

Journal: Westminster Theological Journal

Volume: [WTJ 49:2 \(Fall 1987\)](#)

Article: Ben Sira on OT Canon Again: The Date of Daniel

Author: [Douglas E. Fox](#)

---

Ben Sira on OT Canon Again:  
The Date of Daniel

Douglas E. Fox

The Apocryphal book called Ecclesiasticus or Ben Sira has long been recognized as one of the most important sources for dating the *terminus ad quem* or final limiting point in time for the existence of the OT canon. Every introduction to the OT and every book dealing with the subject of OT canon must wrestle with Ben Sira and its prologue. Since both the book itself (190–180 BC), and the prologue written by Ben Sira’s grandson (132–116 BC) are clearly datable, they provide one firm place to stand in a vast area of uncertainty.

On the basis of three references in the prologue to “The law, the prophets and the rest of the books” (ho nomos kai ai prophēteiai kai hai ta loipa tōn bibliōn, Prol. 24–25; cf. 7–10, 1–2), a wide variety of conclusions have been drawn about the status of the OT canon at the time the prologue was written. Arthur Weiser believed these references prove that the Hebrew OT canon was as yet still undefined at this time.<sup>1</sup> Many other scholars have suggested that the prologue indicates that the law and the prophets were canonical at this time but not the writings. In a different direction R. Laird Harris thought this same passage may prove that the LXX translation was finished before 130 BC<sup>2</sup>

Roger Beckwith’s recent comprehensive study of the OT canon provides a good overview of the issues. He convincingly argues that Ben Sira’s grandson had a threefold canon, distinguished from all other writings, and that the grandson

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 336

implies that such was the case in his grandfather’s time also.<sup>3</sup> Beckwith acknowledges that this reading of the data is not the way all scholars have read the passages in the past, but he rightly complains that the clear evidence of the passages has often been tailored to fit current critical hypotheses which is an obvious reversal of proper historical procedure.<sup>4</sup>

Ben Sira is unique within the genre of wisdom literature in that it “is sprinkled with explicit references and recognizable allusions to biblical persons and events...and the actual quotation of scripture.”<sup>5</sup> Solomon Schechter, whose name has been closely associated with Ben Sira studies because he was the first to identify the recovered Hebrew version of the book, said in his classic (but now hard to find) work *The Wisdom*

of *Ben Sira* that “Ben Sira, though not entirely devoid of original ideas, was, as is well known, a conscious imitator both as to form and as to matter, his chief model being the book of Proverbs.”<sup>6</sup> Schechter then proved this assertion by providing a list of 340 phrases, idioms, typical expressions, and even whole verses from the OT of which he said that “there can be no reasonable doubt that they were either suggested to Ben Sira by, or directly copied from the Scriptures.”<sup>7</sup> A. Eberharter, a decade later, also searched Ben Sira for the same information and found 66 allusions and 67 references to the Pentateuch, 21 allusions and 48 references to the former prophets, and 171 allusions and 125 references to the hagiographa—all totaled 327 allusions and 275 references to the OT.<sup>8</sup> T. Middendorp conducted his own search of Ben Sira

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 337

in 1973 and found 70 allusions to the Pentateuch, 46 allusions to the historical books, 51 allusions to the prophetic books, and over 160 allusions to the hagiographa—altogether 330 allusions to the OT.<sup>9</sup> Schechter had expressed the view, later confirmed by these independent investigations, that “the impression produced by the perusal of Ben Sira’s original on the student who is at all familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures is that of reading the work of a post-canonical author, who already knew his Bible and was constantly quoting it.”<sup>10</sup>

These numerous references to the OT provide important information on specific biblical books and their status at Ben Sira’s time. Isaianic authorship for the entire book of Isaiah is indicated by [Sir 48:17–25](#). C. Taylor, Schechter’s co-editor of *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, recognized that “from the end of chapter 48 it was sufficiently obvious that he [Ben Sira] credited one author with the book of Isaiah as a whole.”<sup>11</sup> E. J. Young also noted that the Greek text of Ben Sira employs the same Greek word for “comfort” (*parakalein*) that is used in the LXX of [Isa 40:1](#) and [61:1–2](#). He also noted that the Hebrew of this passage also uses the same Hebrew word (*naham*) as the Isaiah passages. Dr. Young found it curious that the alleged “Second Isaiah” was unknown to Ben Sira, especially since this “Second Isaiah” was supposed to be one of the greatest of the prophets, and Ben Sira appears to have studied the prophets closely (see [Sir 39:1, 7–8](#)).<sup>12</sup>

