The Aramaic of Daniel

K. A. Kitchen*

[p.31]

INTRODUCTORY

This subject has been closely studied by two or three generations of modern scholars[1]—S. R. Driver,[2] R. D. Wilson;[3] G. R. Driver,[4] W. Baumgartner,[5] H. H. Rowley;[6] J. A. Montgomery,[7] H. H. Schaeder,[8] F. Rosenthal,[9] and various others. Nevertheless, there is today ample scope for reassessment. The inscriptional material for Old and Imperial[10] Aramaic and later phases of the language is constantly growing. One need only mention the Brooklyn and

* My thanks go to Mr. David Clines, Department of Biblical History, University of Sheffield, for kindly reading the manuscript of this paper in the light of his own investigations, and for comments and corrections; also to Mr. Alan Millard, Librarian at Tyndale House, Cambridge, for some additional references.

[p.32]

Borchardt-Driver documents published in 1953 and 1954 or the Aramaic documents from Qumran and other cave-sites of Graeco-Roman Palestine. Furthermore, some earlier views require revision in the light of facts hitherto unknown or neglected.

In dealing with the book of Daniel, theological presuppositions are apt to colour even the treatment and dating of its Aramaic.[11] The only fair way to proceed is to leave open the whole period *c.* 540-160 BC until the end of any inquest on the Aramaic, as far as date is concerned.

---

[1] See F. Rosenthal, *The Aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen* (1939, repr. 1964), pp. 60-71. Throughout this paper no attempt is made to give the luxuriant bibliography of Aramaic either inside or outside of Daniel. Besides Rosenthal down to 1938-1939, *cf.* (e.g.) J. J. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie,* I-II (1962).

[2] *LOT*[9], pp. 502-504, 508, and xxxiv-xxxviii; S. R. Driver, *Daniel* (Cambridge Bible, 1900), pp. lix-lx.

[3] In *Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary...* (1912), pp. 261-306.

[4] *JBL*, XLV, 1926, pp. 110-119, 323-325.

[5] *ZAW,* XLV, 1927, pp. 81-133.

[6] *AOT* and indirectly *HSD*. In English, at least, Rowley's book of 1929 is a classic statement from the point of view of a second century date for the Aramaic of Daniel, with a wealth of data, and was the last substantial work on the subject to appear in English. Therefore his book has been taken as a convenient starting-point at certain junctures in this study. While Rowley's failure adequately to recognize the distinction between orthography and phonetics (and to take any note of relevant ancient literary methods) raises grave doubts of his results, it is a pleasure to acknowledge his convenient and careful marshalling of so much of the basic material at issue.

[7] J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* (International Critical Commentary, 1927), pp. 15-20.

[8] *Iranische Beiträge* I, 1930, being Heft 5, 6. Jahr of the *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft* (Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse). Pages are quoted both by Heft and as book.

[9] See work cited n.1, above.

[10] I use 'Imperial Aramaic' merely as one possible English equivalent among Several others for the usual German term *Reichsaramäische.*

[11] Thus, on 'inhaltlichen Kriterien', 'content' (Rosenthal, *Aramaistishe Forschung,* p. 71 *apud* J. Lindner, *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* LIX, 1935, pp. 503-545; H. L. Ginsberg, *JAOS,* LXII, 1942, p. 231 end, *apud* Schaeder), i.e. prejudging the book *a priori* as pseudepigraphic. Wilson (n. 3, above) and Rowley (n. 6, above) represent opposite viewpoints.

In this study, the Aramaic of Daniel is examined compactly in relation to (*a*) vocabulary, (*b*) orthography and phonetics, and (*c*) general morphology and syntax. This enquiry is necessarily limited to the main points at issue, without digressing into secondary literature or investigating the details of all the older discussions. It is not a total presentation of work done or of material available; the entire analysed word-list of Biblical Aramaic is omitted, and also detailed references to the Nabataean and Palmyrene data (sparse in any case) and Targums.[12]

A. VOCABULARY

1. *Basic West Semitic.* For the purpose of this study, the entire word-stock of Biblical Aramaic, in particular of that in Daniel, has been listed and analysed against the comparative background of objectively-dated inscriptions and papyri in Old and Imperial Aramaic, and cognate West Semitic and Akkadian (Babylonian and Assyrian).[13] The result is that nine-tenths of the vocabulary is attested in texts of the fifth century BC[14] or earlier. The slender one-tenth remaining consists of words so far found only in sources

[p.33]

later than the fifth Century BC (*e.g.* Nabataean, Palmyrene or later Aramaic dialects), or so far not attested externally at all.

The meaning of these facts in either case is clear. Among the nine-tenths, words found in Old and Imperial Aramaic documents in the ninth to fifth centuries BC would in themselves allow of any date for the Aramaic of Daniel from the sixth century BC onwards. Words found in other early West Semitic texts[15] as well as in the Aramaic of Daniel are to be taken as being not merely early Aramaic but as common, early West Semitic, not even peculiar to Aramaic. Words found in Akkadian may be relevant in one of three or four main ways: they may be taken as Common Semitic; they may indicate old West Semitic terms borrowed by Akkadian (e.g., as in the Mari texts of the eighteenth century BC);[16] they may represent Aramaic words so far only attested as loan-words in later Akkadian (Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian, eighth-fifth centuries BC), or else may be Akkadian vocables borrowed as loan-words by Old or Imperial Aramaic and so turn up in our text. Whichever the individual case, the result ultimately is the same—all such words could obviously occur at any time from the sixth century BC onwards.

---

[12] A sufficiency of this later material is included in *AOT, passim.*

[13] Apart from the Ararnaic papyri (which also contain Persian words), what follows principally concerns the main Semitic word-stock of the Aramaic of Daniel. It is regretted that the detailed analysis of the vocabulary of Biblical Aramaic cannot be included with this paper—even set out compactly, it would require up to forty pages in small quarto.

[14] The accidents of preservation and discovery have so far produced very many more Aramaic papyri for the fifth century BC than for the sixth, the upper time-limit for Daniel. However, attestation of a Semitic word in a fifth-century document is ordinarily a sufficient presumption for its existence and use in the late sixth century BC. The onus of proof would lie on anyone who might prefer to believe the contrary. The sixth-century P. Meissner differs in no essentials from fifth-century documents.

[15] Including: Ugaritic (fourteenth-thirteenth centuries BC), Canaanite glosses in the Amarna tablets (fourteenth century BC), Phoenician, Hebrew and Moabite inscriptions (tenth century onwards).

[16] Good examples, *cf.* E. A. Speiser, *JBL*, LXXIX, 1960, pp. 157-163; M. Noth, *Die Ursprünge des alten Israel im Lichte neuer Quellen* (1961), pp. 14-22, 34-40 (on which see D. O. Edzard, *ZA,* LVI, NF XXII, 1964, pp. 142-149); A. Malamat, *JAOS,* LXXXII, 1962, pp. 143-150.

Turning to the one-tenth of unattested and so far late-attested words, two interpretations are theoretically possible for the latter class. One may assume that they are genuinely 'late' words, and therefore bring down the date of the Aramaic of Daniel—or of their introduction into that Aramaic—to a suitably late date. One may with equal justification assume that in fact this is the familiar vicious fallacy of negative evidence[17]—that these words may yet turn up in 'early' sources, so disproving their apparently late date.[18] Otherwise-unattested words, of course, cannot serve as

[p.34]

dating evidence at all. Where nine-tenths of the vocabulary is clearly old-established (fifth century BC and earlier), it is a fair assumption that the lack of attestation of the odd tenth represents nothing more than the gaps in our present knowledge—gaps liable to be filled by new material in the course of time.[19]

Hence, as far as the main (i.e. Semitic) vocabulary is concerned, we have no warrant whatever to draw any conclusion about the date of Daniel from its Aramaic except to say that any date from the sixth century BC onward is possible.[20]

2. *Hebrew and Akkadian Loan-words.* However, separate consideration must be given to foreign loan-words in Biblical Aramaic. These are attributable to Hebrew, Akkadian, Persian and Greek sources. Hebraisms in Biblical Aramaic require no consideration—its writers were Hebrews, one expects them to betray this, and such Hebraisms have no bearing on date.

Akkadian words in Aramaic are also of very limited value in this connection, for Aramaean penetration of Mesopotamia from the Middle Euphrates down to southern Babylonia persisted from the twelfth century BC (Tiglath-pileser I)[21] for six or seven hundred years before the period of the late sixth-mid-second centuries BC that is our concern here. During that long period there was ample time for Aramaic words to enter Akkadian, and for Akkadian words to penetrate Aramaic. From the eighth century BC, Aramaic enjoyed official recognition in

---

[17] See my *Ancient Orient and Old Testament,* section I.B.5 (ii*b*). It is no unusual occurrence in Egyptian, for example, for words once known only from texts of the Graeco-Roman age suddenly to turn up a millennium or two earlier in Old, Middle or Late Egyptian texts. For Semitic, *cf.* (e.g.) the next notes.

[18] A random example or two from Semitic must suffice here. Sixty years ago, *ḥmr* 'wine', in Biblical Aramaic and Hebrew could be dismissed as 'late' in the latter (*cf. BDB,* p. 1093a, *s.v.*). But the word is now attested in Ugaritic (fourteenth-thirteenth century BC; *UM,* III, no. 713) and also in Mari Akkadian (M. L. Burke, *Archives Royales de Mari,* XI (1963), p. 133, §11). Or take *špr,* 'be fair, acceptable', in the Aramaic of Daniel, also in Hebrew, labelled as 'rare and mostly late' (*BDB,* p. 1117, *s.v.*). This word occurs at least twice in the Ahiqar papyrus of the fifth century BC (lines 92, 108 and perhaps 159), once in the mid eighth century BC (Sfiré stela III, line 29), and as a proper name (like Shiprah of Ex. 1:15) back in the eighteenth century BC in the slave-list of Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446 (W. C. Hayes, *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom* (1955), p. 96; W. F. Albright, *JAOS,* LXXIV, 1954, p. 229). Rare it may be; late, it is not.

[19] *Cf.* previous note; a good example is the supposedly late *yt* of Biblical Aramaic turning up in an Aramaic papyrus published in 1953, *cf.* below, p. 69.

[20] When such vocabulary is common to both 'early' sources (Old Aramaic; papyri) and to 'late' ones (e.g. Targums), this does not *a priori* date Daniel any closer to (say) the Targums than to the Old Aramaic texts or the papyri; it could be at either end, or anywhere in between, or even slightly before or after (seen strictly from this vocabulary point-of-view).

[21] See E. Forrer in E. Ebeling and B. Meissner (eds.), *Reallexikon den Assyriologie,* I, 1928, pp. 131-139: *Aramu.*

Assyria.[22] Thus, if one combines the words of possible Akkadian origin given by Rowley in *AOT,* pp. 134-135, with those given by Rosenthal, *GBA,* §§188, 190 (pp. 57-58, 59), one obtains a total of some 37 words and phrases,

[p.35]

including b^el-*ṭ'm* (but not *ṭ'm)* and ^ebr-*nhr* as phrases. One of these 37 is probably not Akkadian (*'uššarna*, in Ezra only) but Old Persian (with Rosenthal, *GBA,* §189). Of the remaining 36 words, 15 occur only in Ezra, leaving 21 in Daniel, 16 of them in Daniel alone. The vocabulary analysis already mentioned would indicate that practically all of these 21 words are either attested in Imperial Aramaic well beyond Daniel, or have a long history prejudicial to their entering Aramaic only in the sixth century BC (or later) or occur already in Old Aramaic or West Semitic, or in Hebrew outside Daniel (ruling out special usage there). In other words, the Akkadian loan-words are probably simply part of the multicoloured fabric of Aramaic, and have no real bearing on the date of the language of Daniel within the sixth to the second centuries BC. Only *'åš^epa,* 'enchanter' (Akkadian *ašipu),* is restricted so far to the Hebrew (1:20; 2:2) and Aramaic (2:10, 27; 4:4; 5:7, 11, 15) of Daniel, outside of Akkadian itself, and is not attested (so Rowley) in the later Aramaic of, for example, the Targums. This might speak for a direct loan from Akkadian into the Hebrew and Aramaic usage of a Hebrew in Babylon in the mid-sixth century BC—but it is *so* isolated that as a single word it cannot constitute proof. A single occurrence of *'šp* in some future discovery of a West Semitic text or Aramaic document would soon dispel any such assumption. Hence, for dating purposes, the Akkadian words in the Aramaic of Daniel must be accorded the same status of *non liquet* as the rest of the Semitic vocabulary.

3. *Persian Loan-words.* The Persian words in the Aramaic of Daniel are some 19 in number. Rowley gave 20 such words.[23] From his list, *zmn* and *srbl* should probably be omitted,[24] and to it *pṭyš* (a garment) be added.[25] With these changes, 13 out of the 20 words are attested in later literature, particularly the Targums,[26] while

[p.36]

---

[22] See R. A. Bowman, *JNES,* VII, 1948, pp. 75-76; in 729 BC, tribute for Tiglath-pileser III is shown as recorded by an Aramaean scribe with pen and parchment alongside his cuneiform colleague; note also for 701 BC, 2 Ki. 18:13-37, Is. 36:1-22.

[23] *AOT,* p. 138.

[24] *Zmn,* 'time', is probably derived from Akkadian *simānu* (refs. in *KB,* p. 1972*a*), rather than from Old Persian *zurvan* (m = rv seems far-fetched). *Srbl,* 'trousers' (?), is of obscure origin, but known to the fifth-century papyri (*AP,* no. 42:9). It can hardly be native to Old Persian, as the latter does not use *l* except in foreign words that already contain *l,* and only in those not assimilated (*OP,* p. 8, §6, and especially p. 33, §107; *cf.* W. Brandenstein and M. Mayrhofer, *Handbuch des Altpersischen* (1964), pp. 32-33, 35, §§28, 32).

[25] With F. Rosenthal, *GBA,* p. 59, §189; *KB,* p. 1112*b*, after Nyberg.

[26] Rowley's twelve words are reduced to ten by omission of *zmn* and *srbl;* but these losses are more than made up by (i) *pṭyš* which also occurs in Talmudic literature (*BDB,* p. 1108), (ii) *gdbr* which is merely a variant of *gzbr* and should not count separately (see below, pp. 61-62), and (iii) *dt,* 'law', which is now attested in the Qumran Targum to Job (see J. van den Ploeg, *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte* II *de Qumran* (1962), p. 7—where *ptgm* also occurs).

6 of them so far are not.[27] (In the Aramak of Ezra, Rowley listed 9 words, which would become 8 with the omission of *zmn* as in Daniel. But to this 8 may be added a further 5 words (with Rosenthal, §§189-190 *et al.*): *'sprn', 'prs(t)k, 'šrn', 'štdr, šršw.* Of these 13 words, 5 occur in later (e.g. Targumic) literature as survivals, that is, Rowley's five, minus *zmn,* but plus *dt* instead.)

In the Aramaic papyri collected together by Cowley,[28] Rowley with him would find (p. 139) some 26 Persian words of which only 2 occur in the Targums. He further noted that only 2 of these words (*t(y)pt, zn*) recurred in Daniel; and 3 (*'zd', gnz, nštwn*) in Ezra, probably 4 (adding *'šrn'*),[29] as preferred here. All this led him to observe that (p. 139) 'a very large proportion of the Persian words found in Daniel is known to have persisted in Aramaic until Targurnic times' [i.e. until the first century BC and later], 'while a very small proportion of those found in Egyptian Aramaic so persisted'. So far so good, on the facts so far adduced. Rowley then interpreted these facts as follows (p. 139): 'In this matter [survival of words in Daniel], therefore, Biblical Aramaic... stands very much nearer to the Targums than do the Papyri.' And later in the same paragraph, 'It thus appears that in the matter of Persian loan-words Biblical Aramaic is also very much nearer to the Targums than it is to the Papyri.'

These inferences are open to question on various grounds.

(1) As generally admitted, the Persian vocabulary in the Aramaic of Daniel amounts to barely a score of words. When the material at hand consists of words by the thousand or even in hundreds, there is some hope of sound results, but a mere score or so of words is altogether too fragile a basis for statistical argument.[30] This will become more evident from what follows.

(2) If one compares the Persian vocabulary of Biblical Aramaic with what the Targums contain—as Rowley does in the interests of a second-century date for Daniel—one should also compare that vocabulary equally with what is found in Imperial Aramaic docu-

[p.37]

ments of the sixth-fifth centuries BC.[31] This omission must now be rectified.

Of the 19 words here accepted as Persian in the Aramaic of Daniel, 8 or g occur in Imperial Aramaic and contemporary sources. In Imperial Aramaic, we find *ptgm, 'zd', zn, t(y)pt, gzbr,*[32] and [*rz*][33] (all in the Elephantine papyri from Egypt); and via Elamite,[34] *'ḥšdrpn, dt,*

---

[27] The proportion is thus now 12:7 instead of 12:8 as in Rowley's time. More Qumran material could easily increase the body of such survivals; the new Job Targum contains some other Persian words, e.g. *dḥšt,* 'desert', known neither to Biblical Aramaic nor to the papyri as yet (van der Ploeg, *loc. cit.*).

[28] *AP.*

[29] See for this word C. G. Tuland, *JNES,* XVII, 1958, pp. 275-274, and as Old Persian, H. S. Nyberg, *Le Monde Oriental,* XXIV, 1930, pp. 538-139. But *cf.* also E. G. Kraeling, *BMAP,* p. 101, n.6.

[30] A fact realized at least in part by Rowley (p. 136: 'While in literature so scanty as our texts, all arguments on Vocabulary are liable to be precarious...'), but not sufficiently. It is clearly stated by F. Rosenthal, *Aramaistische Forschung,* p. 63, in another connection.

[31] In practice, mainly of the fifth century BC, due simply to the accidents of preservation and discovery.

[32] Of which *gdbr* is merely a variant; see below, pp. 61-62.

[33] Ahiqar, 141, restored—but what else of two letters would fit? If this word be omitted, then we have eight, not nine words here.

