θᴴ ᵃ ᵇ ᵐᵍ ᴬᵠ. + μη εις . . . χαλκ. εστιν ιδου . . . και πεινει Δ.
   brass (Θ). See v. 7, and render 'bronze'.
   do homage. The same verb (προσκυνέω) occurs in v. 4. It is the one used in 𝕲 to translate the Hebr. הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה. It represents כְּנַד in the Aramaic parts of Daniel.
   25. Verse 25 of Θ has no counterpart in 𝕲. See Deut. vi. 13; Matt. iv. 10; and cf. Dan. vi. 20, 26; 1 Thess. ii. 9.
   26. **power** (𝕲); **leave** (Θ). The Greek word (ἐξουσία) denotes delegated authority.
   sword. The word in 𝕲 denotes strictly iron; then an iron weapon. 𝕲 uses it in Job v. 20 for חֶרֶב (sword). Cf. a similar use of the Lat. *ferrum*. Θ has μάχαιρα.
   27. **thirty minas.** The weight is not given in Θ. The mina (Greek μνᾶ, Hebr. מָנֶה) is a Babylonian weight adopted after the exile by the Hebrews. The heavy mina weighed 1·636 lb. avoir., the light mina half this. See 1 Macc. xiv. 24.
   together. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό = the Hebr. יַחְדָּו. See Exod. xxvi. 9.
   a cake (𝕲). μάζα usually = 'a barley-cake'; cf. ἄρτος, 'a wheaten cake'. Θ Syr H have the plural. Syr W has a transliterated form of the Greek σφαῖρας (cf. 'sphere'), i.e. 'round things', 'balls', 'pills'. The R.V. renders 'lumps', following the Vulg. *massas*.
   dragon's mouth. + 'and the dragon swallowed them' (to complete the sense) Syr W. Perhaps it is original and should be restored.
   and after . . . asunder. + 'so that it died' Syr W.
   these (fragments). In 𝕲 ταῦτα has a touch of irony, 'these bits!' The words in Θ should be rendered, 'see what things ye worship!' (lit. 'See the objects of your worship', σεβάσματα). See Acts xvii. 23. Θᴬ, for ἴδετε in 𝕲ᴴ, has ἴδου δη.
   28 foll. differ much in 𝕲 and Θ. Verse 29 of Θ is wholly lacking in 𝕲.
   28. **against the king.** 𝕲 reads 'against Daniel' (τὸν Δανιήλ), but the sense requires τὸν βασιλέα as in Θ.
   a Jew. περι του βασιλεως λεγουσι ως γεγονεν Ιουδαιος Syr Hᵐᵍ. Grotius omits the article before βασιλεύς, and translates Θ, 'a Jew has become a king,' which is against the context.
   has overthrown. The verb used in v. 22, often rendered 'destroy'. Θᴴ has a different verb here (κατέσπασεν = 'pulled down'). But Θᴬ reads as 𝕲 (κατέστρεψεν).
   29. Lacking in 𝕲.
   30. This verse is fuller than the corresponding verse of Θ, the latter giving what appears to be a kind of summary. Verses 31 foll. in 𝕲 correspond in matter to vv. 32 and 31 in Θ.
   31, 32. **den.** The Greek word λάκκος (cf. the English 'lake') = a water-pond, a reservoir, then a pit or dungeon, as in Dan. vi. 8, &c., where it translates the Hebr. and Aram. גֹּב. Lions were kept in such places for the chase. See Bevan on Dan. vi. Fritzsche holds that the den in Dan. vi. 8, &c., is a mere cistern, whereas here it is a proper vivarium into which people looked from above. But in regard to Dan. vi. 8, &c., he is hardly right.

𝔊 87   Θ

persons condemned to death being provided for
32 them daily (as food). So the crowds cast Daniel
into that den that he might be devoured and
find no burial. And Daniel was in the lions'
33 den six days. Now it happened on the sixth
day that Habakkuk had wheaten loaves crumbled
in a bowl, cooked, and an earthen jar of mixed
wine, and that he was proceeding into the field
34 to the reapers. Then the angel of the Lord
spake to Habakkuk, saying, Thus says the Lord
God to thee: The dinner which thou holdest,
take it away to Daniel to the lions' den in
Babylon.