In the last century, before the research of Gunkel and Mowinckel, and before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, many scholars boldly rejected the traditional dating of the Psalms by suggesting many of the Psalms were written in the Maccabean period.<sup>13</sup> Hitzig in 1835 said all the Psalms from

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 338

[Psalm 73](#) onward were Maccabean. Oshausen in 1853 went further and referred most of the Psalms to the Maccabean period. Gratz, Reyss, and Cheyne all wrote voluminous commentary on the Psalms under the assumption that many of the Psalms were to be dated in the Maccabean age.<sup>14</sup> In 1899 B. Duhm published a commentary on the Psalms that endeavored to substantiate the case for ascribing most of the Psalter to the Maccabean age.<sup>15</sup>

Right in the midst of all of these theories (1869) came a warning (largely unheeded) from Carl Ehrt, who provided convincing evidence from Ben Sira that “the author of the Book of Sirach had before him the Psalter in all its parts.”<sup>16</sup> He produced evidence from Ben Sira that should have produced caution among these scholars about Maccabean Psalms since Ben Sira is pre-Maccabean. Ehrt also showed that Ben Sira’s grandson was influenced by the Greek translation of the Psalter. In this latter particular, Ehrt’s work provides evidence for Dr. Harris’ theory that the grandson in the prologue is indicating that a Greek translation exists for the entire OT.<sup>17</sup>

Solomon Schechter immediately recognized that his discovery of a Hebrew Ben Sira in 1896 made the Maccabean dating of the Psalms completely untenable because he found that the list of Ben Sira’s references to the Psalter “covered all the books or groups of the Psalms.”<sup>18</sup> Schechter, who says he was once an ardent believer in the possibility of Maccabean Psalms, had to admit reluctantly that the discovery of an original language Ben Sira made his previous hypothesis “a total

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 339

loss.”<sup>19</sup> Did this mean that all those volumes of learned commentary on the so-called “Maccabean Psalms” were destined for the ash heap? For the most part, yes. Perhaps they may have some value in revealing how a controlling paradigm enables one to find only what one wants to find in a biblical text, but their value for serious study of the Psalter is now surely past.

Schechter also demonstrated how scholars who dated the Book of Job to a time almost contemporary with Ben Sira had made a major blunder. Simply because it appeared that Job was not mentioned in Ben Sira’s list of biblical heroes, some scholars felt free to infer that the book was not yet written. But the discovery of the Hebrew Ben Sira showed that the Greek translator had mistaken *’iyob* (Job), for *’ayab* (to be an enemy) in 49:9. Where the Greek translation had, “For surely he remembered the enemies in storm,” the Hebrew reads, “and also he made mention of Job, who maintained all the ways of righteousness.” This kind of thing should not be too surprising if we remember that Ben Sira’s grandson, in his prologue, “prepared us for some of the remarkable errors which we find in his version.”<sup>20</sup> Schechter went on to say that Ben Sira’s “whole cosmography is based on the last chapters of the Book of Job, from which he copied various passages.”<sup>21</sup>

More recently the book of Ben Sira has been employed to demonstrate more conclusively the author’s knowledge of all the legal portions of the OT,<sup>22</sup> while Brevard Childs has drawn attention to the author’s knowledge of “all the prophetic

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 340

books in a canonical order (46:1–49:13) and even the title of the Book of the Twelve.”<sup>23</sup> We should add here that the twelve minor prophets are seen as a literary unity in 49:10, most likely indicating that these twelve books were gathered together on the same scroll before the time of Ben Sira.

Still in most OT introductions, and surprisingly even in R. K. Harrison's, Ben Sira is thought not to know of Daniel, and this is considered an important factor for the dating of Daniel. Since many less conservative scholars date the book of Daniel in Maccabean times (168 BC), those scholars are not surprised to find no trace of Daniel in Ben Sira since they believe that the Book of Daniel was not yet in existence. Harrison does not accept this argument from silence, so he tries to provide an explanation for Ben Sira's failure to mention Daniel. He says that Ben Sira could have "deliberately excluded Daniel from his list of notables for unknown reasons, as he did also with Job [but see the discussion of the Hebrew Ben Sira above] and all the judges except Samuel, as well as Kings Asa and Jehoshaphat, Mordecai, and even Ezra himself."<sup>24</sup>

It seems that conservative scholars want it both ways. E. J. Young says Ben Sira's failure to mention a prophet (Second Isaiah) is significant because Ben Sira shows signs of serious study of the prophets, while Harrison claims Ben Sira's failure to mention Daniel is not significant and the argument from silence should carry no weight when it comes to Daniel.