Dt, 'law, decree', also occurs in Akkadian cuneiform as early as the second, sixteenth and thirty-fifth years of Darius I, and *databara* in a later group of documents.[35] In other words, nearly half of the Persian words in the Aramaic of Daniel are attested (mainly in Aramaic itself) in the sixth-fifth centuries BC. Or, nearly half of the Persian words would speak *just* as much for a sixth-fifth century date as would the 13 words found in the Targums for a second-century date. Now, of the 8 or 9 words here listed as occurring early, 4 or 5 (*ptgm, gzbr, dt, zn,* [*rz*]) recur in the Targums and 4 (*'zd', t(y)pt, 'ḥšdrpn, dtbr*) do not. In other words, on Rowley's kind of reasoning, half of these 8 or 9 words would stand nearer to the Targums and half to the sixth-fifth centuries BC—but as those recurring in the Targums also occur in documents of the sixth-fifth centuries BC, could these documents, too, stand 'nearer' to the Targums than to other documents of their own date? Clearly they could not; the plain fact is that all of these 8 or 9 words came into Aramaic (and Akkadian and Elamite) in the sixth-fifth centuries BC, and some of them happen to be retained four centuries later (*cf.* (4) below). The occurrence of 4 or 5 of them in both Persian imperial documents and Targums merely leaves the date of Daniel's Aramaic where it was before: in the sixth to second centuries BC.

(Similarly with Ezra's Aramaic. Of the 13 words here, 9 occur in Imperial Aramaic or contemporary sources (*'ptm,* perhaps in Akkadian), only 4 so far do not (*'prs(t)k,*[36] *pršgn, 'drzd', 'štdr).* That

[p.38]

is, three-quarters of the Persian words in the Aramaic of Ezra are attested in the sixth-fifth century BC documents available, and speak for an early date. Of these 9 words, 4 recur in the Targums (*ptgm, gnz, gnzbr, dt*) but 5 do not (*'sprn', 'šrn', nštwn, šršw, 'ptm).*[37] In other words, again, half of the words are 'early' only, and half both early and late, with the same result as in Daniel, i.e. sixth-fifth to second centuries BC for scope in dating.)

(3) As for the Aramaic of Daniel having only 2 Persian words (and that of Ezra, 4)[38] in common with the Aramaic of the fifth-century papyri from Egypt, much new material has become available since 1929, and permits of some interesting comparisons.

In the eighty-seven documents collected by Cowley,[39] some twenty-seven words were isolated as probably Persian. Since then, two further (but much smaller) collections of Aramaic documents have been published, by Kraeling in 1953[40] and Driver in 1954-1957,[41] besides a trickle of lesser items.[42]

---

[34] Both under Darius I; for the view that treasury-orders at Persepolis were turned into Aramaic and then Elamite (hence Old Persian words in these texts would come *via* Aramaic), see *PTT,* chapter 2, especially pp. 27 ff., nuanced by G. G. Cameron, *JNES,* XVII, 1958, p. 163.

[35] *CAD,* 3/D, pp. 122-123. These, too, are likely to be indirect evidence for *dt, dtbr* in Aramaic in so far as the latter language was used as intermediary between Persian officials and cuneiform scribes in Babylonia. *Dāta* is, of course, directly attested from Darius I onwards in actual Old Persian texts (*OP,* p. 189).

[36] This word is probably also attested within the Persian period in Akkadian as *iprasakku* (*CAD,* 7/I-J, pp. 165-166). This would give Ezra fourteen words attested early and only three not (so far).

[37] One word (*pršgn*) so far only in Ezra and Targums (apart from biblical Hebrew, left out of account in this study, except where cited).

[38] *AOT,* p. 139, but including *'šrn';* in fact, the proportions are quite different: Daniel, five or six words in the papyri and three more in parallel material; and Ezra, eight in the papyri and one probably in the parallel material—*cf.* above, pp. 37f.

[39] I.e. *AP,* nos. 1-83, plus Ahiqar, Behistun-text, and two documents (A; B + C) in Appendix, pp. 317-319.

[40] *BMAP.*

The Kraeling series comprises seventeen documents (four very fragmentary), practically all legal texts. As might be expected, they contain numerically fewer Persian words than the Cowley corpus—11, of which (*'bygdn, hnbg', hngyt, 'šrn'*) occur in Cowley, 1 in Driver and Cowley (the ubiquitous *krš*), 1 in the Talmud,[43] and 5 (*hptḥpt, hnpn', 'drng, drmy*,[44] *'zt*)[45] nowhere else. In even so few documents, half the Persian words are otherwise unattested in contemporary records!

The Driver series consists of thirteen letters and various lesser fragments. The bulk of these letters came from Babylon (and perhaps Susa) to Egypt, sent by the Persian Arsames, satrap of Egypt (while absent from Egypt) and three of his adjutants. This small

[p.39]

group of documents contains no less than 26 Persian words[46]—three-quarters as many as the entire Cowley collection of eighty-seven documents! Nor is this all. Of those 26 words, 19 are entirely flew to Imperial Aramaic, 2 are shared with Cowley and Kraeling (*krš, pt*), and only another 3 words with the Cowley series (*gnz, hmrkry', hndyz*), and 2 more in other sources (*'sprn, ptgm*). One of the new words (*srwšyt'*, 'punishment') recurs in a slightly different spelling (*šršw*, probably to be taken as *šrśw* originally, initial *śin* assimilated to *shin*?) in Ezra (7:26, 'banishment').[47] Five others of the new words recur in the Talmud (*bg*, 'domain'; *dšn'*, 'gift'; *ptkr*, 'image'; *gnz*, 'treasury'; *ptgm*, 'decree'[48]). In other words, the Driver documents show as many affinities in their Persian vocabulary with the Talmud (3 words; plus *gnz* and *ptgm* attested early and late) as with other records of the fifth century BC (five items in Cowley and Kraeling)—but no-one would use such statistics to prove that the Driver documents should be placed half-way chronologically between the fifth and second centuries BC (*c.* 250?) on such a basis![49] Ezra is in a far more convincing position with his 9 Persian words in sixth-fifth century sources out of only 13 (and 1 word unattested so far except in Biblical Hebrew and the Targums), than are the Driver documents with only 5 or 7 contemporaneously attested Persian words out of 26 (and 3 words unattested elsewhere until the Talmud) Likewise, Daniel with 8 or 9 Persian words in sixth-fifth century sources (5 or 6 actually in the papyri) out of 21 words (and 7 words unattested until the Targums) compares perfectly well with the 5 or 7 words in the sixth-fifth centuries out of 26 (3, only in Talmud) of the Driver documents—these latter have less in the late sources only, but less in the early documents also!

The whole of this section (3) simply throws into relief the following facts. (i) With only a score or so Persian words in each writing or group of documents, statistics are virtually worthless. (ii) The supposedly few Persian words common to the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra and that of the eighty-seven papyri in Cowley prove *only* that our knowledge of the total

[41] G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century BC* (1954) and abridged and revised version 1957).

[42] And others yet to be published, *e.g.* the fifth-century Aramaic papyri from Tuna el-Gebel (Hermopolis West) in Middle Egypt (*cf.* M. Kamil, *Revue de l'Histoire Juive en Égypte,* I, 1947, pp. 1-3).

[43] *Mgwš*, 'magian', in *AP,* p. 254: 'Behistun text', line 60, *cf.* M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud…* II 1926, p. 727*a/b.*

[44] Unless this word is Greek? *Cf.* below, pp. 46, 47.

[45] This word, J. De Menasce, *BO,* XI, 1954, p. 161; *LAP,* p. 38.

[46] Excluding, as throughout this discussion, personal and place names.

[47] N.B. *šrōši* in Qrē—from *śrwšy(t)*?

[48] M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud…* I, pp. 134*b*, 326b, II, p. 1254*b.*

[49] And it is as striking that the Kraeling legal documents have barely half their Persian vocabulary in common with the other Elephantine documents collected in Cowley.

impact of Old Persian upon Imperial Aramaic (and its continuations) is grossly inadequate, when one small group of closely similar documents yields 50 per cent new

[p.40]

Persian loan-words, and another and separate group (from the East) 19 out of 26 words new (*c.* 80 per cent). (iii) It should be noted that in fact several more words in the Aramaic of both Daniel and Ezra are common to them and the Aramaic papyri (besides other documents) than was allowed by Rowley in 1929. (iv) When words are attested outside of Daniel (or Ezra) both in the sixth-fifth century texts and in the late (Targumic/Talniudic) sources, this proves *only* that these words had along life in Aramaic, and in themselves leave open the whole period of the sixth-second centuries BC for Daniel. Words attested *only* in Daniel (or Ezra) and, say, the Targums can be balanced by other words occurring , *only* in Daniel (or Ezra) and the sixth-fifth century documents—each represents merely negative evidence for the periods unattested, and hence is useless for specific dating purposes; they cancel each other out. This matter of survivals must now be further considered.

(4*a*). From the preceding, it should be plainly evident that Persian words in Daniel that survive in Targums or Talmud prove *only* that the words in question could have been used as easily by a writer of Aramaic in the second century BC as by one in the sixth or fifth century BC. It is unjustifiable to infer therefrom (with Rowley, p. 139) that Biblical Aramaic is 'nearer', i.e. chronologically, to the Targums than to the papyri. The numerical 'preponderance' of 13 such words in Daniel as opposed to 5 in Ezra or 7 in Cowley, Kraeling and Driver has thus no necessary bearing on the date of Daniel at all. Words must be weighed, not merely counted.[50]

As already stated, the impact of Old Persian upon Imperial Aramaic was considerable. The Persian kings appointed Persian and Median officials to govern their empire, and Aramaic was the means of communication between these and the polyglot nations so ruled. In the administrative sphere, the impact was intense—note the list of about 100 Old Persian words in the eighty-four Elamite 'money-order' tablets from the Persepolis Treasury published by Cameron,[51] to which still more may be added,[52] not least when 2000 more Persepolis tablets (fortifications archive) are eventually published.[53] The effect on Aramaic must have been the greater, as its use was infinitely wider than Elamite. In the two centuries between *c.* 540 BC and *c.* 330 BC many such words had

[p.41]

ample time not merely to enter Aramaic but to become a regular part of it, assimilated in fact. Thus, when Alexander and his Macedonians supplanted the Persian rulers, Aramaic-speaking peoples would continue to use those Persian words that had lodged securely in Aramaic usage. A fair number of words would drop away—those for institutions and practices that ceased with Persian rule, or received new, Greek names under the Macedonian kings, for example.

---

[50] *Cf.* F. Rosenthal, *Aramaistische Forschung,* p. 63.

[51] *PTT,* Texts 1-84 (no. 85 is an Akkadian 'stray'), and list of Old Persian words on pp. 42-43.

[52] E.g. *nidani, pitgam, karnuvaka, raṣakara, garda* (± *pati*), *fratama, pansukaš* (G. G. Cameron, *JNES,* XVII, 1958, pp. 161-162, 165, n.8, 9).

[53] By R. T. Hallock; *cf. JNES,* XVII, 1958, pp. 256-257.

The *scope* of Persian words borrowed during the Persian Empire must also have been very broad—from specialized technical terms and titles from administration, law and military, through names of specific 'cultural elements' (clothes, materials, etc.) down to apparently ordinary sorts of words like *zn,* 'kind', *ptgm,* 'message', etc.[54] Furthermore, the almost unconscious assumption[55] that Persian words would take some time to penetrate into Aramaic (i.e. well after 539 BC) is erroneous.[56] The Persepolis Treasury tablets run from the 30th year of Darius I to the 7th of Artaxerxes I, while those yet to be published from the fortifications archive go back to the 11th to 28th years of Darius 1.[57] (Akkadian was much less receptive to Old Persian loan-words (so far as is known), but as already seen, *dāta,* 'law, decree', occurs in years 2, 16 and 35 of Darius 1.[58]) Had we similar Aramaic and Elamite documents for Cyrus and Cambyses, the same result might be anticipated. In other words, if a putative Daniel in Babylon under the Persians (and who had briefly served them) were to write a book some time after the third year of Cyrus (Dn. 10: 1), then a series of Persian words is no surprise. Such a person in the position of close

[p.42]

contact with Persian administration that is accorded to him in the book would have to acquire—and use in his Aramaic—many terms and words from his new Persian colleagues (just like the Elamite scribes of Persepolis), from the conquest by Cyrus onwards.

(4*b*). It is necessary, also, to note what words are involved in practice, and not merely how many. Given the two centuries of unhindered Persian penetration of the Aramaic language (*c.* 540-330 BC), one cannot be surprised that such 'ordinary' words as *zn,* 'kind'; *rz,* 'secret'; *nbršt,* 'lamp'; *ndn,* 'sheath, body'; *nbzb',* 'gift', should be assimilated and survive later. The same applies to items of apparel (*hnmk,* 'necklace'; *ptyš,* 'shirt'(?)), and words of such wide application as *ptgm,* 'word'; *dt,* 'law, decree'. *Hdm,* 'limb', came from legal usage[59] (and *gnz,* 'treasure', in Ezra, from administration), as in Daniel, but is an ordinary word in the Targums. The survival of these 10 words (plus one in Ezra) can of itself prove nothing about Daniel's date. Three words remain over (the first in early sources as well as the Targums): *gzbr/gdbr, kr(w)z, srk:* 'treasurer', 'herald', 'chief minister'. These are administrative titles—but for obvious and basic functions. Any Ancient Near Eastern state had treasurers and chief ministers, and courts their heralds also.[60] The non-occurrence so far of *srk* and *krz*[60a] in early

---

[54] Elamite in the Persepolis Treasury texts similarly borrowed quite 'ordinary' words as well as technical and other terms (*PTT,* p. 19, n.125). It should be noted that these so-called 'ordinary' words in most cases probably came in *at first* as technical or cultural words, but became everyday terms in Aramaic. Thus, *ndn,* 'sheath', may come initially from military parlance; *rz,* 'secret', from magicians' usage, and so on. I owe comment on this point to Mr. David Clines of Sheffield University.

[55] *Cf. LOT*[9], p. 508: 'The Persian words presuppose a period after the Persian Empire had been well established.'

[56] Note also G. G. Cameron's remarks (*PTT,* p. 19) on the penetration of Elamite by so many Old Persian words from as early as Darius I.

[57] *PTT,* pp. 32-33, and R. T. Hallock, *JNES,* XIX, 1960, p. 91 (year seven for five).

[58] *CAD,* 3/D, p. 123*a*. Other Old Persian words in Akkadian include also *dātabara* (*ibid.,* p. 122*a*), *aḫšadrapannu* (*ibid.,* vol. 1:1/A:1, p. 195*a*), *ḫamarakara* (*ibid.,* vol. 6/H, pp. 59-60), *gardu, gardupatu* (*ibid.,* Vol. 5/G, p. 50), etc. See W. Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilschrfftlichen Überlieferung,* I (1940). Also the lists of loan-words in reviews of successive volumes of the *CAD* by D. O. Edzard in *ZA,* LIII, NF XIX, 1959, LIV, NF XX, 1961, and LVI, NF XXII, 1964.

[59] E.g. *GBA,* §189.

[60] E.g. the *wḥm-nsw,* 'Royal Herald', in Egypt (A. H. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica,* I, 1947, p. 22*, no. 80).

sources, beyond Daniel and the Targums (likewise *pršgn* in Ezra), is merely negative evidence (*cf.* also (5), below). It should also be remembered that survival of words from Daniel or Ezra in the Targums is to be expected *a priori*—after all, they belong to *one* literary tradition, Jewish, biblical and commentary/interpretation therefor!

On the other hand, 2 words are so far unique to the Aramaic of Daniel: *'drgzr* and *hdbr,* both high titles ('counsellor', 'companion'); and 4 words occur so far only in the Aramaic of Daniel and early (i.e. sixth-fifth century) documents: *'ḥšdrpn* ('satrap'), *dtbr* ('judge'), *t(y)pt* ('magistrate'); *'zd'* ('certified', etc.). Here also, 3 are titles and 1 part of official style (*cf.* Rosenthal, *GBA,* §189). There is as yet no evidence that any of these 6 terms survived the Persian period (i.e. after *c.* 330 BC). This in itself is negative evidence, and therefore is inadequate. But there is limited positive evidence in its support, from the LXX (Old Greek and Theodotion).[61] Among the official titles in the Aramaic of Daniel (Dn. 3:2-3, etc.), Persian

[p.43]

'ḥšdrpn and Semitic *sgn* and *pḥh,* and the general phrase 'all the rulers of the provinces' are reasonably well rendered. But for *'drgzr,* 'counsellor'; *gdbr,* 'treasurer';[62] *dtbr,* 'law-officer'; *t(y)pt,* 'magistrate, police chief', the Old Greek (and later) renderings are hopelessly inexact— mere guesswork. If the first important Greek translation of Daniel was made some time within *c.* 100 BC-AD 100, roughly speaking, and the translator could not (or took no trouble to[63]) reproduce the proper meanings of these terms, then one conclusion imposes itself: their meaning was already lost and forgotten (or, at the least, drastically changed) long before he set to work.[64] Now if Daniel (in particular, the Aramaic chapters 2-7) was wholly a product of *c.* 165 BC, then just a century or so in a continuous tradition is surely embarrassingly inadequate as a sufficient interval for that loss (or change) of meaning to occur, by Near Eastern standards. Therefore, it is desirable on *this* ground to seek the original of such verses (and hence of the narratives of which they are an integral part) much earlier than this date, preferably within memory of the Persian rule—i.e. *c.* 539 (max.) to *c.* 280 BC (allowing about fifty years' lapse from the fall of Persia to Macedon). At maximum, this could affect the whole book of Daniel as we have it; at minimum, it could indicate that a second-century writer used in his work some pre-existing Daniel-narrations, but adapted them so little that he did not even eliminate words meaningless to him and his readers, such was his archaeological conscience. On the use of Persian words in reference to the Babylonian kingdom, and their preponderance over Greek terms, see section 4(5) below.