35 But Habakkuk said, O Lord God, I have not
seen Babylon and the den—I do not know where
36 (it) is. Then the angel of the Lord laid hold of
Habakkuk by the hair of his head and set him
37 over the den in Babylon. And Habakkuk said
to Daniel, Arise, and eat the dinner which the
38 Lord God has sent thee. Then said Daniel,
(Yea), for the Lord God who forsakes not those
who love Him has remembered me.

39 So Daniel ate ; and the angel of the Lord set
Habakkuk down (in the place) whence he had

and two sheep: which then were not given to
them, to the intent that they might devour
Daniel.

Now there was in Jewry the prophet Habak- 33
kuk, who had made pottage, and had broken
bread into a bowl, and was going into the field,
for to bring it to the reapers. But the angel of 34
the Lord said unto Habakkuk, Go carry the
dinner that thou hast into Babylon unto Daniel,
in the lions' den.

And Habakkuk said, Lord, I never saw Baby- 35
lon; neither do I know where the den is. Then 36
the angel of the Lord took him by the crown,
and lifted him up by the hair of his head, and
with the blast of his breath set him in Babylon
over the den. And Habakkuk cried, saying, O 37
Daniel, Daniel, take the dinner which God hath
sent thee. And Daniel said, Thou hast remem- 38
bered me, O God: neither hast thou forsaken
them that love thee.

So Daniel arose, and did eat: and the angel of 39
God set Habakkuk in his own place again imme-

(two) bodies. σώματα: not necessarily the bodies of dead persons. It = bodies of living or dead persons;
persons, human beings. Here it = criminals condemned to death. In Gen. xxxvi. 6 (𝔊), Tobit x. 10, Rev. xviii. 15,
and Polyb. xii. 16. 5, σῶμα = a slave. 'Two carcases', R.V. of Θ, should be 'two human bodies' or 'two persons'.
The addition in Θ and Syr W to v. 32 (𝔊 31), 'which then', &c., was suggested by Dan. ii. 19.