The argument from silence proves nothing if other things are equal, but in this case other things are not equal. It is, much better to follow the approach of E. J. Young. Ben Sira says that the ideal sopher or "scribe" (as Ben Sira envisioned himself) should seek out the wisdom of the ancients and be concerned with all of the prophetic writings (39:1), since he investigates God's mysteries (39:7–8). Because Ben Sira believes that God "will not let any of his words fall to the ground" (47:22), he looks for a descendant of David to usher in a Messianic era (47:22; cf. [1 Kgs 11:38–39](#)). Ben Sira says

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 341

Isaiah "saw by an excellent spirit what should come to pass at the last" so Ben Sira envisions an eschatological future that involves the Gentiles (36:1–10). Ben Sira believed that Isaiah "showed the things that should be at the end of time, and the hidden things before they even came" (48:24–25). For Ben Sira, God's promise, sworn on oath to Abraham, means that Abraham's descendants will one day gain an inheritance "from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth" (44:21). Having read [Mal 4:6](#), he awaits the return of Elijah to "turn the hearts of the fathers unto the children" (48:10), and interpreting Isaiah's "Servant" as an individual rather than a corporate entity, he considered it part of the messianic task "to restore the tribes of Israel" (48:10) which Isaiah had said was part of the Servant's task in [Isa 49:6](#).

With all of this interest in Scripture and especially in eschatology and the Messiah, we find it hard to believe that Ben Sira would show no acquaintance with Daniel and his prophecies if that book had been available to him. After all, the grandson had bragged that his grandfather "had greatly given himself to the reading of the law and the prophets and the other books of the fathers," and that he had "gained great familiarity therein" (Prol. 6). It would be very odd after noting Ben Sira's wide ranging biblical study not to find at least something of Daniel reflected somewhere in his book. If Ben Sira does not

mention Daniel, we must face the fact that the argument from silence should carry some serious weight in this particular case.

Now the claim that Daniel is not mentioned in Ben Sira would lose all of its force (and would in fact be turned on its head) if it could be demonstrated that Ben Sira does indeed refer to passages in the Book of Daniel, and surprisingly enough, this now appears to be the case. C. C. Torrey recognized that the Geniza Hebrew manuscript B of Ben Sira referred to a passage in the Book of Daniel and noted this in his 1950 essay, “The Hebrew of the Geniza Sirah.”<sup>25</sup> He said that this Hebrew Ben Sira manuscript is “plainly dependent on the Hebrew of Daniel” and he gave as evidence “cp 36:10

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 342

with [Dan 8:19](#), [11:27](#), [35](#).” Torrey’s interesting observation calls for closer examination.

In chap. 8 of the Book of Daniel, the angel Gabriel is called upon to provide Daniel with the meaning of his vision. The first thing the angel tells Daniel is, “Son of man, understand that the vision concerns the time of the end” (ky lmw’d qš). Later in chap. 11 two of the same key Hebrew words are used again in a slightly different order. Here Daniel is receiving an explanation of what will happen to his people in the future ([10:14](#)). In [11:27](#) the speaker says “for the end is still to come at the appointed time” (ky ‘wd qš lmw’d). Later in this chapter once again the same words are used a third time in a similar manner in verse [35](#), “until the end time, because it is still to come at the appointed time” (‘d qš ky ‘wd lmw’d).

The Hebrew words qēš (“time”) and mo ‘ēd (“appointed time”) are found in collocation on all three of these occasions and they become almost a technical phrase to refer to the eschatological end of time.

[Sir 36:8](#) (which corresponds to v [10](#) in the Greek translation, and [33:8](#) in Segal’s Hebrew edition) occurs in the middle of an eschatological battle prayer.<sup>26</sup> In v [8](#) Ben Sira writes, “Hasten the end, and ordain the appointed time” (hḥyš qš wpqwd mw’d). Ben Sira’s use of precisely the same words (again in collocation) with the very same meaning must be seen as exceedingly strong evidence of literary dependence, as Torrey had noted.