(5) One further point should be made here: the Persian words in Daniel are specifically *Old Persian* words.[65] The recognized divisions of Persian language-history within Iranian are: Old down to *c.* 300 BC, Middle observable during *c.* 300 BC to *c.* AD 900, and New from *c.* AD

[60a] But see now A. Schaffer, *Or.,* XXXIV (1965), pp. 32-34, for evidence of *krz* about 1500 BC.

[61] See J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel,* pp. 199-200, on LXX of Daniel.

[62] Presumably not recognized by the LXX translator as identical with *gzbr.*

[63] The LXX of Daniel is known to have been a relatively 'free' rendering—but if the translator gave reasonable renderings for some terms (e.g. *sgn, pḥh, 'ḥšdrpn*), one would expect him to do this for the rest, had he known them equally well.

[64] This point has also been made by W. St. Clair Tisdall, *JTVI,* LIII, 1921, p. 206.

[65] Even when words in the Aramaic of Daniel cannot be compared with attested Old Persian words, they correspond with reconstructible forms in Old Persian, not later forms. Old Median is here kept with Old Persian.

900 to the present.[66] Now, the fact that the Iranian element in Daniel is from *Old* Persian and not Middle indicates that the Aramaic of Daniel is in this respect pre-Hellenistic, drew on no Persian from after the fall of that empire—and not on any Middle Persian words and forms that might have penetrated Aramaic in

[p.44]

Arsacid times (*c.* 250 BC, ff.). This fact again illustrates that the occurrence of Persian words in Daniel also in late sources such as the Targums has no bearing whatever on Daniel's date except to keep open the whole period of the sixth-econd centuries BC, as already observed.

4. *Greek Loan-words.* (1) In the Aramaic of Daniel, three words in particular[67] are commonly considered to be of Greek origin. The three are all terms for musical instruments: *qytrs, psntrn, smpny'*. For detailed consideration of these three words (possible origins, history, meanings), see the study by T. C. Mitchell and R. Joyce, pp. 39-7 above. In this section, it is not so much the words themselves as the *principle* and significance of Greek words occurring in Imperial Aramaic that will be considered.

(2) The common assumption about the significance of these three words in Daniel is pithily enshrined in S. R. Driver's oft-quoted dictum:[68] 'the Greek words *demand...*a date *after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great* (BC 332).' It is widely assumed, even today, that—before Alexander's conquest of the Orient—Greek words could have no place in Ancient Near Eastern languages, and least of all in a city so far removed from the East Mediterranean seaboard as is Babylon. However, these easy assumptions of Greek influence in the East only after *c.* 332 BC are in large measure misleading and erroneous, as the following evidence makes clear.

(3) Effective Greek intercourse and influence in the Near East long antedate the end of the fourth century BC. Leaving aside the Assyrian king Sargon II's boast[69] of drawing the lamanian ('lonian' of Cyprus) from the Mediterranean like a fish, good archaeological evidence betrays Greek traders active in the Orient in the eighth century BC:[70] at the Syrian seaport of Al Mina (ancient Posideion ?), levels X-VII, Euboean Greeks shared the trade with Cypriots. Greek pottery of the period has been found at various Syrian sites (including Hamath and in the Amq plain), and penetrated even to Nineveh in Assyria itself:[71]

In Palestine itself, eighth-century Greek pottery is attested, e.g.

[p.45]

an Argive crater from the Samaria of Jeroboam II, *c.* 750 BC,[72] and other material from Megiddo and Tell Abu Hawam.[73] The process continues in the seventh century: the Greeks

---

[66] *OP*[2], pp. 6-7, especially §§3-5.
[67] From time to time, other words have been claimed to be of Greek origin, or even phrases (as loan-translations), but none are at all convincing, and they require no refutation here.
[68] *LOT*[9], p. 508; the italics are those of Driver.
[69] *ARAB* II, §80; A. L. Oppenheim in *ANET*[2], p. 285a, '11.11-15'. Iamani of Ashdod was probably Semitic, not Greek, *cf.* H. Tadmor, *JCS,* XII, 7958, p. 80 and n.217, and H. W. F. Saggs, *Iraq,* XXV, 1963, pp. 77-78.
[70] For what follows, *cf.* conveniently *GO,* pp. 67-70, with bibliography, p. 725.
[71] Unpublished, *cf. ibid.,* p. 69.
[72] M. Avi-Yonah, *IEJ,* XI, 1961, p. 158b, *apud* K. M. Kenyon *et al., Samaria-Sebaste* III (1957), pp. 210-212.

supreme at Al Mina[74] (levels VI-V), and their pottery still reaching into Syria (e.g. çatal Hüyük, Zincirli), elsewhere in Phoenicia (Byblos, Tell Sukas), and Palestine (Tell Abu Hawam; Mezad Hashavyahu)—and even to Babylon of all places.[75] From the late seventh century BC onward, the Greeks had their famous centre Naukratis in the Egyptian Delta. In the early sixth century, Tell Sukas replaced Al Mina as chief Syrian port of the Greeks, but the latter revived under Persian rule in the fifth century.[76] In the fifth century, Greek (Athenian) pottery is well attested in Syria and Palestine at a series of sites,[77] right down to Elath (Tell el Kheleifeh) on the Gulf of Aqaba leading into the Red Sea.[78] During the sixth-fifth centuries BC, a new Greek port-settlement flourished at Minet el Beida (old Leucos Limen) near the long-ruined mound of Ugarit (Ras Shamra),[79] and lasted perhaps until the third century BC. In other words, Greek traders were active in the Levant from the days of Amos onwards, and their wares penetrated to Nineveh and Babylon.

Greek mercenaries are attested in the Orient from the late seventh century BC onwards. Apart from those Greek and Carian mercenaries recruited *c.* 660 BC by Psammetichus I of Egypt in the pages of Herodotus, excavations at Carchemish yielded a splendid Greek bronze shield, once doubtless the property of a Greek mercenary who served under the next pharaoh, Necho II, at the Battle of Carchemish in 605 BC.[80] The Greek and Carian mercenaries of Psammetichus II left their names at Abu Simbel in Nubia. Greek

[p.46]

mercenaries also served in the *Babylonian* forces about the period 605-585 BC, as witnessed by the poet Alcaeus whose brother fought alongside the Babylonians in Phoenicia.[81] Fourth-century Greek papyri were found at Elephantine in Upper Egypt long ago.[82]

Going a step further, it may be noted that Greek artisans were apparently employed in the Babylon of Nebuchadrezzar. The ration-tablets from the tenth to thirty-fifth years of Nebuchadrezzar II (i.e. *c.* 595-570 BC) published by Weidner[83] include 'Ionians',[84] besides such people as Jehoiachin of Judah, his entourage, and many other assorted foreigners (especially craftsmen). It is clear from one or two of the personal names that these 'Ionians' came from Asia Minor in particular (Cilicia, Lycia, etc.); the name *Kunzumpiya* is good

---

[73] *GO,* p. 69; T. J. Dunbabin, *The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours* (1957), pp. 72-74 (Tell Abu Hawam and Syrian sites to *c.* 700 BC).

[74] *GO,* pp. 70-74.

[75] *Ibid.,* p. 75; Dunbabin, *op. cit.,* p. 76; on Greek pottery at Mezad Hashavyahu, *cf.* J. Naveh, *IEJ,* XII, 1962, pp. 97-99.

[76] *GO,* pp. 76-77. For Tell Sukas, see preliminary reports by P. J. Riis, *Annales Archéologiques de Syrie* VIII-IX, 1958-1959, pp. 128-130; *ibid.,* X, 1960, pp. 223-128; *ibid.,* XI-XII, 1961-1962, pp. 137-140. A spindle-whorl of *c.* 600 BC from this site has a woman's name of Ionian type in Greek script on it, see *Archaeology,* XVII, 1964, pp. 206-207 with fig.

[77] *GO,* p. 79.

[78] See N. Glueck, *BASOR,* LXXX, 1940, p. 3, and into Arabia then, W. F. Albright, *ibid.,* p. 3, n.2*a*.

[79] See C. F. A. Schaeffer and C. Clairmont in *Ugaritica* IV (1962), pp. xxxv, 631-636; coin-hoard, Schaeffer, *Ugaritica* I (1939), p. 50 and fig. 39 *idem,* in *Mélanges... R. Dussaud,* I (1939), pp. 461-487.

[80] *Cf.* latterly, *GO,* pp. 75, 132, and plate 6*b*.

[81] *Ibid.,* p. 76; J. D. Quinn, *BASOR,* CLXIV, 1961, pp. 19-20.

[82] *Cf. BMAP,* p. 57, and n.5 and refs.

[83] In *Mélanges... R. Dussaud,* II (1939), pp. 923-935.

[84] *Ibid.,* pp. 932-935.

Luvian,[85] and others may be. In other words, the Babylonians lumped together under 'Ionians' the mixed inhabitants—Greek, Cilician, Lycian—of Southern Asia Minor. Greek artisans in the Persian Empire are well known.

Finally, there is the question of Greek words and expressions in Imperial Aramaic a century before Alexander ever went East. Already, fifty years ago, the Greek money-term 'stater' was identified in the Aramaic papyri from Egypt in documents of *c.* 400 BC.[86] The reserve formerly felt[87] about this identification because of a possible connection with Babylonian *istatir(anu)* can be discounted. The Babylonian word is now considered itself to be a Greek loan-word (mainly in documents of the Alexander and Seleucid periods) in that language,[88] while in Imperial Aramaic the word 'stater' recurs in Papyrus Brooklyn 12:5 and 14, there explicitly called 'Greek money' (*ksp Ywn,* 'silver of Yavan').[89] While some earlier attempts to identify certain words as Greek in the Aramaic papyri have failed,[90] this possibility has now come under renewed examination. Yaron with some plausibility would identify *drmy* in P. Brooklyn 9:3 as Greek *dōrēma*.[91] The case of

[p.47]

prypt or *pdypt* is doubtful (P. Brooklyn 12:11). Yaron read *pdypt* and took this as *Greek paideutos,* 'brought up', i.e. 'ward' or 'nursling', quoting the Talmudic *pdypty* as parallel.[92] Possibly with less likelihood, Rabinowitz read *prypt*[93] and interpreted this as Greek *threpte.* They cannot both be right, and may both be wrong.[94] Rabinowitz would find three more Greek words: *prtrk* as from *prōtarkhēs*;[95] *hpth* as from *'ippeutēs*;[96] and *'bygrn* as from *epigramrna*.[97] But these, too, are rather dubious; the meaning gained for *'bygrn* is attractive, though the transliteration or transcription (*b/p*; *n/m*) is unconvincing but not quite impossible. Perhaps still more difficult to be sure of are various suggested 'loan-translations' from Greek into Aramaic. Again, most of these are dubious,[98] while one or two are admittedly striking[99]— unless future discoveries prove them to be less distinctive than they appear at present. Moreover, as Yaron remarked, attestation of a 'Greek' usage in Aramaic documents of a date *earlier* than its occurrence in actual Greek documents so far known to us can be purely

---

[85] *Ibid.,* p. 933 (after Sundwall); *cf.* A. Goetze, *JCS,* VIII, 1954, p. 77, and eapecially Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (1961), pp. 139, (177).

[86] In *AP,* nos. 35:4, 7; 37:12; [61:8?]; 67:9. *Cf. ibid.,* p. 131, in agreement with Sachau and Ungnad; *AOT,* pp. 143-144.

[87] *Cf. AOT, loc. cit.,* on Johns and Olmstead.

[88] *Cf. CAD,* 7/I-J, p. 204: *istatirru.*

[89] *BMAP,* pp. 277, 276, *cf.* pp. 40, 269.

[90] Reviewed and rightly rejected by Rowley, *AOT,* pp. 142-145 *passim.*

[91] *HUCA,* XXVIII, 1957, p. 49.

[92] *Ibid.,* pp. 49-50.

[93] *Biblica,* XXXIX, 1958, p. 78, and his *Jewish Law* (1956).

[94] A Greek origin appears to have been tacitly abandoned by Yaron in his *LAP,* p. 40 (and n.3).

[95] See the references in notes 93, 96, above, and below.

[96] *Biblica,* XLI, 1960, pp. 72-74.

[97] *Biblica,* XXXIX, p. 78-79; his passing suggestion (*ibid.,* 82, n.2) that *ptgm* is from Greek is certainly mistaken, on Eastern data.

[98] *Cf.* on *gw', qry 'l* J. J. Rabinowitz, *Biblica,* XXXIX, 7958, pp. 77-78, 80-81.

[99] *Cf. LAP,* pp. 703-704, 126-127, and *HUCA,* XXVIII, 1957, pp. 50-51.

accidental,[100] simply because the earlier Greek documents and occurrences have not yet been recovered. (This point should be borne in mind by those who insist upon the *smpny'* of Daniel being a musical instrument in Greek 'only' late in the Hellenistic period—this is, identically, the elementary fallacy of negative evidence and proves nothing except the inadequacy of our Greek source-material, musical as well as legal.)

In other words, the idea that Greek words and influence *could not* affect the Near East or appear in Aramaic before Alexander the Great *must* be given up—the massive general background apart, both are sufficiently attested by the certain occurrence of *statēr,* clearly labelled 'Greek money', the probable occurrence of *dōrēma,* 'gift', and just possibly by other words or phraseology that need confirmation before they could be taken as definite evidence. It is a gain to have this linguistic demonstration of Greek influence at *c.* 400 BC; in view of the penetration of the Orient by Greek mer-

[p.48]

chants and mercenaries for 350 years before even *that* date, still earlier evidence must be expected some day.[101] One may mention the long-known lion-weight from Abydos (Mysia) in N. W. Asia Minor, inscribed '*sprn lqbl stry' zy ksp,* 'Exactly corresponding to the silver s(t)ater',[102] which probably dates to roughly 500 BC.[103]

(4) It is in the light of the foregoing background that the three Greek musical terms in Daniel should be approached. Of the three terms, *qytrs* (*kitharos*) is already known from Homer (i.e. eighth century BC at latest), and so has no bearing on date whatever. This leaves only the two words *psntrn* and *smpny',* commonly stated to be attested only from the second century BC or so with the required meanings. On these words, *cf.* Mitchell and Joyce's paper in this volume; here, suffice it to reiterate that this is only *negative* evidence, i.e. *lack* of evidence, and there is nothing to prevent earlier occurrences from turning up some day in future Greek epigraphic finds. There are plenty of parallels in the Near East for the accidental preservation of words of one language as loan-words in another tongue at an earlier date than extant *known*

---

[100] *Cf. ibid.,* and *LAP,* p. 704 top; contrast the naïve and unjustified scepticism of Rowley, *AOT,* p. 148; where may one find a corpus of Greek papyri (legal, or music!) to compare with Near Eastern sources? *Cf.* also n.105, below.

[101] There is thus no justification for the *a priori* view that 400 BC is the earliest likely date (*cf.* J. J. Rabinowitz, *Biblica,* XXXIX, 1958, p. 79, n.5). The speculations of C. H. W. Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents,* II, pp. 278 ff., have little bearing on *stater* in Aramaic, now that it is there called 'Greek money'. Double *t* in the word has nothing to do with Ashtoreth, unless metathesis be involved—but no such form as *Ashtater is attested for Ashtoreth.

   Note also the possible occurrence of the Greek term *karpobogos,* 'tax-gatherer', in an Aramaic ostracon of the fifth century BC from Elath on the Gulf of Aqaba (N. Glueck and W. F. Albright, *BASOR,* LXXX, 1940, pp. 8-9 and n.12); but note that C. C. Torrey, *ibid.,* LXXXII, 1941, pp. 15-16, would read (*ḥ*)*mr blgn,* 'bottled wine'.

[102] Most recently, H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische lnschriften,* I (1962), p. 50:263, and II (1964), p. 370:263; *ef.* also Kraeing, *BMAP,* p. 276, with Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge,* I (1930), p. 267 [69]. It has been suggested that the lion weight itself corresponds to a gold, not silver, stater in weight. But as Dormer and Röllig remark, we still know far too little about weights and measures in Persian-period Anatolia to judge of this.

[103] S. A. Cooke, *Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (1903), p. 193: sixth-fifth centuries BC; Schaeder, *loc. cit.,* and Rosenthal, *Aramaistische Forschung,* p. 24: *c.* 500 BC; Dormer and Röllig, *loc. cit.,* fifth-fourth century BC.

occurrences in the original tongue.[104] In Mesopotamia we have clay tablets, and in Egypt papyri, ostraca and monumental texts, on a far grander scale of survival than any contemporary records of West Semitic (even with Ugaritic) or classical Greek No-one raises objections when a West Semitic word (or a particular meaning of a word)

[p.49]

turns up as a loan-word in Egyptian New Kingdom texts or in the Mari tablets, perhaps *centuries* before it is attested in any West Semitic inscriptions or papyri,[105] and exactly the same principle should apply to Greek. Thus, these two words *psntrn* and *smpny'*—and *only* two words from an entire book!—are necessarily indecisive, when the only appeal is to ignorance.

There seems to be little or nothing original about the broad *types* of musical instrument indicated by the three words (lyre, double pipe, etc.); similar instruments in these categories were already long known in the Ancient Near East, Mesopotamia included.[106] At most, they could be new sub-varieties, introduced alongside other possible novelties in Neo-Babylonian (or later ?) state worship;[107] even when a civilization already has its own wealth of musical instruments, new models with their foreign names are still acceptable.[108]

(5) Lastly, it is noteworthy how *few* are these words: three in an entire book as contrasted with even 19 or 20 Persian words in the Aramaic and a few more in the Hebrew. The obvious inference, when one remembers the Greek relations with the Near East from the eighth century BC onwards, is that the Aramaic of Daniel could have been written at any time from *c.* 539 BC onwards until *just after* the fall of the Persian Empire. In Ancient Near Eastern literature, a later writer tends to deck his description of an earlier period with trappings of his own time, while retaining archaic features that have survived. On this basis, if we supposed a Daniel high up in the administration at Babylon during the first few years of the Persian supremacy (as the book itself suggests), then writing of his—under

[p.50]

Persian rule—would naturally depict both his Babylonian and Persian settings within the now-current (i.e. Persian) terms, plus some Babylonian survival; hence the Persian words

---

[104] Despite Rowley's unconsciousness of all this, *AOT,* pp. 149, 152 middle; there is nothing 'peculiarly difficult' about this. Preservation of W. Semitic terms in Egyptian, etc., long before they appear in dated Semitic material, is a coimnonplace phenomenon (see next note); why not Greek in Aramaic?