32. the crowds (𝔊). > Θᴬᴮ Syr W in v. 31.
that he might be devoured. The reason is given in 𝔊 only. The ancients dreaded non-burial as a dire
calamity, no doubt for superstitious reasons. See Century Bible on Psalm lxxix. 3.
six days. Daniel was in the den six days (so 𝔊, v. 32, Θ, v. 31). According to v. 33 (𝔊) it was on the sixth
day that Daniel was miraculously fed. Θ, v. 40. says he was delivered on the seventh day.
33–39. The miraculous incident in which the prophet Habakkuk plays so prominent a part has no vital connexion
with the rest of the narrative, and is certainly a late interpolation. The legend belongs to an age when the heroes
of the past, such as Daniel, Habakkuk, were becoming more and more idealized.
33. 𝔊 alone gives the time— the sixth day— and also the earthen jar and the mixed wine (see on v. 11); the place
in Judaea (R. V. ' Jewry ') is given by Θ and Syr W only. Θ and Syr W speak of Habakkuk ' the prophet '; not so 𝔊.
The Greek form of the name, Ἀμβακούμ, is due to the change of the first of two ' b's' for euphony ('mb' for 'bb') and
the dissimilation of the final ' k' to 'm'. See König, ii. 465 and 473.
34. the angel, &c. The definite article rightly prefixed, though it is absent from the Greek (𝔊 and Θ). It is really
a Hebraism, cf. מַלְאַךְ יְהֹוָה, the article in a construct noun being unnecessary in Hebrew, as in Welsh. See
Introduction, § 4. (b) 4.
The dinner. The Greek ἄριστον denotes more commonly the mid-day (dinner) than the morning meal (breakfast),
but it is not necessarily either. See Susanna, v. 13, where the R. V. renders ἀρίστου ὥρα as ' dinner time '.
35. den. After λάκκον in Θᴮ, Θᶜ adds τῶν λεόντων: cf. v. 34 (𝔊 and Θ).
is. Θᴬ; > Θᴮ. So R.V. Syr W has ' and the den I do not know '.
36. The verb ἐπιλαμβάνομαι takes after it two genitives in both versions, an unusual but not unprecedented con-
struction. According to 𝔊 the angel laid hold of the hair of the prophet's head ; Θ says it was of the crown (κορυφή)
of his head that the angel laid hold, though he was lifted up by his hair.
the angel of the Lord. Θᴬ omits Κυρίου : the article before ἄγγελος supports this. See on v. 34.
with the blast of his breath. Only in Θ. Render ' with the swiftness of wind ', omitting αὐτοῦ (dittograph).
Syr W and Midrash Bereshith Rabba, ' by the might of the Holy Spirit '; Jer. Vulg. in impetu spiritus sui (' by the
force of His spirit '), Douay version. See Dan. ix. 21 ; Ezek. viii. 3. In one instant Habakkuk is transferred from
Palestine to Babylon, and in another he is brought back.
37. Habakkuk. Syr W. Ἀμβακούμ 𝔊 Θᴮ (see on vv. 1, 33). Ἀμβακούκ Θᴬ. Θᴬ omits Ἀμβακούμ, reading ' and
he cried out '.
Arise and. ἀναστάς, &c., a Hebraism, though found in Syr W. Cf. קוּם followed by another verb = ' set about '.
See Introd. §§ 4, (b) 4, and cf. Century Bible, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, p. 145.
38. In 𝔊 Daniel speaks of God in the 3rd person ; in Θ he addresses God.
who forsakes not. ἐγκαταλείπων 𝔊 ; ἐγκατέλειπες Θ ; ἐγκαταλιπών Syr H. Syr W gives 3rd person as 𝔊.
39. Note the Hebraism in Θ, ἀναστάς ; so Syr W. See on v. 37 (𝔊).
the angel of the Lord. Θ changes ' Lord ' to ' God '. Syr W has simply ' an angel '.
in his own place (Θ). For εἰς (Θᴮ), Θᴬⱽ reads ἐπί.

𝔊 87

Θ

taken him on the same day. But the Lord God
40 remembered Daniel. (Then) the king after these
things went forth bewailing Daniel; and as he
stooped to pry into the den he saw him sitting
41 (there). So the king cried out and said, Great
is the Lord God, and there is no other (god)
42 besides Him. And the king led Daniel out of
the den, and those who would have brought
about his destruction he cast into the den in the
presence of Daniel, and they were devoured.

diately. Upon the seventh day the king came to 40
bewail Daniel: and when he came to the den, he
looked in, and, behold, Daniel was sitting. Then 41
cried the king with a loud voice, saying, Great
art thou, O Lord, thou God of Daniel, and there
is none other beside thee. And he drew him out, 42
and cast those that were the cause of his destruc-
tion into the den: and they were devoured in
a moment before his face.

on the same day (τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ 𝔊); **immediately** (παραχρῆμα Θ): 'in that hour' = 'immediately' Syr W. The
bracketed words in the rendering of 𝔊 above occur in Syr W, which usually follows 𝔊.
But the Lord God remembered Daniel. This last clause in 𝔊 is absent from Θ.
40. **after these things** in 𝔊 corresponds to 'on the seventh day' in Θ.
41. In 𝔊 the king speaks of God in the third person; in Θ he addresses God. See on v. 38. Syr W omits last
clause of verse ('there is no other').
the king (Θᵍ). Θᴮ om. ὁ βασιλεύς.
and there is none other beside thee. > καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν πλην σου αλλος Θᴬᵠ. In 𝔊 (followed by Syr H) these
words are appended: Δανιηλ κατα τους ό: in Θᴮᵠ Δανιηλ: in Θᴬ τελος Δαν. προφητου.