But this was only one of three different passages in Schechter’s list which seemed to refer to the Book of Daniel. Two other passages in his list paired [Sir 3:30](#) (kn šdqh tkpr ḥt’t) with [Dan 4:24](#) (ḥtyk bšdqh prq), and [Sir 36:17](#) (tšm’ tplt ‘bdyk) with [Dan 9:17](#) (šm’ lḥynw tplt ‘bdk). It was Schechter’s claim that the discovery of the Hebrew Ben Sira proves that Ben Sira was later than any biblical book with one possible exception.<sup>27</sup>

Yet even after providing such compelling evidence, Schechter left the matter in doubt as to whether Daniel was to be dated earlier than Ben Sira. It was the one biblical book that

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 343

he was reluctant to date before Ben Sira. But Schechter laid down a sound methodological procedure which should have conclusively settled the question. His two principles were as follows:

1. When the same phrases occur in one of the canonical writers and in Ben Sira, the balance of probability is strongly in favor of the supposition that Ben Sira was the imitator of the canonical writer and not vice versa.
2. Because clear examples of such imitation by Ben Sira can be found in the case of all the canonical books, with the doubtful exception of the Book of Daniel, these books must as a whole have been familiar to Ben Sira, and must therefore be anterior to him in date.<sup>28</sup>

If Schechter had been completely true to his principles he would not have wavered with regard to the Book of Daniel. But as it was, he already expected to receive enough heat (which he did in fact receive) for his new discoveries, which threw a major monkey wrench into “the assured results of modern criticism” regarding the date of such books as Job, Ecclesiastes, Chronicles, and the so-called Maccabean Psalms. At the outset of his work on Ben Sira Schechter accurately predicted that his study of the relation of Ben Sira to the OT “will probably call forth a good deal of opposition,” but fortunately for later scholars, he believed “this is no reason for suppressing views which are the result of studies pursued for a long time with earnestness and devotion.”<sup>29</sup>

Th. Nöldeke was one of the first to look at the passages which referred to Daniel that Schechter had collected and declare that Schechter was going much too far. After all, he said, we know that Ben Sira is pre-Maccabean and it is a known fact that Daniel was written in 168–167.<sup>30</sup> Looking at the first and most compelling example of dependence that we have examined ([Sir 36:8](#)), he had to say, “One must acknowledge that one of these two passages here is dependent on the other.”<sup>31</sup> But his way of explaining the dependence was to assert that the author of Daniel had used the book of Ben Sira. He believed that these two writings originated in a similar

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 344

period, so similar ideas and modes of expression were only what was to be expected.

In answer to Nöldeke’s claim, it is interesting that these two words *qēṣ* and *mo ‘ēd* are used extensively in the Qumran literature. B. Roberts noted the use of *qēṣ* 15 times in the Damascus Rule (CD) and he commented that the word often takes on an apocalyptic nuance.<sup>32</sup> Yigael Yadin in his study of the War Scroll (IQM) noted the “enormous influence of Daniel” both in style and in apocalyptic and eschatological terminology, including the words *qēṣ* and *mo ‘ēd*.<sup>33</sup> and *mo ‘ēd* see pp. 258, 344.

In a similar vein, M. R. Lehman compared this passage in Ben Sira 36:1–17 (he followed Segal’s numbering system) with the four battle prayers in IQM and noted such similarity that he was led to postulate that either the Qumran author was influenced by Ben Sira or

that both “paraphrased a common source.”<sup>34</sup> Scholars such as Y. Yadin, J. van der Ploeg,<sup>35</sup> and G. Vermes<sup>36</sup> have recognized that Daniel is the source for the War Rule. Thus the common source for the War Rule and Ben Sira, which Lehman recognized, must also be the Book of Daniel.