[105] From the possible range of examples, let two here suffice. In the Syrian war-reliefs of Ramesses II (*c.* 1290-1224 BC) at Luxor occurs the place-name *D[l]t-Ḏinūr,* for **Deleth-Ṣilūl* (or *-Ṣilul,* by dissimilation), 'Door of Locusts'. *Ṣilūl* is a form of well-known collective type (*zᵉbūb, gᵉdūd*), and related to the *ṣᵉlāṣal* of Deuteronomy 28:42; its meaning is certified by the locust-hieroglyph determinative. Similarly, *p' sš* (or, *sn*) *Ḏirʿum* (P. Anastasi I, 27:3), 'Crossing of the Hornets' (**Sirʿūm).* Where in any W. Semitic inscriptions are these words attested as early as the thirteenth century BC? Or even elsewhere at all in just these forms? No-one finds this 'peculiarly difficult'. (For these names, see Kitchen, *JEA,* L, 1964, pp. 53-54.)

[106] See the paper by T. C. Mitchell and R. Joyce in this volume, pp. 19-27.

[107] E.g., the changes at Ur, reminiscent of the ceremony at Dura in Daniel (*cf.* C. L. Woolley, *Excavations at Ur* (1954), pp. 224-228 (esp. 227-228), or his *Ur of the Chaldees* (1950, etc.), pp. 146-152, esp. pp. 157-152), and the official publication, *Ur Excavations,* IX (1962), pp. 23-24.

[108] As in Nineteenth Dynasty Egypt, Egypt's own heritage of instruments did not inhibit her from borrowing a series of foreign terms and models. At random, *cf.* the *w'r, knnrt, nṯḫ,* etc., of P. Anastasi IV, 12:2-3 (R. A. Caminos, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies* (1954), pp. 182, 186-187).

even in his account of government hierarchy under Babylon (Dn. 3). By the same token, a writer of the second century BC should have used *Greek* terms in such a passage where Hebrew or Aramaic terms did not suffice for technicalities—*stratēgos*, *epistolographos, archōn* and the rest; for in 165 BC, Palestine had already had 150 years of Ptolemaic and Seleucid rule. Therefore, one would—on the Greek and Persian evidence above—prefer to put the Aramaic of Daniel in the late sixth, the fifth, or the fourth centuries BC, not the third or second. The latter is not ruled out, but is much less realistic and not so favoured by the facts as was once imagined.

B. ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONETICS

1. *The Phenomena Summarized.* (1). Returning from foreign loan-words to the actual *Aramaic* Aramaic of Daniel, one of the most contested points has been the spelling of certain classes of words. Thus, in the Old Aramaic texts (tenth to seventh centuries BC) and Imperial Aramaic papyri (sixth to fourth centuries BC), one finds written:

z	where Daniel and Ezra have *d*;					Hebrew *z,*	and Arabic *ḏ* ('*dh*'),			
š	"	"	"	"	"	*t*;	" *š*	"	"	*ṯ* ('*th*'),
q	"	"	"	"	"	';	" *ṣ*	"	"	*ḍ,*
ṣ	"	"	"	"	"	*ṭ*;	" *ṣ*	"	"	*ẓ,*
'*s*'(*ś*?)"	"	"	"	"	*ś or s* "	*š*	"	"	*š,*

Also, variations in final *h* and '.

Because of the spellings with *d, t, ', ṭ*, as in the later Aramaic of the Targums (and Syriac) and in Nabataean and Palmyrene, Rowley would consider that the Aramaic of Daniel must fall between that of the papyri (say, fifth century BC) and that of these later dialects, i.e. in the second century BC, the *ś/s* and *h/'* having less significance. At first sight, and superficially, this group of facts appears to justify Rowley's conclusions on dating; but in point of fact, these conclusions depend upon two major assumptions:

(i) That the consonantal text of the Aramaic of Daniel has undergone no change of orthography since the time of its original composition.

(ii) That the normal orthographies of Old, Imperial and Biblical Aramaic all give throughout a strictly accurate phonetic spelling of the consonant-sounds of these forms of Aramaic—in short, that sounds and spellings always and closely agree.

[p.51]

In reality, neither assumption is justified—the first is most probably wrong, and the second one is demonstrably wrong. If the first assumption is lost, then the existing orthography may date only *itself* to the second or third centuries BC, and not the first composition of the Aramaic part of the book—the date will be open, on this particular point. If the second assumption is proved wrong (see below), then the Aramaic of Daniel could have been written in the sixth—fifth centuries BC phonetically, or else in the then-conventional orthography subsequently replaced (gradually or otherwise) by the later and surviving orthography. The

result either way is the same: to place the Aramaic of Daniel anywhere in the sixth to second centuries BC. These points require an examination of the phenomena in question.

(2) The Canaanite—Phoenician alphabet now has a respectable pedigree reaching back from the tenth century BC[109] via various Palestinian epigraphs of the thirteenth—twelfth centuries BC to the so-called Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions and related material of the fifteenth century BC,[110] if not earlier.[111] While their 'prehistory' probably goes back much further,[112] the first major settlement of Aramaeans in Syria and Upper Mesopotamia dates to the twelfth-tenth centuries BC, and it was from the late Canaanites or Phoenicians that they borrowed the alphabet.[113] The early primacy of Phoenician over Aramaic as a *written* language found curious later echoes in northern Syria and Cilicia. Thus, in the little northern Syrian kingdom of Sam'al-Ya'diya (now Zincirli and region), king Kilamuwa—though an Aramaean—had his inscriptions set out in Phoenician, language as well as script,[114] about 830 BC. Later, kings Panammu I (*c.* 760 BC) and Bar-rakib (*c.* 730 BC)[115] set up inscriptions in their own peculiar Aramaic dialect ('Yaudic'), and Barrakib also an inscription in regular Old Aramaic, practically Imperial Aramaic. In Cilicia, as late as *c.* 730 BC,[116] Asitiwada of Que set up bilingual inscriptions at Asitiwaddiya (modern Kara-

[p.52]

tepe) in Hittite hieroglyphs and Phoenician;[117] from the sixth century BC onwards Aramaic was used in Asia Minor.[118]

Now the point of all this is that Aramaic had in the early first millennium BC maintained separate *more* of the Old Semitic consonants than had Phoenician. In Phoenician and Hebrew, $\underline{d}$ had fallen together with z, $\underline{t}$ with $š$, $\d{d}$ and $\underline{z}$ with $ṣ$, $\d{h}$ with $ḥ$, $ğ$ with '. and so on.[119] However, in Old Aramaic, $\underline{d}$, $\underline{t}$, $\d{d}$, $\underline{z}$, were still pronounced as distinct sounds—but no separate symbols existed for them in the Phoenician alphabet in which Aramaic now came to be written. Instead of creating additional letters, the Aramaeans—perhaps under Phoenician scribal influence— simply made certain letters serve to write *two* consonants, often following Phoenician orthography in the words concerned ($\underline{d}$ written as z; $\underline{t}$ as $š$, $\underline{z}$, as $ṣ$), but not in all ($\d{d}$ written as q, not $ṣ$).[120] This tension between pronunciation and spelling—phonetic fact and orthographic

[109] E.g. the Byblos inscriptions of kings Ahiram, Yehimilk, Abibaal, Elibaal; references in F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography* (1952), p. 11 and n.1.

[110] References, *ibid.,* pp. 8-9, notes 31-38.

[111] Possibly the Gezer potsherd (*c.* 1700 BC?), *ibid.,* p. 8, n.30, and even a Sinai text (*cf.* A. H. Gardiner, *JEA,* XLVIII, 1962, pp. 45-48).

[112] See Kitchen, *Hittite Hieroglyphs, Aramaeans and Hebrew Traditions,* chapter 11:2; A. R. Millard, *Archaeology and the Life of Jacob*; both forthcoming.

[113] A generally recognized fact, e.g. Cross and Freedman, *op. cit.,* p. 37.

[114] References in Cross and Freedman, *op. cit.,* pp. 11-12, n.2; Rosenthal in *ANET*[2], pp. 500, 501.

[115] For dates, *cf.* Kitchen, *Hittite Hieroglyphs, Aramaeans and Hebrew Traditions,* Table XII and commentary.

[116] On date and kingdom, *cf. ibid.,* Table XI and commentary.

[117] For latter version, *cf* Rosenthal in *ANET*[2], pp. 499-500 with refs.; Donner and Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften,* I-II, no. 26.

[118] *Ibid.,* nos. 258-265 (fifth century BC, ff.).

[119] Most of these sounds were separate in Ugaritic; *cf. UM* (and *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965)).

[120] This probably reflects a phonetic change that had already occurred in Old Aramaic. For this section, *cf.* G. Garbini, *L'Aramaico antico* (1956), pp. 247-248.

convention—has long been recognized in Semitic scholarship and is generally accepted today.[121]

This was the state of things by the eighth century BC, by the end of which we have Imperial Aramaic, used within Assyria as well as in Syria itself. From now on, Aramaic came increasingly to be *written* (and eventually spoken) by many other people besides the Aramaeans themselves—by Assyrian scribes in commerce and royal service, even between high officials of Assyria (e.g. the Assur ostracon),[122] and by correspondingly more different peoples in the

[p.53]

Neo-Babylonian and Persian Empires. By and large, Aramaic continued to be written in its phonetically-inadequate, pseudo-Phoenician orthography. But by the fifth century BC (as is illustrated by the Aramaic documents from Egypt) and beginning rather earlier, certain phonetic changes occurred in the spoken language, and occasionally appeared in the written documents. In speech, *ḏ* was now pronounced as *d, ṭ* as *t, 'q'* as '. etc., and occasionally a scribe lapsed into actually writing these consonants instead of 'historical' *z, š, q*, etc., thus betraying the true state of affairs.[123]

(3) The full evidence for these facts need not be repeated here; a few points must suffice, especially more recently demonstrable or neglected ones.

(i) *'z'/ḏ/d.* In Old Aramaic the name of certain kings appears as Hadad-'*eezer* in Hebrew (same orthography as Phoenician) but as (H)adad-(')*idri* in Assyrian cuneiform. *D* is not the Assyrian transscript for Hebrew *z*—witness Azriyau for Azariah of Judah; nor is *z* the Hebrew-Phoenician transcript for Aramaic *d*—witness Hadad in both. *Z* in Hebrew-Phoenician and *d* in Assyrian have only one common denominator, and that is *ḏ* ('*dh*'), as often shown by Ugaritic *ḏ* (*cf.* here, '*ḏr*).[124] To Hebrew names in –'*ezer* (e.g. Eli'ezer),

---

[121] By: D. H. Müller, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgeniandes,* VII, 1893, pp. 113 ff.; C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen,* I (1908), p. 134, and clearer, *idem, Précis de Linguistique Sémitique* (1920), p. 73, §58; *idem, Handbuch der Orientalistik,* III. 2-3 (1954), p. 135; H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1927), §6, pp. 25-27; Baumgartner, *ZAW,* XLV, 1927, p. 98; Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge* I (1930), pp. 242, 244 [44, 46]; Rosenthal, *Aramaistische Forschung* (1939), pp. 56-57; J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (1951), p. 155, §8*; Cross and Freedman, *op. cit.,* pp. 23-24; Garbini, *loc. cit.; cf* S. Moscati, A. Spitaler, E. Ullendorff, W. von Soden, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (1964), pp. 29-30, §8.18 (adding an alternative suggestion that also presupposes non-equivalence of Aramaic phonetics and orthography); the reserves of S. Segert, *Archiv Orientální,* XXVI, 1958, pp. 570-572, result from a too superficial treatment of the question.

[122] *Cf.* R. A. Bowman, *JNES,* VII, 1948, pp. 73-76, for examples and references, plus H. Tadmor in B. Mazar, *BA,* XXV, 1962, p. 111, n.24.

[123] Long ago recognized by M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik,* III, 1915, pp. 79, 106. In a criticism of Boutflower, Rowley, *AOT,* p. 25, committed the astonishing *faux pas* of confusing phonetics with orthography, when he naïvely assumed that in Aramaic *ḏ* ('*dh*') first became z and then changed to *d* to be seen in the papyri. Phonetically, the facts are wholly otherwise (*cf.* refs in n.121, above): *ḏ* was first *written* as *z* (and still pronounced *ḏ*; or just possibly already as *d* on the alternative mentioned by Moscati *et al., Introduction,* p. 29), then it became *d* in speech, and so came to be written as *d* instead of *z*. In *HSD,* p. 118, Rowley still talks of 'the *language* of the scroll' (and of the Aramaic of Daniel) [my italics] when it should be *orthography.* As alternative, the most that could be postulated would be *two* parallel dialectal forms, one in *d* and one in *z; cf* latterly in Hebrew and Ugaritic, M. Dahood, *Biblica,* XLV, 1964, pp. 407-408 and references there given.

[124] *UM* no. 1384; note that in Ugaritic, many words have passed from *ḏ* to *d* (e.g. *d* = Aram. *dî,* Heb. *zē*).

cuneiform sources offer many Aramaean names ending (in cuneiform) in -*idri* (e.g. Ilu-idri), besides names from other roots containing *d*,[125] e.g. Ha*d*yan which in Hebrew appears as Hezion and in Akkadian cuneiform as Hadianu.[126] A less obvious but telling example is afforded by the Old Aramaic stela of Zakir, king of

[p.54]

Hamath (*c.* 760 BC).[127] Among the Seven kings that attacked him was the king of *Mlz*. No kingdom of *Mlz* is attested in N. Syria or Anatolia—but *Milid* (Malatya) is well known.[128] It is evident that this name was treated as if it were 'Milidh' (with *d*)—and the supposed *d* automatically written as *z*. For a late Anatolian personal name Kindisarma treated in the same way, *cf.* p. 62 below.

The real phonetic change in pronunciation from *d* to *d* that already clearly appears in the fifth century BC as indicated by occasional *dî* for *zî*, *dahab* for *zahab,* etc., can be illustrated from two phenomena: false archaism (*z* written wrongly for real *d,* as if it had been *d*), and truly *phonetic* transcription of Aramaic into an alien script.

(*a*) *False archaism.* In P. Brooklyn 3:17, we find instead of normal *dyn w-dbb,* 'lawsuit and process', the solecism *zyn w-zbb*.[129] For the scribe, *d* and *d* had long been indistinguishable in pronunciation, and so he wrote *dyn* and *dbb* with a *z* that was totally irrelevant as the *d* here is original and not derived from old *d*. This process is further attested in Mandean much later;[130] it may also be the explanation for *Mlz* for *Milid* in the Zakir stela (eighth century BC) noticed just above and of Kind/zisarma on p. 62 below.

(*b*) Aramaic *phonetically* written in an alien script. As is well known, a clay tablet from Uruk (S. Babylonia) of perhaps *c.* 300 BC bears an Aramaic-language text written in cuneiform script; despite the difficulties of interpretation,[131] it is crystal clear that *d* and not *z* was being written for *d.[132] But much earlier and more important than this is a unique Egyptian papyrus of the fifth century BC (*i.e.* contemporary with the Elephantine papyri) written in the Demotic script, and in the Aramaic language! Regrettably, if understandably, only a preliminary sample has been published,[133] and no definitive edition in the twenty years since then, but there is, even so, amply enough to serve our purpose. In Egyptian at this period, the sound *d* had mainly become *t* in pronunciation, and

[p.55]

---

[125] Some are quoted by Baumgartner, *ZAW,* XLV, 1927, pp. 95-96 with references.

[126] *Cf.* W. F. Aibright, *BASOR,* LXXXVII, 1942, p. 26, n.7, and *AS,* VI, 1956, p. 84, n.53; on the kings Hezion and Hadianu, *cf.* Kitchen, *Hittite Hieroglyphs, Aramaeans and Hebrew Traditions,* Tables IV and X respectively.

[127] Kitchen, *ibid.,* Table V, commentary, for date; Donner and Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschrzften,* I-II, no. 202 for text, etc.

[128] Kitchen, *op. cit.,* Table XIV, for kings and chronology.

[129] *BMAP,* p. 162, and more clearly, E. Y. Kutscher, *JAOS,* LXXIV, 1954, p. 235.

[130] *Cf.* M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik,* III, 1915, p. 106, quoting Th. Nöldeke's *Grammatik;* plus Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge* I, p. 245 [47].

[131] On this text, *cf.* C. H. Gordon, *A.f.O.,* XII, 1937-1939, pp. 105-117 (with earlier literature, p. 105, n.1); B. Landsberger, *ibid.,* pp. 247-57; Gordon, *Orientalia,* NS IX, 1940, pp. 29-38.

[132] The relative pronoun is *dî*; Gordon, *A.f.O.,* XII, 1937-1939, pp. 112:42, 116.

[133] See R. A. Bowman, *JNES,* III, 1944, pp. 219-231.

foreign *d* was written with the old signs for *t, d,* or even *nt.*[134] Now whenever in this document a word occurs which is written with *z* in Old Aramaic and the papyri and with *d* in Biblical and later Aramaic, in this papyrus it is written with *t* (for *d*). Thus, *tn, tn', k-tnh* stand for pronominal *dn, dn', k-dnh,* usually written 'historically' as *zn, zn', k-znh* in the Elephantine papyri. In other words, by the fifth century BC (and doubtless earlier) *z* for *d̠* was a *purely* 'historical' spelling, and the real pronunciation was *d* as in Biblical and later Aramaic; the evidence of this document (combined with the *zyn-zbb/dyn-dbb* of P. Brooklyn 3:17) is final.

(ii) 'š'/*t̠*/*t.* Here, the shift from *t̠* written *š* to *t* both spoken and written was under way long before the fifth century BC, when it occurs almost throughout in the papyri. Thus, West Semitic *t̠br,* 'to break', in Ugaritic (*UM,* III, no. 2000) is written *šbr* in Old Aramaic (e.g. Sfiré texts), but *tbr* in the fifth-century papyri (*AP,* four references) as in Daniel and later Aramaic. *T̠wb,* 'return', in Ugaritic (*UM,* III, no. 2013) is written *šwb* in Old Aramaic (Sfiré), but *twb* in the papyri—and as *twb* already in the Assur Ostracon of the seventh century BC[135] (*c.* 650 BC), line 11, which takes this change back well over a century before there could be a book of Daniel on *any* view. Many more examples from the fifth century BC papyri could be cited for *t̠* written as well as spoken *t.*[136] For the late sixth century BC (in 515 BC)—earliest possible date for Daniel—one may cite the Meissner papyrus,[137] e.g. in line 8 *ḥrt* 'to till (ground)'[138] = Hebrew *ḥrš, cf.* Ugaritic *ḥrt̠* 'to plough' (*UM,* III, no. 668a); and just possibly *t(wb)* in line 15.[139] The sole apparent exception is the common word 'shekel',[140] written almost always in the papyri in the old orthography *šql*. But it does occur

[p.56]

once each way, as *tql* alongside *šql,* in the Cowley corpus, no. io, line 5, and in the Kraeling series (Brooklyn), no. 2, line 8 (*cf. BMAP,* p. 148). More important still, the 'real'. form *tql* occurs in the sixth-century Meissner papyrus (line 13 alongside *š(ql),* line 12 end[141] (formal abbreviation of the historical Spelling), so that the *šql* of the fifth century papyri is purely a historical spelling throughout. It should be obvious that in the late sixth and the fifth centuries BC, *t̠* was already identical in speech—and commonly in writing—with *t,* and this process was under way in the seventh century BC (Assur).

---

[134] As in the case of 'Darius' which in Egyptian hieroglyphic texts occurs once each as *trwš* and *ndrit̠,* usually (*i*)*ntrywš,* M. Burchardt, *Die Altkanaanäischen Fremdworte im Ägyptischen,* II (Leipzig 1910), no. 85, pp. 5-6. *D* having become *th* in modern Greek, it too has trouble with foreign words containing the sound *d, nt-* being one solution—a light-hearted example, M. Chubb, *City in the Sand* (1957), p. 8.

[135] A. Dupont-Sommer, *Syria,* XXIV, 1944-1945, p. 57; noted already by Rowley, *AOT,* p. 28. Note that 'there is', known in the papyri, Daniel, etc. as *'yty* (Ugaritic *it̠ cf UM,* no. 292), may also occur in this form in the Assur Ostracon, line 6 (Dupont-Sommer, *op. cit.,* pp. 37:6, 57), but contrast Donner and Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften,* II (1964), p. 284. On date of this ostracon *cf.* Donner and Röllig, *ibid.,* pp. 288-290.

[136] A good selection in *AOT,* pp. 26-28.

[137] Last edition, A. Dupont-Sommer, *Un Contrat de Métayage Egypto-Araméen en l'an 7 de Darius* Ier (*Mémoires... Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres,* XIV. 2), 1944).

[138] *Ibid.,* p. 16.

[139] *Ibid.,* pp. 25-26, adding (26, n.1) *AP,* no. 1:7, of 495 BC.

[140] As opposed to the verb 'to weigh', usually written *tql.*

[141] Dupont-Sommer, *op. cit.,* p. 21.

(iii) *'q'/ḍ-ǧ/'* In this case, the phonetic change is a little more complicated.[142] The Old-Semitic sound *ḍ* seems to have passed over to *ǧ* (ghain), and this in Old Aramaic—in these cases—was written as *q* in the Phoenician-derived alphabet.[143] But eventually, as already in Hebrew and Phoenician, *ǧ* was assimilated to ' ('ayin), reducing *q* to a mere historical orthography, and so at length was written instead of *q*.[144]

How early *ǧ* became in pronunciation (in Aramaic) is uncertain, as both could be expressed as *ḫ* in cuneiform, which contains the earliest evidence. For the name of the last independent king of Aram-Damascus which in Hebrew appears as *Rᵉṣīn* (a contracted form of *Raṣyan*), the Assyrian texts of Tiglath-pileser III offer a form *Raḫianu*;[145] *ḫ* cannot be for real *ṣ*—only for a *ǧ* or ' here, hence for a **Raǧyan* or of course a **Ra'yan*. This is in 732 BC.[146] During the fifth century BC, the Aranaaic papyri from Egypt sometimes write real instead of historical *q* (for **ǧ*)—so in the case of *'l', 'rib'*; *'mr* 'wool' (Cowley; Kraeling/Erookiyn, 2:4);[147] and *'r'*, 'earth'.[148] Then, it is possible that *''*, 'wood', and *r''* 'to break', occur in the cuneiform Aramaic text from Uruk (lines 2, 15, respectively).[149] In other words, this shift is in an exactly similar position to the two already considered.

[p.57]

(iv) *'ṣ'/ẓ/ṭ*. A similar phenomenon to the foregoing three. *Ẓ* in Aramaic was first written as *ṣ* in the Phoenician-derived alphabet of Old Aramaic; *ẓ* then passed over to *ṭ* in pronunciation; and so eventually, written *ṣ*—now a historical spelling—was supplanted by written and spoken *ṭ*. As usual, the fifth-century Aramaic papyri already show the effect of the sound-shift by including several spellings with in *ṭ* place of the 'historical' *ṣ*. Thus attested are *y'ṭ*, 'to counsel'; *'ṭh*, 'counsel' (noun); *ṭwr*, 'mountain'; and *nṭr*, 'to guard'.[150] A specially interesting word is *ṭll*, 'shade'—so written in both Daniel and the papyri—for which the original *ẓll* is preserved in Ugaritic (*UM*, III, no. 778), and which may already occur as *ṭll* the mid-eighth century BC in the Old Aramaic Sfiré stelae. Broken context prevents absolute certainty over the latter and so over any postulated change being started by the eighth century BC.[151]

(v) *'š'/š/ś-s*. The passage from an apparent, written *shin* to *samekh* visible in late Aramaic (e.g. Palmyrene) may suggest that *ś* as distinct from *š* was also long retained in Aramaic, but indistinguishable from *š* in written documents. That *ś* (*śin*) and *s* (*samekh*) were—or became—closely similar in pronunciation seems clear from the fact that in Hebrew words

---

[142] See C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen,* I (1908), p. 134, δ; S. Moscati *et al.*, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (1964), p. 30.

[143] So, in the Zincirli texts (ninth-eighth centuries BC), for example.

[144] A different view, Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge,* I, p. 246 [48].

[145] Not *Raṣunnu,* as often mis-transliterated; see B. Landsberger, *Sam'al,* I (1948), p. 69 and n.169 end; A. L. Oppenheim in *ANET²*, p. 283, n.4a; D. J. Wiseman, *Iraq,* XVIII, 1956, p. 121.

[146] Date of fall of *Rᵉṣīn* to the Assyrians; Kitchen, *Hittite Hieroglyphs, Aramaeans and Hebrew Traditions,* Table IV.

[147] Also attested in the unpublished Hermopolis papyri; *cf.* M. Kamil, *Revue de l'Histoire Juive en Égypte,* I, 1947, p. 3.

[148] Listed in *AOT,* pp. 30-31, plus other, non-biblical words.

[149] C. H. Gordon, *A.f.O.,* XII, 1937-1939, pp. 116, 117.

[150] Others, especially non-biblical, in *AOT,* p. 29.

[151] A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Inscriptions Araméennes tie Sfiré* (1958), p. 85 on IB:42; *cf.* S. Segert, *Archiv Orientálni,* XXXII, 1964, p. 119.

from certain roots are written on occasion with either sibilant.[152] *A priori,* therefore, the same phenomenon might be expected in Aramaic. In fact, it is hardly attested at all either in Biblical Aramaic or outside it in Imperial Aramaic. In Daniel, there is only *one* 'native Semitic' example: *sbr* (for *śbr*), 'to think'. The same is true in Ezra (*str*). In the Aramaic papyri, Rowley reviewed four possible roots showing *s* for *ś*; of these, *sbrt* ('I thought', *AP,* no. 37:7)[153] and *tstkl* from *śkl,* 'consider', or the like (*AP,* in Ahiqar, 147),[154] seem beyond reasonable doubt, despite Rowley's reserves.[155] Now, one isolated example in each major piece of Biblical Aramaic proves nothing at all—they are *far* too slender a basis by which to identify the 'first beginnings' (*AOT,* p. 38) of a general change in orthography from *ś* to *s*. We know for a fact that, in the pre-Christian centuries (and even down to the Massoretic epoch, on to the eighth century AD), there was some MS-variation between *ś* and *s* in the spelling of a few words:

[p.58]

e.g. *śbk', śgy'n, śtr.*[156] Therefore, we have *no* guarantee that *śbr* and *śtr* had not once upon a time fluctuated and eventually become settled with *s*-orthography perhaps long before the Massoretes,[157] whereas *śbk', śgy'n,* and *śtr* continued to fluctuate in MS-tradition till much later. Loan-words and foreign proper names, of course, are not so directly applicable to Semitic phonetic developments. In the Dead Sea Scrolls manuscript-fragment from Qumran Cave I, fluctuation here is attested for the loan-word *srbl* in Daniel, which in the scroll appears as *śrbl.*[158] (Note for Ezra 7:26, that the loan-word *śrśw,* better *śrśw,* appears as *srwśyt*—with initial *samekh*—in the Arsames documents of the fifth century BC.[159]) As *Ksdy',* 'Chaldaeans', in Ezra is a foreign name, it too is worthless as evidence on this point— especially if taken from (or contaminated by) Akkadian, where the Assyrian and Babylonian dialectal position on *ś/s* and *š* is very intricate.[160] In brief, we have no guarantee that *s* is original (*cf.* Quniran and later MSS-variations)—and one Semitic common noun in each of Daniel and Ezra is much too little evidence on which to base anything.

(vi) Finally, the variation between *h* and ' at the end of words. Enough has been said already by Rowley,[161] Baumgartner,[162] and Schaeder,[163] to obviate need of long discussion here. The net result is that such variations are chronologically worthless. Of Rowley's conveniently tabulated 15 points,[164] nos. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, show such affinity in usage between the Aramaic of Daniel and Old and Imperial Aramaic, that they prove nothing. Likewise, points 9 and 11, where in each case an isolated writing with *h* is neither 'early' nor 'late', but merely

---

[152] E.g. *BDB,* pp. 690-69, (*swg*), p. 962 (*śt; śwk*), etc.

[153] Cowley, *AP,* p. 134, shows little real doubt about reading *sbr.*

[154] See C. F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Quest,* III (1962), p. 192 end, and references.

[155] Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge,* I, p. 247 [49] and n.5, would add *skyn,* 'knife'.

[156] Quoted by Rowley, *AOT,* p. 34 and n.1.

[157] It is, therefore, nonsense to allege that this has any bearing upon 'phonetic revision', e.g. as 'particularly damaging' or otherwise, *pace* Rowley, *AOT,* p. 38, n.1.

[158] Noted by Rowley in *HSD,* p. 118 and n.3.

[159] *Cf.* p. 39 above; G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents* (1957), Letter 3:6, 7.

[160] *Cf.* briefly W. Von Soden, *Grundriss tier Akkadischen Grammatik* (1952), §30, especially 6g, p. 31.

[161] *AOT,* pp. 39-50; *HSD,* pp. 118-120.

[162] *ZAW,* XLV (1927), pp. 90-94, 112-115.

[163] *Iranische Beiträge,* I, pp. 233-235 [35-37], 239-242 [41-44].

[164] *AOT,* pp. 39-50. In *HSD,* pp. 118-120 (Sect. II), points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 = *AOT,* points 6, 5, 4, 1, 2; *HSD,* point 6 covers *AOT,* nos. 12-25, and 7, the latter, p. 67:4. *Cf.* also Baumgartner, *loc. cit.* (n. 162, above).

anomalous. This leaves point no. 1 on 'we'—indecisive, see below under grammar (p. 68); and nos. 12-15 on the ending of various parts of verbs having final weak radicals ' or *h* (for *y/w*). While the Aramaic of Daniel shows variation in the use of *h* and ', the Aramaic papyri generally discriminate in

[p.59]

writing between verbs in final' and in final *h* (*w/y*); but this is not always so: the papyri *do* show some variations, and these can occasionally appear even in Old Aramaic inscriptions. As Schaeder's study shows clearly,[165] this is the same phenomenon: *h* and 'serving by the fifth century BC simply as *vowel-letters* in the roles concerned, without consonantal value— and the supposed 'distinction' in the papyri is nothing more than historical orthography, while the incidental 'errors' (*h* for ', or vice-versa) betiay once more the underlying phonetic facts. In 1927, Montgomery had already supposed what he rather unsuitably called 'scribal confusion' (*Daniel,* p. 18) in transmission. Despite Rowley's opposition to this idea,[166] one may affirm that in the course of transmission scribal variations have come in—they can be seen at work in the Qumran MSS of Daniel, as Rowley himself is forced to note.[167]

(4) By contrast with these observed changes in the spelling of meaningful parts of speech (common nouns, pronouns, verbs, etc.), a small point of a different kind may here be briefly offered. A *foreign* personal name is essentially a mere *label*—it may be either fossilized or deformed in later transmission, but it will not so easily be modernized by those to whom its form is not meaningful. Hence, such a name may be preserved in an *older* orthography when the native matter around it has long been changed or changing. This seems to be precisely the case with the name Darius in Daniel and Ezra (both Aramaic and Hebrew, the former being our main concern). In these books, it appears in the form *Drywš*. Now, in the two oldest-known Aramaic papyri from Egypt, we find *Drwš* in the Meissner contract of 515 BC (year 7 of Darius I),[168] and *Drywš* (as in Daniel and Ezra) in the agreement of 49~ BC (Darius I, year 27)[169]—but in all the documents of Darius II, the spelling with *h:Dry(w)hwš*.[170] This *h*-spelling was retained down to Darius III (Sarnaria papyrus, accession-year, 335 BC).[171]

There is, therefore, an obvious cleavage in spelling between documents under Darius I (*Dr(y)hwš*) and those under Darius II and III (*Dry(w)hwš*)—and Daniel and Ezra preserve the *early* spelling in their Aramaic.[172] If their Aramaic portions had been composed in the late sixth to mid-fifth centuries BC (or before Darius II), then this is understandable. But if their matter was first composed in the third century BC or later, then their failure to

[p.60]

use the form with *h*—in constant use for a century by then (*c.* 420-330 BC)—is quite incomprehensible. At a minimum, *something* must thus go back to before *c.* 420 BC. An

---

[165] See n.163, above.

[166] *AOT,* p. 49; *HSD,* p. 120.

[167] *HSD,* p. 120, n.5.

[168] A. Dupont-Sommer, *Contrat tie Métayage* (1944), p. 8.

[169] *AP,* no. 1, p. 1.

[170] E.g. *AP,* nos. 20 ff.; *BMAP,* nos. 6, 7, 8.

[171] *Cf.* F. M. Cross, *BA,* XXVI, 1963, p. 113.

[172] Likewise their Hebrew, which influenced that in Nehemiah 12:22.

attempt has also been made[173] to date the form *Drwš* to before year 27, and *Drywš* to years 27 and following, of Darius I, in parallel with the Egyptian hieroglyphic spellings of the name (*trwš, trywš,* and variants). Actually, the use of *Drywš* in Egypt probably began earlier in the reign.[174] It is attested throughout in Demotic documents from Egypt;[175] and in the East (Babylon), *Darimuš* (= *Dariwuš,* Aramaic *Drwš*) was merely a variant for *Dariyamuš* (= *Danzyawuš,* Aramaic *Drywš*) in cuneiform.[176] Thus a Daniel might have begun with a *Drwš* for his Darius, and this be made later to conform to *Drywš,* the form current down to Ezra's day (458 BC); but as these documents—Daniel and Ezra—originated in the East (Babylon, etc.) on their own statements, they probably would write *Drywš* from the start. A single name is only very limited evidence, but has to be taken into account.[177]

2. *Significance of the Phenomena.* (1) One may state on the evidence surveyed that neither of Rowley's underlying assumptions is justified.

(*a*) In relation to the second assumption (p. 50, above), it is plain to see that, down to the fifth century BC, the normal orthography of Old and Imperial Aramaic did *not* offer a strictly phonetic spelling for all consonants: *d* had to be written with a *z*; *t* as *š*; *d>ğ* as *q*; *z,* as *s*, etc. It should also be perfectly clear that, by the fifth century BC,[178] a series of sound-shifts had occurred in Aramaic (*d* had become *d*; *t* as *t; d/ğ* as '; *z* as *t*, etc.), thereby reducing the old, traditional written spellings of words from (Phoenician-influenced) phonetic approximations to phonetically false historical orthographies. This fact is betrayed by the tell-tale examples of *d* where *z* 'normally' stood, *t* for *š*, etc.; of lapses into phonetic spell-

[p.61]

ing; and even by *false archaisms.* With *h* and ', again, we have in the fifth century BC mere vowel-letters, and historical spelling similarly betrayed by occasional scribal lapses. Some of the changes can already be seen to be operative in the eighth century BC (*h/'* Zincirli) or in the seventh (*t/t;* just possibly *z/t*). In other words, *phonetically* there is no reason to doubt that the Ararnaic of Daniel (or Ezra) was the kind spoken and *could* have been written in the fIfth or late sixth centuries BC—or some centuries later (leaving *Drywš* inexplicable) if so desired. It becomes a question of orthography, not of phonetics. And here we come back to the first assumption, that of *constancy* in the orthographic transmission of the Aramaic of Daniel. In detail, for *h*, ', *y,* the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls on the text of Daniel shows that orthographic variation did in fact occur in MS transmission and tradition.[179] While it is theoretically possible that a Daniel in Babylon in the early Persian period (*c.* 530 BC) might have written his Aramaic as spoken, and not in the customary historical orthography, it would

---

[173] See M. Burchardt, *Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache,* XLIX, 1911, pp. 78-80; Rosenthal, *Aramaistische Forschung,* p. 37; *cf.* Dupont-Sommer, *loc. cit.* (n. 168 above).