Recent studies on the Aramaic of Daniel indicate that it is closely akin to the fifth-century Imperial Aramaic of Ezra and the Elephantine papyri,<sup>37</sup> but very different from the later Palestinian derivations of Imperial Aramaic witnessed by the Genesis Apocryphon and the Targum of Job found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>38</sup> It now appears that “the Genesis Apocryphon furnishes very powerful evidence that the

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 345

Aramaic of Daniel comes from a considerably earlier period than the second century BC.”<sup>39</sup> Of the fragments of Daniel that have been found at Qumran, the points in the book where the language changes from Hebrew to Aramaic are attested.<sup>40</sup> This means the present structure of Daniel, with its changes between Aramaic and Hebrew, is very ancient. With its early variety of Aramaic, Daniel is certainly earlier than the Aramaic found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. For these reasons, no one today should assert that Daniel is dependent on Ben Sira: the early Aramaic in Daniel precludes such a possibility. So discoveries since Nöldeke’s day make his suggestion that “Daniel” used Ben Sira highly suspect.

In addition, it should be recalled, as Schechter and others have emphasized, that Ben Sira was a conscious imitator, while the author of the Book of Daniel must be seen as a highly creative and original thinker. We expect Ben Sira to rely on others, but not the author of the Book of Daniel. So for a couple of reasons, Nöldeke’s explanation will not work today.

As was the case in the reference to Job, the Greek of Ben Sira 36:10 had gone astray, so the dependence on Daniel could not be recognized until the Hebrew came to light. Once the similarities between the Hebrew Ben Sira and Daniel were recognized, some scholars were reluctant to draw the necessary conclusions. Their controlling paradigm (that Daniel is to be dated after 168 BC) forced them to seek for other explanations. Israel Levi recognized the dependence on Daniel in his 1904 edition of Ben Sira’s Hebrew text.<sup>41</sup> But his apparent answer, and the more explicit answer of C. C. Torrey, was that the Geniza Hebrew manuscripts of Ben Sira were later retroversions from the Syriac<sup>42</sup> or Arabic.<sup>43</sup> So the de-

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 346

pendence on Daniel was only more evidence, for Torrey and Levi, that the Geniza Hebrew was late and expansionary. For a time this theory about the nature of the Geniza Hebrew gained many followers.<sup>44</sup>

But this theory about the nature of the Geniza Hebrew Ben Sira was dealt a serious blow, first when some fragments of a Hebrew Ben Sira were found in the small cave 2 in the Judean desert near Qumran in 1952.<sup>45</sup> M. R. Lehman immediately recognized that the discovery of these Hebrew Ben Sira fragments at Qumran vindicated the champions of the originality of the Geniza Hebrew text of Ben Sira and he observed that the fragments showed the same arrangement of hemistiches as the B Manuscript of the Geniza text.<sup>46</sup> He also recognized that Ben Sira and the Qumran literature shared many similarities in terminology since they originated about the same time. He was able to adduce numerous parallels in Hebrew terminology and phraseology between the Qumran documents and Geniza Ben Sira. He thus provided more evidence against the theory that the Geniza manuscripts were later retroversions.

This new footing for the Geniza Ben Sira texts was even further strengthened when Yigael Yadin excavated Masada between 1963 and 1965 and found extensive portions of another Hebrew Ben Sira.<sup>47</sup> Like the Qumran fragments,<sup>48</sup> the Masada texts could be dated very early on the basis of their script, even to the first half of the first century BC making them very close in time to the Greek translation done by Ben

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 347

Sira's grandson.<sup>49</sup> Enough of the Masada Hebrew text exists for a detailed comparison with the Geniza manuscripts and such a comparison reveals a very close correspondence. Any controversy about the originality of the Geniza Hebrew texts could then be considered resolved.<sup>50</sup> The book of Ben Sira was surely originally written in Hebrew and the Geniza manuscripts of Ben Sira (five different manuscripts have been identified)<sup>51</sup> can no longer be viewed as retroversions from other languages and most importantly for our purposes, the kind of expansionary tendencies that Torrey and Levi envisioned could no longer be considered plausible. In fact, there are some good reasons to suggest that the Ben Sira manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza may reflect texts that originally came from the Qumran caves.