[174] Note the criticisms by G. Posener, *Première Domination Perse en Égypte* (1936), pp. 162-163 (and with reference to the Suez stelae, pp. 176, 188-189).

[175] Posener, *op. cit.,* pp. 162-163; used throughout in hieroglyphs at Temple of Kharga for Darius I and II, and for III in the Bucheum (p. 762, n.2).

[176] *Cf.* F. W. König, in *Reallexikon tier Assyriologie,* II (1938), p. 121*a*.

[177] Note also the title *mārē' male'ḵîn,* 'Lord of Kings' (and not 'of Kingdoms' as in Ptolemaic for third-second century BC), given to God in Daniel 2:47, which occurs about 600 BC in the letter of Adon to the pharaoh of Egypt (Donner and Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften,* II (1964), p. 313).

[178] Equivalent bodies of papyri, etc., for the seventh and sixth century BC are not at present available; such a find might serve to show how much further back the fifth-century phenomena really go.

[179] *Cf. HSD,* p. 118, n.3; p. 120, n.5; p. 123, n.10; p. 126, n.5. Also M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert,* III (1962), p. 115.

be a far simpler and a more realistic assumption that he would have written his Aramaic in the then current historical orthography which eventually was conformed to the more phonetic spelling of a later day. Rowley has pilloried Wilson for making of Daniel a 'spelling reformer[180] and refused Tisdall's view of a modernization of spelling later than Daniel (and likewise Batten's of Ezra) as being merely 'to brush the evidence [of the existing text] aside',[181] these scholars being held by him to have assumed that 'the present Biblical text is phonetically unreliable'.[182] The last phrase betrays Rowley's own confusion of orthography with phonetics, of conventional written spelling with pronounced sounds. For Wilson and Tisdall maintained the *phonetic* constancy of Daniel, and invoked *orthographic* (not phonetic) change (Rowley's 'unreliability') in its text. The transitions so carefully noted by Rowley (pp. 37-38) are purely *orthographic* ones, following in the wake of prior phonetic change, as pointed out above, pp. 52-59.

It should be noted that Rowley's rejection of later orthographic modernization of the text suggested by Tisdall and mooted above has itself found no acceptance with some of the more eminent later investigators. Thus, already in 1930, Schaeder considered it necessary to postulate 'modernization' of the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra, and cited what looks like a case of hyper-modernization;[183]

[p.62]

this was accepted by Brockelmann[184] and tacitly by Rosenthal.[185] Hence, orthographic modernization of the text cannot be excluded *a priori.* For evidence in the text itself; Schaeder pointed to *gdbry*, 'the treasurers', in Daniel 3:2, 3 as compared with *gzbry* in Ezra 7:21 (and in Hebrew, Ezra 1:8). *Gzbr* is a loan-word from Old Persian (or, with Schaeder, the closely-related Median) *ganzabara*. When the orthography of Daniel was changing (or, with Schaeder, was actively revised), with change of written *z* to spoken *d,* written *š* to spoken *t,* etc., a scribe 'corrected' *gzbr* to *gdbr* as if it had once been **gdbr*.[186] That this is a case of hyper-correction (intentional or otherwise) may safely be conceded. But an apparent parallel for such over-reduction of '*z*' to *d* in a Persian word in the fifth century BC, from the Arsames correspondence,[187] may here be dismissed. In letters 8, 9 and 10, Arsames writes to 'Naḥtiḥur, *Knrsyrm* and his colleagues', while in Letter 11, one Warohi writes very similarly to 'Naḥtiḥur, *Kndsyrm* [variant in the address: *Hn*[*d*]*syrm*] and his colleagues'. Opinion has wavered over the significance of *Knzsrm* and its variants—a Persian title, or a personal name of some kind?[188] It would, in fact, appear to be a proper name of Ciician origin[189]—like others in these same texts.[190] At first glance, *Knzsrm* could well be a *Kunzu-sarma*;[191] but the variant

---

[180] *Cf. AOT,* pp. 23, 24, 39, etc.

[181] *Ibid.,* p. 24.

[182] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[183] *Iranische Beiträge* I, p. 242 [44], and especially pp. 245-246 [47-48].

[184] *Handbuch tier Orientalistik,* III (*Semitistik*), 2-3 (1954), p. 140, quoting Schaeder's example of hyper-modernization.

[185] *Aramaistische Forschung,* pp. 69 and 71 (linguistics cannot put Daniel in the third-second centuries BC, only its content).

[186] References in notes 183, 184, above, plus Rosenthal, *op. cit.,* p. 69 and n. 1; *GBA,* p. 15.

[187] Texts in G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents* (1954-1957).

[188] *Cf.* already, Driver, *op. cit.* (1954), pp. 26, 32; *op. cit.* (1957), pp. 67, 78; Eilers, *A.f.O.,* XVII (1954-1956), p. 326 and n.14.

[189] *Cf.* Eilers, *loc. cit.*

[190] Eilers, *loc. cit.;* A. Goetze, *JCS,* VIII, 1954, pp. 75-79 *passim;* Ph. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (1961), pp. 125, 128, 133, 176.

Ḥ/Kndsyrm speaks rather for a *Kindi-sarma* (**Kinda-sirma?*),[192] *cf.* older Luvian *Ḫanta-sar-ruma.*[193] We have here, then, exactly the same phenomenon as with the *Mlz/Milid* (also an Anatolian name!) from the Zakir stela of the eighth century BC (*cf.* p. 54 above): a *d* treated as if it were, or had been, *d* ('*dh*') and written with *z* by one scribe, but in this case treated simply for what it was (phonetic *d*) by another (Letter II). Hence, this is not the same as Schaeder's phenomenon (reduction

[p.63]

of true *z* to *d)* that would for its part more likely occur at a date after the Persian Empire and common use of *ga*(*n*) *zibara* had passed away.

(*b*) Therefore, in the abstract (so to speak), there is no reason to deny possible orthographic change during the textual transmission of Daniel—and at least one piece of positive textual evidence points in that direction. But there are two further points to be borne in mind here which, so far as I know, have hitherto been entirely (and regrettably) ignored in considering this question of textual change, whether it be gradual, sudden, or the one leading to the other.

The first is that one must make a distinction between inscriptions or *ad hoc* documents written once, with no long history of transmission (such as the Elephantine papyri—letters, lists, legal documents, etc.), and essentially literary works (like Daniel, Ezra or Ahiqar) transmitted by successive copyists for centuries.[194] In the case of 'single-occasion' documents available to us in their originals, there can be no question of important scribal variants or orthographic modernization resulting from linguistic changes in addition to repeated recopying over a period of time. But, conversely, in the case of long-transmitted literary works in use for centuries, whose originals are lost, there can be no guarantee that substantially later 'first-available' copies have preserved the original details of orthography (or even of grammar and syntax).

The second point is that not merely are such changes (i) possible and (ii) probable, but (iii) they actually and often took place in the transmission of Ancient Near Eastern literature, and occurrence of 'modernization' is a fact that can be illustrated from that range of literature. We have no warrant to exempt Biblical literature from sharing in the same fundamental processes that affected all other literature in the Biblical world. As the available corpus of long-transmitted West Semitic literature is very small (outside of the Old Testament), it will be more instructive in the first instance to turn to a parallel Near Eastern literature which *can* show a more abundant transmitted literature, with clearly datable works and MSS—Egypt.[195]

Let us view some of the principles already found valid for Imperial Aramaic, or (as in the case of orthographic change) suggested for the Aramaic of Daniel.

[p.64]

---

[191] *Cf.* ten Cate, *op. cit.,* pp. 138-139, 134-136, for the elements *Kunzu* and *Sarma* respectively.

[192] Perhaps the vowel-letter *y* after the *s* instead of before it may indicate a vocalic metathesis.

[193] For the element *Hant*(*a*)/*Knt,* see ten Cate, *op. cit.,* pp. 149-150.

[194] A distinction apparently entirely overlooked by Rowley, e.g. in *AOT,* p. 49, when comparing the orthography of Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions (written just the once) with that of Daniel, long transmitted as literature.

[195] Mesopotamia and other regions would also offer illustration of these principles if time and space permitted.

(i) *Historical Orthography.* In Egypt, this is abundantly attested. The word *djed* (*dd*), 'to say', is so spelt from the beginning right down to the latest epochs; but by the early first millennium BC and probably xooo years earlier, the final *d* (first becoming *t*) was lost from speech in nearly all uses, as shown by occasional spellings as *d* for *dd*.[196] Or take the word for 'star', *siba'* (*sb'*), so spelt at all periods to the end—but already pronounced *siw* (*b* to *w*) not only in the early first millennium BC as shown by two occurrences in the Twenty-second Dynasty[197] but even in the late second millennium BC (Nineteenth Dynasty).[198] In the Demotic script, the two opposing tendencies—use of inherited historical orthography versus phonetic spellings—have long complicated the task of modern transcribers.[199]

(ii) *False Archaism.* This, too, is well known. In Egyptian, various sound-shifts occurred over the centuries, such as *d (dj)* to *d* and *d* to *t, r* to *i̯,* and so on. Sometimes a word containing an original *d, t, i̯,* etc., was misspelt in later texts with a *d, d* or *r,* etc., that it never originally possessed (exactly like the *zyn w-zbb* for *dyn w-dbb* in Imperial Aramaic, p. 54 above). Thus the Egyptian word *wdḥw* for 'offering-table' was frequently written later as *wdḥw,*[200] and even *w(')dḥw,*[201] to cite but one example.

(iii) *Orthographic Changes* in long manuscript-transmission. One may mention the characteristically Late Period (*c.* 800-200 BC) orthographies found in the MS Papyrus Chassinat I (*c.* 650 BC?) of the story of *General Sisenet and King Neferkarē'*—a story which, in fact, goes back to the Middle Kingdom age, about iooo years earlier[202]—and the similar case of a new *Ghost Story.*[203] The same kind of thing could be instanced of New Kingdom writings in other

[p.65]

Middle Kingdom literary works. An even more vivid example is afforded by the transmission of religious literature, especially ritual texts—the orthography of these (in both historical and phonetic features) in the great Ptolemaic temples (*c.* 300 BC-AD 200) is wholly different from that of the versions known from New Kingdom temples and papyri of 1000 to 1500 years earlier—the versions that prove by their very existence that a late orthography does not necessarily imply a late date of origin.[204]

---

[196] From M(iddle Kingdom), according to A. Erman and E. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache,* V (1931), p. 618 lower right. Examples will be found in names like Dje(d)-Khons-'ef-'eonkh, Dje(d)-Mūt-'es-'onkh, etc., of the early first millennium BC in texts such as those published by G. Legrain, *Statues et Statuettes ties Rois et des Particuliers,* III (1914) (Catalogue Général du Caire).

[197] R. A. Caminos, *The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon* (1958), p. 81, §119j and reference.

[198] Compare in Ostracon Cairo 25,521, *recto,* line 24, in a proper name: *Ḫ'-m-swi̯* for *Ḫ'-m-sb'* (published in J. Cerný, *Ostraca Hiératiques* (1930-1935), p. 23*).

[199] See briefly H. Brunner in H. Kees (ed.), *Handbuch tier Orientalistik,* I (*Ägyptologie*), I (1959), pp. 49-51 and references.

[200] E.g. R. O. Faulkner, *Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (1962), p. 73, the first four variant writings under *wdḥw.*

[201] *Ibid.,* fifth variant writing.

[202] *Cf.* G. Posener, *Revue d'Égyptologie,* XI, 1957, pp. 121, 233 and n. 1.

[203] P. Chassinat II; Posener, *ibid.,* XII, 1960, pp. 77, 81-82 (late period spelling of *Ḫnty-k'* and *ink;* but a Middle-Egyptian text).

[204] *Cf.* for example, the 'book' *Subduing of the Nobility,* and even more the *Ritual of the Royal Ancestors* (refs., *cf.* H. W. Fairrnan in S. H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual and Kingship* (1958), pp. 89-90, 100-104).

(2) Orthographic changes can come about piecemeal, following on even long after phonetic changes, and can leave obvious inconsistencies.[205] After a suitable interval of time, scribes accustomed to write in the orthography of their own day will be found also to use their *own* customary spelling conventions in copying out a long-transmitted text, completely or otherwise. All this is simply 'natural' (even unconscious) revision, not dogmatic policy. The Ptolemaic texts, however, present an example of *deliberate* revision of spelling in texts, but in their case to keep the contents from the knowledge of outsiders, instead of (as with most other examples of change) to make the written and spoken word agree more closely for easier comprehension.

Needless to say, similar orthographical phenomena can be found in other parallel Near Eastern literatures, e.g. the cuneiform texts of Mesopotaniia, and even in those of the Hittites.[206] Of early Aramaic transmitted literature outside the Old Testament, we have little besides Ahiqar. So far, our only early Aramaic MS of Ahiqar (as opposed to all the very late post-Christian versions) is that from among the fifth century papyri found at Elephantine.[207] Its orthography is that of those fifth-century documents—but no-one today would suppose that Ahiqar and story and wisdom were invented only in the fifth Century BC. Apart from the references to Assyria and the kings Sennacherib and Esarhaddon in the text, Ahiqar himself is now attested within later cuneiform tradition as an *ummanu,* 'scholarly adviser', serving Esarhaddon in the seventh

[p.66]

century BC.[208] This, with the general considerations already put forward by the Assyriologist Meissner, and Olmstead,[209] indicates a seventh-century date for the origins of the Ahiqar narrative and wisdom.[210] Hence, the orthography of the fifth century BC is unlikely to be wholly the original orthography of a seventh-century original—and if some day we ever come into the possession of a copy of the third to first centuries BC (contemporary, say, of the earlier Dead Sea Scrolls), it will be interesting to see whether such a copy has anomalously preserved a fifth-century orthography (mainly *z, q,* etc., rarely *d, ‛,* etc.) or—as one would expect on the analogy of the rest of Near Eastern usage—has taken on an orthography like that of Daniel or the Genesis Apocryphon.

In the light of the comparative evidence briefly sampled above, it should be obvious that orthographic change (sometimes 'revision', sometimes more gradual) is normal—and the onus of proof lies on those who would maintain that the Aramaic text of Daniel or Ezra could

---

[205] Exactly like *‛rq* and *’r‛* in Je. 10:11 (a fact unknown to Rowley, *AOT,* p. 24, citing Jeremiah).

[206] In Hittite, it is commonplace to have documents composed in the eighteenth-fifteenth centuries BC preserved in tablets showing 'late' (i.e. fourteenth-thirteenth century BC) script and spelling; e.g. 'old' and late ductus in the Hittite Laws (H. G. Guterbock, *JCS,* XV, 1961, pp. 64-65), or the Anittas text (H. Otten, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Oriene-Gesellschaft,* LXXXIII, 1951, pp. 43-44).

[207] Recent translation, H. L. Ginsberg, in *ANET*[2], pp. 427-430; literature, *cf.* Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie* I (1962), pp. 136-145.

[208] See J. J. Van Dijk in H. Lenzen, *XVIII. Uruk Vorbläufiger Bericht* (1962), pp. 45, 51-52. The reasons for a fifth-century date given by F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Die Aramäische Sprache unter den Achaimenitien,* I (1963), p. 185, are superficial and erroneous, and ruled out by the new Uruk reference, the use of Aramaic by Assyrian officials, and the vagueness of *ḫyl.*

[209] B. Meissner, *Das Märchen vom weisen Achiqar* (*Der Alte Orient,* XVI.2, 1917), pp. 26-32. A. T. Olmstead, *JAOS,* LVI, 1936, p. 243 and references; W. von Soden's suggestions in *ZA,* XLIII, *NF* IX, 1936, pp. 9-13, are now rendered somewhat obsolete by the Uruk text.

[210] Note also J. C. Greenfield, *JAOS,* LXXXII, 1962, pp. 292-293, 297-299.

not or did not fare similarly in similar circumstances.[211] In the case of Ezra, we are dealing with documents related to Persian officialdom preserved in a literary work (hence their transmission). Despite the imaginings of a Torrey, there is no factual warrant whatever for denying the authenticity of the Ezra material and its origin in the fifth Century BC;[212] the assumption of orthographic change during literary transmission is here obligatory.

As for the date of orthographic change in Daniel (on any sixth/fifth century dating, but not on second-century basis) and Ezra, nothing compels us to put it quite as late as the second century BC. It is very probable that Imperial Aramaic retained its historical orthography in the main well beyond *c.* 399 BC, the latest date among the Elephantine papyri.[213] The recently discovered Samaria papyri should throw light on the period *c.* 375-335 BC; one fragment shows the historical orthography with *z* in *znh,* 'this', for phonetic *dnh,*

[p.67]

c. 370 BC.[214] One may thus assume that the historical orthography persisted in official use while the Persian Empire existed,[215] with a gradual infiltration of phonetic spellings like those of the fifth-century papyri. But when Alexander and his successors took over the Orient by 330 BC and following, the role of Aramaic as the language of government must have declined visibly; the official tongue of the new rulers was Greek. Nothing now would bind all users of Aramaic in different regions to an official habit, and for greater intelligibility a reduction of orthography to match spoken usage would set in.[216] In the third century BC and certainly after it, when the documents of daily life must have been written in an ever more phonetic orthography, only inherited literature such as Ezra or Daniel (if older) would still have existed in an outdated orthography whose continuance would be an increasing bar to ready intelligibility. The impulse to use newer, more familiar spelling would eventually be irresistible and would need no special sanction.

What, then, is the significance of all this? Simply that we have no inherent right to assume that the present orthography of the Aramaic of Daniel requires a second-century date for the original composition of that Aramaic text. Certainly, if the book was composed at that time, then only restricted variations would have been possible (e.g. in vowel-letters; *ś* and *s*). But in reality there is no factual reason for preferring this view to the possibility that this Aramaic text was composed in the third, fourth, fifth or late sixth century BC and underwent orthographic changes that are *not* the invention of theological conservatives[217] but are the common fate of all such transmitted literature in times of linguistic change. Hence—precisely

---

[211] I.e. apart from the lesser variation of *h/ʾ* still visible in the Dead Sea Scrolls; Rowley's position in *AOT,* p. 24, is thus belied by the comparative evidence.