Paul Kahle considered this a "very likely" possibility and Alexander A. Di Lella called it "more than probable."<sup>52</sup> Their evidence can be summarized by the following facts:

1. Shortly before AD 800 a great deposit of Hebrew manuscripts was discovered in a cave near Jericho. The Nestorian Christian patriarch Timotheos I reports this discovery, telling of the existence of books of the OT and other books in Hebrew script.<sup>53</sup>
2. There is a close connection between the document Schechter called the Zadokite Fragments also discovered in

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 348

the Cairo Geniza and the texts found at Qumran called the Damascus Rule (CD). The "A" recension of the Zadokite document is substantially identical to the Damascus Rule. The



sectarian nature of this document seems also to have influenced Karaite teaching<sup>54</sup> in the ninth or tenth century AD<sup>55</sup>

By the way, this explains why some scholars (notably Solomon Zeitlin) were at first led to believe that the Dead Sea Scrolls belonged to the Middle Ages. They recognized the similarities to this much later Karaite literature. However, the similarities were much better explained as derived from the fact that some of the scrolls were discovered earlier at the end of the eighth century, which then influenced the Karaite literature.

3. Nearly all trace of the Hebrew of Ben Sira disappears from the historical record after the time of Jerome (d. 420) and does not reappear until the latter part of the ninth century when Saadia Gaon employed several quotations from Ben Sira that correspond exactly to the Geniza text. It is unlikely that manuscripts of the Hebrew Ben Sira were available in the time of the Talmud and Midrash since the later rabbis who mention Ben Sira seem to have quoted from it at second hand, from older authorities.<sup>56</sup>

4. The Cairo Geniza Ben Sira fragments appear, because of Persian notes in the margins, to have been copied some time between the ninth and twelfth centuries.

These facts were combined and explained in the fairly reasonable theory of Paul Kahle, later refined by Alexander Di Lella, regarding the textual history of the Geniza manuscripts. According to their complicated but ingenious theory, very ancient manuscripts of Ben Sira were discovered around AD 800 in a Qumran cave. These manuscripts were then carefully

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 349

copied (even noting variant readings in the margin) and some descendants of these manuscripts, along with the Damascus Rule, eventually found their way into the Cairo Geniza. This explains the presence of this Qumran sectarian document in the Cairo Geniza in the Middle Ages when all the other traces of the document were lost, and it explains the long silence regarding the Hebrew Ben Sira between the fifth and the ninth centuries and its later complete obscurity.

Whether this theory of the textual transmission of the Geniza Hebrew manuscripts is accepted in its entirety or not, it must now be universally acknowledged that the Geniza Ben Sira manuscripts show all the earmarks of very ancient texts. These manuscripts, which Levi and Torrey once regarded as late retroversions, must today be seen as very careful copies<sup>57</sup> of very early manuscripts, perhaps even copies of manuscripts found in a Qumran cave around AD 800, originally written in the first half of the first century BC.

But what of the references to the Book of Daniel in manuscript B of the Geniza Ben Sira? It is now nearly impossible to conceive of these references to Daniel in Ben Sira as later glosses since there is every reason to believe, because of the similarity between the Masada manuscripts and the Geniza manuscripts, that these references to Daniel existed in a manuscript written in the first half of the first century BC. So we have something

remarkably close to the autographs with the Masada Ben Sira. This leaves little time for later glosses to come into the text. But even more importantly, as M. R. Lehman points out, the passage which provides the most convincing evidence ([Sir 36:10](#)) fits beautifully into the context of what Lehman calls Ben Sira's "battle prayer" into chap. 36.[58](#) If it is a later gloss, it was very skillfully woven into the context of [Sir 36](#), in fact too skillfully to be considered a gloss.

With the Masada Ben Sira providing support for the originality of the Geniza Hebrew text and confirming the great antiquity of the B manuscript from the Cairo Geniza, that manuscript would now seem to provide clear literary evidence

*WTJ* 49:2 (Fall 1987) p. 350

for the existence of, at least portions, of the Book of Daniel in 190–180 BC. This means that standard OT introductions which deal with the Book of Daniel should now give this 190–180 BC date as a new *terminus ad quem* to at least portions (and interestingly enough, to the latter Hebrew portions)[59](#) of the Book of Daniel.

Realistically, it is unlikely that the authors of new introductions to the OT will immediately accept these arguments. There is simply too much at stake. Evangelical scholars have long complained that the same Qumran evidence that has been allowed to push back the dating of the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and Chronicles exists for Daniel, but because of the issue of predictive prophecy, equivalent manuscript finds have not been allowed to do the same thing for Daniel.[60](#)

We will be content if these references to Daniel in Ben Sira are seen as one more piece of evidence in a growing body of evidence which should lead to a wider general recognition among scholars that the Book of Daniel most certainly deserves to be dated earlier than 165 BC, the date it is traditionally given. Perhaps one day still more new evidence will vindicate the champions of an early date for Daniel even more fully.

Box 98  
Stafford, Connecticut 06075

---

<sup>1</sup> Arthur Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (New York: Association, 1961) 339.

<sup>2</sup> R. Laird Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible: An Historical and Exegetical Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957) 145.

<sup>3</sup> Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) 111.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 166.

<sup>5</sup> James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: an Introduction* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981) 150.

<sup>6</sup> Solomon Schechter and C. Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Portions of the Book of Ecclesiasticus from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection, Presented to the University of Cambridge by the Editors* (London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1899) 12.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 20-25, the total is my calculation.

<sup>8</sup> A. Eberharter, *Der Kanon des Alten Testaments zur Zeit des Ben Sira auf Grund der Beziehungen des Sirachbuches zu den Schriften des Alten Testaments dargestellt* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1911) 6–52. The number is counted and reported by Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom and Ethics* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985) 61.

<sup>9</sup> T. Middendorp, *Die Stellung Jesu Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus* (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 49–91. These numbers were also calculated by Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom*, 62.

<sup>10</sup> Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 26.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, ix.

<sup>12</sup> Edward J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) 207.

<sup>13</sup> R. Clements, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976) 76–77.

<sup>14</sup> Information on the particular Psalms thought to be Maccabean by the various authors can be found in T. K. Cheyne, *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions* (London: Paul, Trench and Trubner and Co., 1891) 15–16 and a well named appendix, “Last words on Maccabean Psalms,” pp. 455-460.

<sup>15</sup> B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen* (Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899, 2d ed. 1922).

<sup>16</sup> Carl Ehrt, *Abfassungszeit and Abschluss des Psalters. Zur Prüfung Der Frage nach Makkabaerpsalmen historich-kritisch untersucht* (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1869) 126.

<sup>17</sup> So also Z. Frankel (*Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* [Leipzig: Vogel, 1841] 21), “*dass der jüngere Sirach eine volistandige Uebersetzung zu kennen scheint.*” Beckwith (*Old Testament Canon*, 21, 141) independently agrees with this assessment.

<sup>18</sup> Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 25-26.

- <sup>19</sup> Solomon Schechter, *Studies in Judaism, Second Series* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1938) 46.
- <sup>20</sup> These are C. Taylor's words in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, viii.
- <sup>21</sup> Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, 46-47. The Hebrew reading for [Sir 49:9](#) which mentions Job is accepted as original by Rudolf Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin: n.p., 1906); W. O. E. Oesterley in *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912) 333; Otto Sauer, "Auch des Job gedachte er! Bemerkungen zu [Sir 49,9](#)" in the F. K. König Festschrift, *Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 10* (1965) 119-26; and Georg Sauer, *Jesus Sirach USHRZ 3/5*; Giltersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1981) 629.
- <sup>22</sup> T. N. Swanson, "The Closing of the Collection of Holy Scripture: A Study in the History of the Canonization of the OT" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1970).
- <sup>23</sup> B. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 64.
- <sup>24</sup> R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament, with a Comprehensive Review of Old Testament Studies and a Special Supplement on the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 1123.
- <sup>25</sup> This appeared in *The Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume* (ed. Saul Liebermann; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950) 597.
- <sup>26</sup> Manfred R. Lehman, "Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature," *RevQ 3* (1961-62) 105-6.
- <sup>27</sup> Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 35.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 1-2.
- <sup>30</sup> Th. Nöldeke, "Bemerkungen zum hebräischen Ben Sira," *ZAW 20* (1900) 87.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 88.
- <sup>32</sup> B. J. Roberts, "Some Observations on the Damascus Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BJRL 34* (1951) 380-81.
- <sup>33</sup> Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: University Press, 1962) 14. For the use of the words qēs
- <sup>34</sup> Lehman, "Ben Sira," 105-6.