[212] There is no space here for a digression upon this topic.

[213] P. Brooklyn 13, *cf., BMAP,* pp. 113, 283.

[214] *Cf.* F. M. Cross, *BA,* XXVI, 1963, p. 115 and pp. 110-121 generally, and p. 111 with pp. 120-121.

[215] A modicum of uniformity across the Empire was necessary for mutual intelligibility when Aramaic was being used by officials and others from so many different linguistic backgrounds.

[216] Wherever Aramaic really was a living language of everyday speech. But the opposite, of course, will apply wherever Imperial Aramaic was merely a written medium, not spoken—here it tended to be mainly fossilized in its Imperial orthography without a body of customary Aramaic speakers to bend it to current speech. This is well illustrated by the survival of *z*-forms in Iran, India (e.g. Taxila) and elsewhere. Although Nabataean is so late (second-century BC ff., *cf.* J. Starcky, *BA,* XVIII, 1955, p. 89), it—being principally a *written* language in the hands of Arab speakers (*cf.* J. Cantineau, *Le Nabatéen* II (1932), pp. 179-180)—sometimes retains a *z* in the old tatters of Imperial orthography.

[217] E.g. *gdbr* hypercorrected from *gzbr.*

as with the main Semitic vocabulary-stock and with the loan-words—a time-range of the late sixth to second centuries BC remains open, and any choice of date within this period must be made on other grounds.

[p.68]

C. GRAMMAR AND SYNTAX

1. *Morphology.* Here also, a condensed treatment must suffice. Rowley's 'evidence' on morphology (and syntax) is far less significant than he thought, and most of it is not a matter of morphology at all, but again of orthography and phonetics, as considered above. His mechanical listing and treatment of 'differences' (e.g. between Biblical Aramaic and that of the papyri) is thus misleading. Again, grossly inadequate statistics have been pressed into service (based upon mere units or tens of words instead of upon thousands), and the fallacy of negative evidence—a fallacy capable of illustration from discoveries since 1929. Most of the 'evidence' adduced is invalid, as far as a 'late' date for the Aramaic of Daniel is concerned, inasmuch as it falls into the following categories,[218] with reasons stated.

(1a) *Purely orthographic variation in use of vowel-letters.* Rowley, V:4 (*HSD,* 111:3): variation in use of *h/'* at end of 'we' (*'nḥna*), without significance—see on vowel-letters, pp. 58-59 above.

(i*b*) *'Defective' spelling in papyri, 'full' (plēnē) spelling in Daniel (and Ezra).* R., V:I (*HSD,* 111:2:); V:4 (*HSD,* III:3); V:8; VI:I; X:2; X:18. In every case, an ending (or form, X:18) in Daniel is written with a vowel-letter (*h, ', y*) where the papyri generally write none.

This, too, has no chronological value except for the history of orthography.[219] The forms in the Aramaic of the papyri and of Daniel were phonetically identical, as shown by tell-tale variants in the papyri: they sometimes use a *plēnē* spelling of exactly the same type as is found in the Aramaic of Daniel (e.g. *-yn* for *- īn,* VI: 1). Schaeder appropriately pointed[220] to an exact parallelism—*hḥwyn//hḥwyn'*—in *AP,* nos. 30:16 and 31:15, these being the draft of a document and its contemporary duplicate. If *-n'* is to be counted later in Daniel, it should also be counted as centuries later in *AP,* no. 31! This, of course, is impossible. And in fact, there is *no* difference in any of these points between the Aramaic of Daniel (and Ezra) and that of the sixth/fifth centuries BC except in orthography—which (as already plainly shown) reflects the textual transmission of a literary work (not necessarily its date of composition), in contrast to the once-for-all point in time occupied by a nonliterary everyday or official document.

[p.69]

(2) *Forms common* to the papyri (and sometimes Old Aramaic), Daniel (and Ezra), and the 'late' sources (Nabataean, Palmyrene, Targums, etc.). R., V:7; V:11; V:12; V:15 (*HSD,* III:4); VII:1-8; VIII:1 (*HSD,* V:4); IX:1 (*HSD,* V:7); IX:3; IX:4 X:3, 5, 6; X:7 (*hith-, 'ith-*); X:9

---

[218] For brevity's sake, Rowley's works will be cited by Section (Roman numerals) and points (Arabic numbers) from pp. 50-106 of *AOT;* parallel sections and points from his paper in *HSD* will be prefixed in brackets by the abbreviation *HSD.*

[219] As Rowley will admit in a case where chronology is not involved (*cf.* his VII:2, where 'defective' orthography is recognized as such).

[220] *Cf.* his discussion in *Iranische Beiträge* I, pp. 240-242 [42-44].

(*HSD,* IV:4); X:10 (*HSD,* IV:5); X:11 (*HSD,* IV:6); X:12 (if valid at all); X:13 X:18 (*HSD,* IV: 9); X:19, 20. Here, time and again, we have examples of a form attested at once in Daniel/Ezra Arainaic, *and* both in the papyri (and even Old Aramaic) and in the 'late' sources. In cases of this kind, their evidential value is absolutely *nil:* they show merely that certain forms were known in the sixth/fifth centuries BC (or before) and persisted for many centuries. On such a basis, the Aramaic of Daniel could be of any date from the sixth century BC onwards.

In the case of V:15 and IX:4, new evidence has come to light since 1929. At that time, *'ln* for 'these' (V:15) was attested only in Daniel and the late Palmyrene.[221] But since then, the Old Aramaic treaty-texts from Sfiré in N. Syria, of the eighth century BC, have yielded some fourteen examples of *'ln*[222]—it is, therefore, an *old* form, which has survived (i) in *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* II, III:5 and Daniel, and (ii) in Palmyrene.

In IX:4, the accusative particle *yt*[223] is a classic example of the fallacy of 'negative evidence', i.e. the apparent non-attestation of a form in 'early' documents. In 1929, the form *yt*—outside Daniel—was known only from the late Nabataean and Palmyrene texts; Old Aramaic had a different form, and the Imperial Aramaic of the papyri apparently none. But in Papyrus Brooklyn 3:22a, the particle *yt* is now attested from the fifth century BC,[224] and is unlikely to have been invented for that particular document. As for VII:3 (*'dyn,* 'then'), its form in Daniel agrees with that of the papyri—but in the Targums this word shows the quite different orthography *hydyn.* Yet this kind of difference, upon which Rowley laid such stress in other cases when it helped to show 'differences' between Daniel and the papyri, is suddenly discounted by him as a mere question of orthography when it comes to Daniel being different from the Targums! This smacks of *plaidoyer.* (Again, the Targumic *h'-k* and especially *hyk d* (also in Palmyrene) were held by Rowley (p. 72) to 'differ but little'—i.e. insignificantly—from the *h'-kdy* of

[p.70]

Daniel (VIII:5). But this is a greater difference than many of the other distinctions that Rowley made between items in Daniel and the papyri and listed as real differences when it was solely a matter of orthography. For 'late' *btr* as compared with *b'tr* (VIII:3), note the occurrence of *btr* as an ideogram in Pahievi—taken over from the Imperial Aramaic of the sixth-fourth centuries BC via its fossilized use in the chancelleries of Seleucid and Arsacid Iran, before becoming an ideogram.[225] The omission of a quiescent ' is far less than the differences between Daniel and the Targums (VIII:5) just quoted.)

In X:7, 9, alternation of *h* and ' in preformatives for reflexive and causative verb-forms claims attention; Rowley gave too little weight to the agreement of Biblical Aramaic with Old and Imperial Aramaic in commonly having *h* in the causative (as opposed to Pahnyrene, Targums

---

[221] With one solitary exception from Persia, *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarwn,* II (1889), III:5 (*AOT,* p. 56).

[222] Full references in A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Inscriptions Araméennes de Sfir* (1958), p. 140, *s.v.*

[223] Apodictically termed 'late' by H. L. Ginsberg, *JAOS,* LXII, 1942, p. 231b—'negative evidence' again!

[224] *BMAP,* p. 163.

[225] *Cf.* R. N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* (1962), pp. 146-149; date of ideographic use of Aramaic in Pahlevi, *cf.* F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Die Aramäische Sprache unter den Achaimeniden,* I (1963), pp. 4-74, for a later date of change from Aramaic 'properly' written to ideographic use than has commonly been supposed. On Pahlevi, see H. S. Nyberg, *A Manual of Pahlevi,* I (1964). References for *btr,* C. F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques tie l'Ouest,* I-II (1960), pp. 45-46.

and in part Nabataean, with '), while duly noting (pp. 94/95, i) the usage with the reflexive (both *h* and ') in Daniel as different from the papyri (using '). But the plain fact is that both *h* and ' forms are old; Rowley himself quotes the forms from Zincirli and Neirab respectively (p. 80). Where only a handful of each form is available both in Biblical Aramaic and in the papyri, etc., statistical treatment is useless, especially if any orthographic change has occurred.[226]

Items like X:13 are wholly indecisive; if assimilation and non-assimilation of initial radical *n* are both attested both 'early' and 'late', they prove nothing because they could as easily be considered a residual archaism (*cf.* Zakir, no *n;* Neirab with *n,* etc.) as a 'late' mark (e.g. Palmyrene, no *n*; Nabataean with *n,* etc.).

(3) *Historical orthography,* in particular *z* for *d,* from *d̲*: R., V:11, 13, 14, 16. This point needs no further treatment; see above, pp. 53-55. On V:11, *cf.* also paragraph (4) below. As for V:14, *d',* 'this', precisely this form occurs in the phonetically-written Demotic—Aramaic papyrus of the fifth century BC; appeal to Nabataean and the Targums, therefore, proves nothing whatever—except long use.

(4) *'Anomalous' forms,* so far unique to Daniel. R., V:11 (*HSD,* 111:7) on *dkn;* VIII:4; VIII:5 (*HSD,* V:5; 'Heb.' *ngd*); X, 21, 22. Forms otherwise unattested, early *or* late, have no evidential dating-

[p.71]

value whatever, because their external occurrence cannot (yet) be controlled. In VIII: 4, the form in Daniel (meaningless *z/d* apart) differs *only* in having *t* (*dbrt*) from the '*l-dbr-zy* of the papyri; *ngd* in VIII:5, being a Hebraism, has no significance, as everyone admits that the author was a Hebrew, whatever his place and date. *Hn,* 'if', goes back to Old Aramaic as well as the papyri;[227] *lhn,* 'except', is in the papyri;[228] *bgyn* is merely 'negative evidence'. Irrelevant in practice, as Rowley admitted, are VI:2, 3—Palmyrene rarities not attested in Daniel; similarly, X:4, 8.

All the foregoing material is irrelevant to the date of the Aramaic of Daniel, as it could be 'early' or 'late'. Now we turn to material that is more apparently 'early' or 'late'.

(5) *Material found only in Biblical Aramaic and older sources* (Old Aramaic, papyri, etc.) is listed by R., VII: 1-8. As he noted, several of these terms and forms survive into the Targums but are not found in Nabataean and Palmyrene. This affects VII:2, 4, 6; I (if *ken* (p. 69) be compared with *k'nt*), 8 (indirectly), and 3 if Rowley be allowed to discount orthography, for once, in his own interest.

This leaves VII:5 (different to Targumic *tmn,* whose occurrence in an Egyptian ostracon is strictly irrelevant to Daniel), and VII:7 (*HSD,* V:10) as so far early only. As for VII:9 (*HSD,* V:11), *tnynwt* in Daniel should be compared with *tnyn* of the papyri (*AP,* nos. 70:7; 63:73). One may add IX:2, *'lw,* 'lo'; the alternation of *h* and need be worth no more here than elsewhere.

---

[226] See on this matter Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge,* I, pp. 249-250 (51-2].
[227] *Cf.* Jean and Hoftijzer, *op. cit.,* p. 66 meaning (2).
[228] *Cf. ibid.,* III, p. 235.

This leaves us with—at last—several items of apparently rather sounder evidential value for a relatively late dating of the Aramaic of Daniel than the mass of irrelevant matter so far eliminated.

(6) *Apparently Late Criteria.* (*a*) *Illusory lexical and phonetic examples.* Under VIII: 2, the form *tḥwt,* 'under', is contrasted with *tḥt* of the papyri, and noted as occurring in the Targums (p. 72)—but this form *tḥwt* is now (since 1953) known from the papyri too (P. Brooklyn 6:70). It therefore belongs in section 2, above (common forms).

Under X:16, the verb *slq* in Daniel is observed to assimilate the *l* as in Palmyrene, once having a 'compensatory' *n.* This assimilation already occurs in Old Aramaic in the eighth century BC,[229] while for *n,* probably compare P. Brooklyn 6:10.[230]

(*b*) *Pronominal Forms* that add *n,* or substitute it for the *m* of the papyri, *cf.* R., V:5, 6, 9, 10; X:1.

The origins of such forms as *hmwn* for 'older' *hmw*; *-kwn, -hwn,* etc.,

[p.72]

have already been perfectly adequately explained by Schaeder,[231] whose treatment it is needless to repeat here. He notes the occasional occurrence of *-n* forms of suffixes in the fifth-century papyri,[232] which show that, by then, these had already become part of spoken Aramaic, and so occasionally pierced the older and customary orthography of the papyri. In other words, where before we had historical and phonetic orthographies, here we have older and later grammatical forms. And, as Schaeder also notes, in the transmission of Ezra and Daniel the later forms of current speech and of everyday writing (i.e. of the third century BC and later) have begun to make an impact on Ezra, and have replaced wholly the older form in Daniel, giving Old Testament scholars the superficial impression that the Aramaic of Daniel is 'younger' than that of Ezra.[233] The change in pronominal forms has gone further in Daniel than in Ezra, but this does not automatically prove that such was already the case when the Aramaic parts of these books were actually composed. For, in fact, grammatical and morphological change (and not only orthographical) not only can but did take place in Ancient Near Eastern textual transmission. Thus, a third-second century date for the Aramaic of Daniel could be retained, under the onus of having to prove that no morphological changes have occurred in the transmission of the Aramaic of Daniel (and Ezra). An earlier date (sixth-fourth centuries BC), assuming such change to a limited degree, is at any rate in harmony with observed facts of Ancient Near Eastern textual transmission.

---

[229] Sfiré texts: A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Inscriptions Araméenes de Sfiré,* p. 247, *s.v.*

[230] *Cf. BMAP,* p. 196 top; contrast no. 9:15.

[231] *Iranische Beiträge,* I. pp. 250-252 [52-54].

[232] *Ibid.,* p. 250 [52], and n.3 adding an example to those of Baumgartner, *ZAW,* XLV, 1927, p. 105(*b*).

[233] *Cf.* (e.g.) Baumgartner, *op. cit,* pp. 120-222, more cautious than Renan; and Rowley, *AOT,* pp. 55, 254 (also cautious).

As with orthographic changes, one may turn to a better-documented area of literature in the Biblical world for some examples of this phenomenon; again, Egypt is convenient (but not unique).[234]

The *Instruction of Ptahhotep* in Egypt is one of the older wisdom-books in a long series. It is now generally accepted that it indeed originated in the late Old Kingdom (Fifth-Sixth Dynasties, *c.* 2400 BC),[235] showing clear traces of its Old Kingdom origin.[236] However,

[p.73]

this book, which must then have been composed in Old Egyptian, underwent not *one* but *two* revisions of grammatical structure: (i) Papyrus Prisse of *c.* 2000 BC is Middle Egyptian rather than Old, while (ii) the other MSS show a fuller Middle Egyptian form and text-tradition.[237]

Again, the *Instruction of Aniy* is a good Eighteenth Dynasty work, in formal Middle Egyptian, but the Berlin Museum tablet no. 8934 accompanies its Middle Egyptian text with a Late Egyptian version (broken off after the title).[238] *Cf.* the same phenomenon in the *Ritual for Repulsing Evil,* a text provided with a version in later Egyptian.[239]

In the foregoing cases, we probably have examples of fairly consistent modernization, rather as Schaeder considered likely for the Aramaic of Daniel. Less deliberate change also took place, of course. If we possessed only the Ashmolean Ostracon MS of *Sinuhe* in Egyptian, written out in the Ramesside period (*c.* 1300-1100 BC), and applied the methods and viewpoints of a Rowley or a Baumgartner, then a fifteenth to early thirteenth century date (BC) for *Sinuhe* (and a pseudepigraphic origin, 600 years after the date suggested by statements in the text) would seem every bit as certain as the second-century date appears for Daniel on the linguistic grounds offered by these scholars. However, we have for *Sinuhe* what we lack for Daniel (and for *all* Old Testament writings): *really* early MSS, in the case of *Sinuhe* reaching back to *c.* 1800/1700 BC, within 150 years of the composition of the original text near the end of the twentieth century BC. These MSS show (i) that *Sinuhe* is so much earlier, and (ii) that the 'late' features of the Ashmolean Ostracon text are simply the result of long manuscript transmission and some modernization; they date that MS, not *Sinuhe*.[240] A text composed later than Sinuhe is *The Sporting King,* not earlier than Amenemmes II (*c.* 1900 BC) whom it concerns; but our sole and late MS (end of Eighteenth Dynasty, late

---

[234] Leaving aside the vast province of Mesopotamian cuneiform, one should note the widely admitted and attested practice of grammatical modernization in even the much smaller province of Hittite cuneiform. Some random examples: A. Goetze, *JCS,* XVI, 1962, p. 24*b*, in §1 (Deeds of Hattusil I); H. Otten, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft,* LXXXIII, 1951, pp. 43-44 (Deeds of Anittas), besides orthography.

[235] *Cf.* (e.g.) the six scholars named by Fecht (see next note), p. 50, n.1.

[236] G. Fecht, *Der Habgierige und die Maat in der Lehre des Ptoizhotep* (1958), pp. 49-50.