- <sup>35</sup> J. van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre* (Leiden: Brill, 1959) 59.
- <sup>36</sup> G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Pelican, 1975) 122.
- <sup>37</sup> Kenneth A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965) 31–79.
- <sup>38</sup> Gleason L. Archer, Jr., "The Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon compared with the Aramaic of Daniel" in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (ed. J. Barton Payne; Waco, TX: Word, 1970) 169. See also Bruce K. Waltke, "The Date of the Book of Daniel," *BSac* 133 (1976) 319–29.
- <sup>39</sup> Gleason A. Archer, "The Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon," 169.
- <sup>40</sup> See Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary* (Madison, WI: InterVarsity Press, 1978) 69.
- <sup>41</sup> Israel Levi, *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus*, (Leiden: Brill, 1904 reprinted 1951) 37. See his note O.
- <sup>42</sup> D. S. Margoliouth, *The Origin of the "Original Hebrew" of Ecclesiasticus* (London: James Parker and Co., 1899). This view of a retroversion from the Syriac was taken up again (but only for a few select passages) by A. A. Di Lella in his *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study* (Studies in Classical Literature 1; The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966), but is convincingly refuted by Hans Peter Rieger in *Text und Textform im hebräischen Sirach Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik der hebräischen Sirachfragmente aus der Kairoer Geniza* (BZAW 112; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970) 115.
- <sup>43</sup> This was Levi's suggestion in *The Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus*, X. See also *REJ* 38 (1899) 308, and compare W. Bacher's discussion of Levi's view in *JQR* 12 (1900) 106.
- <sup>44</sup> The scholars who embraced the retroversion theory for the Geniza Ben Sira are listed and discussed in Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text Of Sirach*.
- <sup>45</sup> For a description of these fragments see M. Baillet, *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran* (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962) 75–77.
- <sup>46</sup> Lehman, "Ben Sira," 104.
- <sup>47</sup> Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scrolls from Masada* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965).
- <sup>48</sup> M. Baillet ("Petites Grottes," 75): "La copie peut donc être datée de la seconde moitié du 1<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C."

<sup>49</sup> Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scrolls*, 4.

<sup>50</sup> Georg Sauer (*Jesus Sirach*, 484-85): “*Dass es sich hierbei um den originalen hebräischen Text und nicht um Ruckübersetzung aus dem Syrischen oder Arabischen handelt, kann heute nach der Auswertung der Funde von Masada nicht mehr bestritten.*”

<sup>51</sup> See Schechter and Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Also J. Marcus, “A Fifth MS. of Ben Sira,” *JQR* 21 (1930/31) 223–40.

<sup>52</sup> Paul Kahle, “The Age of the Scrolls,” *VT* 1 (1951) 46. A. A. Di Leila takes Kahle’s theory and refines and develops it more fully in “Qumran and the Geniza Fragments of Sirach,” *CBQ* 24 (1962) 245–67. Yigael Yadin very early thought there was “some validity to this view” and quoted extensively from Timothy’s letter in his *The Message of the Scrolls* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1957) 122.

<sup>53</sup> A brief account of the discovery in AD 800 can be found in O. Eissfeldt, “*Der Anlass zur Entdeckung der Höhle und ihr ähnliche Vorgänge aus alterer Zeit*,” *TLZ* 10 (1949) 597–600. Di Lella provides translations of Timothy’s letter and several other interesting accounts of this discovery in AD 800 in “Qumran and the Geniza Fragments of Sirach,” 245ff

<sup>54</sup> Henry Hart Milman called the Karaites “the Protestants of Judaism” because they threw all Talmudic lore aside and tried to return to the Bible and its Messianic promises. See his *The History of the Jews: from the earliest period down to modern times* (New York: A.C. Armstrong, 1886) 2.136ff.

<sup>55</sup> See W. Bousset, “*Literatur und Religion des Spätjudentums und des rabbinischen Judentums*,” *TRu* 18 (1915) 51–58.

<sup>56</sup> See A. E. Crowley and A. Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus xxxix: 15-xlix:11: Together with the early versions and an English translation followed by the quotations from Ben Sira in rabbinical literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1897) xix-xxx; also Smend, *Weisheit*, xlvii-1.

<sup>57</sup> Kahle (“Age,” 47) says the person who copied the Geniza manuscript called B “must be regarded as a real scholar” since he carefully collected the various readings and put them on the margin of his copy.

<sup>58</sup> Lehman, “Ben Sira,” 106.

<sup>59</sup> This portion of Daniel has been called “the third apocalypse” and is said to have been written “shortly before the summer of 165 B.c. when the author expected a third campaign of Antiochus against Egypt” (Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* [AB 23; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978] 14). But this view must now be seen to be erroneous, since

as we have observed, there is literary evidence that this portion of Daniel was in existence before 180 BC.

<sup>60</sup> Waltke, “The Date of the Book of Daniel,” 321–22.