[237] *Cf.* the convenient layout of parallel texts in Z. Žába, *Les Maximes tie Ptahhotep* (1956).

[238] *Cf.* (e.g.) E. Suys, *La Sagesse d'Anii* (1935), pp. vii, 1; G. Posener, *Revue d'Égyptologie,* VI, 1949, p. 42 and n.2.

[239] S. Schott, *Die Deutung tier Geheimnisse ties Rituals für die Abwehr des Bösen* (1954); note also the Demotic version of parts of older, Middle Egyptian texts in P. Carlsberg I (e.g. Parker, *Revue d' Égyptologie,* X, 1955, pp. 49-59).

[240] For Sinuhe MSS see G. Posener, *Littérature et Politique dane l' Égypte de la XIIe Dynastie* (1956), pp. 87-88 and references. On a couple of 'late' elements (among others) in the Ashmolean Ostracon, *cf.* my *Ancient Orient and Old Testament,* part I:B, Section 5, (ii), *b*:i, *apud* principle III.

fourteenth century BC) in this case preserves the Middle Kingdom forms throughout.[241] Thus, an earlier

[p.74]

work (*Sinuhe*) can easily appear with linguistic forms that are 'younger' than those preserved for a later composed work (*The Sporting King*)—*just* as may be the case with Daniel and Ezra. Why is this? Simply, in the case of *Sinuhe* and *The Sporting King,* because the one work was more widely used and copied, and had more circulation, than the other. We have several major MSS of *Sinuhe* and a crowd of ostraca,[242] but, so far, only the *one* MS of *The Sporting King*.[243] So, it is just as possible that Daniel's graphic narratives and intriguing visions were more often read and recopied than the drier and more prosaic doings of Ezra and his predecessors. In other words, forms like *hmwn* date themselves rather than the text in which they occur, and so leave the date of Daniel open for consideration on other grounds.

(*c*) *Other Forms.* In the Pe'al Imperfective, *yd'*, 'to know', shows an *n* before *d* (*R.*, X:15), which is also a less well attested use elsewhere. It is practically absent from 'early' and 'late' sources alike, apart from limited occurrence in (e.g.) the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan.[244] But a possible example of the form *mnd'* in the Ahiqar papyrus[245] should warn us that, in fact, this item really belongs in section (2) above—i.e. is both 'early' and 'late', and so useless.

2. *Syntax.* Syntax offers, as Rowley rightly remarked, 'few differences' of any importance. Of his various points (section XI in his *AOT,* pp. 98-108), XI:1(i), (iii)*a*, 2, 3(*b*), 6 and 7, all fall under the same judgment as §1, section (2), above, attested in early sources (Old Aramaic and papyri) as well as late (Targums, etc.), this robbing them of all evidential value.

The points left over (XI: I (ii), (iii)*b, c, d*; 4, 5) are no better, for the following reasons.

In XI:1, item (ii) is restricted to a couple of occurrences in the papyri (*AP,* 41:3 twice) and is thus irrelevant; (iii)b is irrelevant, because limited to Pahnyrene; (iii)*c, d,* are so rare in Biblical Aramaic (*c*: 3 in Ezra, I in Daniel; *d*:1 in Ezra, 2 in Daniel) as opposed to Palmyrene that they prove nothing at all.

In XI:4 and 5, the trend of the facts is clearly against Rowley's position, largely as a result of discoveries since 1929. As for XI:4, the preposition *l* before a king's name in dates is a mark of *early* date. In all the Cowley papyri, it occurs once: in the *oldest* document, dated to year 27 of Darius I, *c.* 495 BC.[246] This is no fluke; *cf.* now the Meissner papyrus (line 1) from year 7 of Darius I (*c.* 575 BC, within 22 years of the earliest possible date for the book of Daniel:

[p.75]

3rd year of Cyrus, 536 BC).[247] As late as 457 BC (14th year of Artaxerxes I) the earliest papyrus in the Brooklyn series uses *l*.[248] In all later documents, no *l* is so far attested before a

[241] R. A. Caminos, *Literary Fragments in the Hieratic Script* (1956), p. 23.
[242] See note 240, above, for reference covering most of these.
[243] See n.241.
[244] *Cf. AOT,* pp. 93-95, item (iv).
[245] *Ibid.,* p. 96, on (viii).
[246] *AP,* no. 1, line 1.
[247] Dupont-Sommer, *Contrat tie Métayage* (1944).

royal name in datelines[249]—this item in the Aramaic of Daniel, therefore, is as likely to be an archaic survival as anything else, and to have found subsequent extension of use in a later day, in Nabataean and Targums. In XI:5, again, the use of 'king' before a royal name (Darius) is attested by our oldest-available papyrus, P. Meissner of 575 BC. The use in Daniel is parallel to such as this as much as to the Targums, which latter (being Jewish literature, after all!) are more likely to have been influenced by Biblical precursors such as Daniel, and thus to be without any independent value.

In fine, under Grammar and Syntax, there is nothing decisive in favour of an early or late date for the Aramaic of Daniel. The 'late' phenomena (restricted, in fact, to a mere *n* in certain pronominal forms) are as likely to represent textual history as date of composition; most of the supposed criteria are in fact invalid. One or two points would suit an early date, but are indecisive; for word-order, see in the next section.

D. GENERAL AFFILIATIONS OF THE ARAMAIC OF DANIEL

The Aramaic of Daniel (and of Ezra) is simply a part of Imperial Aramaic—in itself practically undatable with any conviction within *c.* 600 to 330 BC—a part which differs from nearly[250] all the rest solely in being scribally transmitted literature and hence subject to orthographic and allied changes. The old battles over 'Eastern' or 'Western' Aramnaic were a waste of effort, for Imperial Aramaic antedates both, and offers no good evidence for such a distinction.[251]

Within Imperial Aramaic, it is tempting to classify this or that

[p.76]

minor peculiarity as hinting that this or that document shows E. or W. connections; but by and large, this is still unconvincing. In Biblical Aramaic, word-order in sentences having finite verbs is quite different from normal N.W. Semitic usage (verb — subject — etc.). Instead we find the subject commonly first with the verb at the end of the sentence having the object more often before than after it (i.e. subject — object — verb; or, subject — verb — object). This stands in striking contrast to the Dead Sea Scrolls *Genesis Apocryphon* of about the first century BC[252] and *Targum of Job* of the late(?) second century BC,[253] both of them

---

[248] *BMAP,* no. 1, line 1.

[249] E.g. a dateline from the Samaria papyri (fourth century BC) has no *l*; *cf.* F. M. Cross, *BA,* XXVI, 1963, p. 113.

[250] Except, of course, Ahiqar.

[251] *Cf.* already Baumgartner, *ZAW,* XLV, 1927, pp. 123-124; Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge,* I. p. 253 [55], *cf.* p. 228 [30]; summing up, Rosenthal, *Aramaistiche Forschung,* pp. 67, 70-71. *Cf.* also Dupont-Sommer on the Assur Ostracon, *Syria,* XXIV, 1944-1945, pp. Rowley, *AOT,* pp. 15, 154 top, was conscious of this fact, but still too bound to the old ideas. On p. 15, one sees again his confusion of orthography and phonetics, in line 13 from top of page—for 'phonetic', one should read 'orthographic'; the idea that phonetic changes of this class in Aramaic occurred in the West in the fifth century BC but in the East only in the second century BC is grotesque and rests wholly on this confusion of orthography and phonetics (see his p. 13, n.1). The phonetic change had come by the fifth century BC, while orthography long lagged behind.

[252] *Cf.* E. Y. Kutscher, *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* IV (1958), pp. 33-34; F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Die Aramäische Sprache unter den Achaimeniden* I (1963) pp. 224-222.

[253] On which date see J. van der Ploeg, *Le Targum de Job de Ia Grotte* II *de Qumran* (1962), p. 7. For the word-order in this document, *cf.* the extract illustrated and printed on the plate, pp. 8-9.

embarrassingly close in time to a supposedly second-century Daniel.[254] But it agrees well with the word-order of the Assur ostracon of the seventh century BC,[255] and with the freedom of order in the fifth-century Aramaic papyri from Egypt.[256]

The origin of the phenomenon lies in the East—in Mesopotamia, following the model of Akkadian in which the verb normally falls at or near the end of the sentence.[257] However, this merely proves that the Aramaic of Daniel (and Ezra) belongs to the early tradition of Imperial Aramaic (seventh-sixth to fourth centuries BC) as opposed to later and local, Palestinian derivatives of Imperial Aramaic (like the Scrolls cited), and not automatically that a Daniel himself was under Babylonian influence in his writing. During the whole period *c.* 1200-630 BC, with Aramaean penetration into Mesopotamia, the Assyrian conquest of the Aramaean states, and deportation of Aramaeans into Mesopotamia, there was plenty of time for this Mesopotamian imposition on Aramaic syntax to take place in Mesopotamnia. When the Mesopotamian-naturalized Aramaic became a chancellery-language for Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and above all Persian government officials, it carried this mark everywhere. But as a spoken language in Palestine, among Hebrews and perhaps other West-Semitic language-stock, Aramaic reverted to the old syntactic pattern, visible in the Old Aramaic inscriptions of N. Syria itself; outside of Mesopotamia and not populated by Akkadian-speakers. In view of this and other considerations, several scholars today would consider an Eastern

[p.77]

(Mesopotamian) origin for the Aramaic part of Daniel (and Ezra) as probable,[258] in agreement with the subject-matter, though absolute proof cannot be given within the relative unity of Imperial Aramaic.

E. GENERAL RESULTS

1. *Vocabulary: Semitic.* As noted above (pp. 34, 35), nothing decisive on date is obtainable here.

2. *Vocabulary: Persian.* Statistical appreciations of Persian loan-words (especially in relation to survivals into the Targums, etc.) are worthless (pp. 36, 39, 40); the impact of Old Persian upon Imperial Aramaic is very considerable. In the LXX versions, some four Persian words are so poorly 'translated' that their meanings must have been lost long beforehand; this would argue for a date before the second century BC (pp. 42-43). The Persian words are Old Persian, not Middle; this indicates *no* independent borrowing of Persian words into Daniel after *c.* 300 BC (pp. 43 f.). These facts suggest an origin for the Persian words in the Aranmaic of Daniel before *c.* 300 BC.

---

[254] Note also the reactions of van der Ploeg, *op. cit.,* p. 24

[255] Note A. Dupont-Sommer, *Syria,* XXIV, 1944-1945, pp. 57-58.

[256] See Baumgartner, *ZAW,* XLV, 1927, pp. 129-230, on these.

[257] *Cf.* W. von Soden, *Grundriss tier A/dcadischen Grammatik* (1952), §130 (pp. 183-185).

[258] *Cf.* E. Y. Kutscher, *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* IV (2958), p. 2, opting for an E. origin of Biblical Aramaic (within Imperial); his detailed reasons were to be given in a review-article in *JAOS,* on 'Aramaic Dialects and the Problem of Biblical Aramaic', but this had not appeared at the time of writing. *Cf.* also van der Ploeg, *loc. cit.* (n.254 above); Kutscher, *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* IV, p. 20, contrasting the usage of *l* in Imperial with Biblical Aramaic, and the Genesis Apocryphon, with 'Western Aramaic'; and F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, *Die Aramäische Sprache unter den Achaimeniden,* I (1963), pp. 58, 207.

3. *Vocabulary: Greek.* Only three words (of one class: music) are involved. Greek wares reached all over the Ancient Near East from the eighth century BC onwards; Greek mercenaries and artisans served the Babylon of Nebuchadrezzar. Greek words occur in Imperial Aramaic at the end of the fifth century BC (*statēr,* probably *dōrēma?,* just possibly others), and there is nothing to stop them appearing earlier. It is unjustifiable to hold that Greek words in Aramaic imply a date after 330 BC. Many Old Persian words alongside hardly any Greek words in our text suggest a date in the Persian age; a document of Hellenistic date with a penchant for loan-words should have taken them from Greek (or Middle Persian). Hence, a second-century date cannot be based on three Greek words; a very late sixth-century date is early enough for the body of Persian words—between these dates no greater precision is possible linguistically.

[p.78]

4. *Orthography and Phonetics.* Old and Imperial Aramaic texts started off with a Phoenician orthography that, in some respects, only *approximated* to the phonetics of Aramaic as spoken; sound-shifts in Aramaic within the eighth-fifth centuries BC turned these approximate spellings into purely *historical* spellings. These phenomena are betrayed by sporadic phonetic writings and false archaisms in Imperial Aramaic documents of everyday business. By contrast, in Daniel and Ezra, which are scribally transmitted literary texts, the phonetic changes have shown themselves in modernization (most probably unofficial, at least initially) of spelling, probably in or after the third century BC. A second-century date could be held by proving that no modernization had occurred, if that is possible (what of *gzbr/gdbr?).* In favour of modernization is a case of hyper-modernization of a Persian word (*gdbr*), and by contrast one case of a proper name surviving in an *old* form (because, being foreign, it had no meaning beyond being a personal 'label'). Orthographic modernization is quite commonplace in Ancient Near Eastern literary transmission.

5. *Grammar.* Much of the supposed 'evidence' on word-forms had to be dismissed because it was merely a repetition of points raised under Orthography and Phonetics, and was sufficiently dealt with under this head. One or two 'late' forms are actually early. Only in the pronominal forms is there any evidence for 'late' forms—and some of these are already attested in the fifth century BC—but in the Aramaic of Daniel (and Ezra) they represent the effect of (gradual?) modernization, the pressure of spoken, living language upon a scribally transmitted literary text, exactly as elsewhere in the Ancient Near East. As with orthography, so here, non-revision would have to be factually eliminated to certify so late a date as the second century BC for composition.

6. *Syntax.* Most points here are irrelevant for dating-purposes, and two points that once seemed peculiar are in all probability a mark of, or survival from, an early date (*l* before a royal name in dates; use of 'king' before a royal name). The word-order of the Aramaic of Daniel (and Ezra) places it squarely in full-blooded Imperial Aramaic—and in striking contrast with *real* Palestinian post-Imperial Aramaic of the second and first centuries BC as illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls. Beyond this, the Aramaic of Daniel (and Ezra) is neither Eastern nor Western, simply Imperial that cannot be divided in this way; some hints would point East, but do not constitute proof in themselves.

[p.79]

Summary. What, then, shall we say of the Aramaic of Daniel? It is, in itself; as long and generally agreed, integrally a part of that Imperial Aramaic which gathered impetus from at least the seventh century BC and was in full use until *c.* 300 BC, thereafter falling away or fossilizing where it was not native and developing new forms and usages where it was the spoken tongue. If proper allowance be made for attested scribal usage in the Biblical Near East (including orthographical and morphological change, both official and unofficial), then there is nothing to decide the date of composition of the Aramnaic of Daniel *on the grounds of Aramaic* anywhere between the late sixth and the second century BC. Some points hint at an early (especially pre-300), not late, date—but in large part could be argued to be survivals till the second century BC, just as third—second century spellings or grammatical forms must be proved to be original to the composition of the work before a sixth—fifth century date could be excluded. The date of the book of Daniel, in short, cannot be decided upon linguistic grounds alone.[259] It is equally obscurantist to exclude dogmatically a sixth-fifth (or fourth) century date on the one hand, or to hold such a date as mechanically proven on the other, *as far as the Aramaic is concerned.*

ABBREVIATIONS

For standard reference works and journals, the abbreviations adopted by *The New Bible Dictionary* (1962) are employed. Other abbreviations are:

AK	*Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Karatepe* (*Erster Vorbericht*) (H. T. Bossert), 1950
AOT	*The Aramaic of the Old Testament* (H. H. Rowley), 1929
AOTBI[2]	*Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament* Vol. 2 (ed. H. Gressmann), 1927
AP	*Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (A. E. Cowley), 1923
ASc	*Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum, Reign of Ashur-nasir-pal, 885-860 B.C.* (E. A. Walls Budge), 1914
ASD III, IV	*Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli* III, IV (F. von Luschan), 1902, 1911
BMAP	*The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (E. G. Kraeling), 1953
C II	*Carchemish* II (C. L. Woolley), 1921
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary* (ed. I. J. Geib *et al.),* 1956.
DAB	*The Development of Attic Black-Figure* (J. D. Beazley), 1951.
DM	*Darius the Mede* (J. C. Whitcomb), 1959
DTM	*Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (H. H. Rowley), 1935
GBA	*A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (F. Rosenthal), 1961
GO	*The Greeks Overseas* (J. Boardman), 1964
HCC	*Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus* (J. L. Myres), 1914
HGB	*A Handbook of Greek Black-Figured Vases* (J. C. Hoppin), 1924
HSD	'Notes on the Aramaic of the *Genesis Apocryphon'* (H. H. Rowley), pp. 116-129 of *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to C. R. Driver* (ed. D. W. Thomas and W. D. McHardy), 1963

---

[259] Some recent tendencies towards allowing a date for Biblical Aramaic earlier than the second century BC may be mentioned in passing. Note, e.g., E. G. Kraeling, *BMAP,* p. 7; J. J. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie,* I (1962), p. 154, by his classification includes Biblical Aramaic with fifth-century material; on a Mesopotamian origin *cf.* J. van der Ploeg, *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte* II *de Qumran* (1962), p. 24. This new flexibility and open-mindedness is welcome.

LAP	*Introduction to the Law of the Aramaic Papyri* (R. Yaron), 1961
MAO	*Die Musikinstrumente des Alien Orients* (M. Wegner), 1950
MS	*The Music of the Swnerians... Babylonians and Assyrians* (F. W.Galpln), 1937
NB	*Nineveh and Babylon* (A. Parrot), 1961
NI	*A Catalogue of the Nimrud Ivories* (R. D. Barnett), 1957
OP	*Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*[2] (R. G. Kent), 1953
PTT	*Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (G. G. Cameron), 1948
SA	*The Stones of Assyria* (C. J. Gadd), 1936
UE II	*Ur Excavations* II, *The Royal Cemetery* (C. L. Woolley), 1934
UM	*Ugaritic Manual* (C. H. Gordon), 1955