

kind from his predecessors according to the LXX. He merely differs from 'the first (kings)' (v. 24, τοὺς πρώτους) in his 'evil deeds' (κακοίς). The MT emphasizes rather that the king is different from 'the former ones' (אֲנִיָּמָם) themselves, not from their deeds.<sup>65</sup>

Both versions agree at v. 3 where it is said that the beasts are 'different one from the other' (διαφέροντα ἓν παρὰ τὸ ἓν, אִתְּמָן אֶד יִנִּי). However, from that point they disagree somewhat in the manner outlined above on the nature of that difference. The MT tends to place the fourth beast and then the eleventh king in a different category. The LXX rather sees them as the culmination of a process.

### *Differences in Understanding of the Son of Man*

If these differences in the way the beasts are distinguished from one another are finely drawn and partly due to translation technique, variations in the way the figure like a son of man is treated are more clearly distinguishable. The first task in dealing with these variations is to establish the most likely text of the LXX at the crucial v. 13.

The phrase ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ('one like an ancient of days') poses a problem. Montgomery has labelled this as an erroneous reading which attempts to render the MT's 72.<sup>66</sup> However, Lust points out that ὡς is the reading of 967, so there is no textual evidence available in support of its emendation to ἕως.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, the nominative form of παλαιός that follows is correct for the reading as it stands. If ἕως were correct, we would expect it to take a genitive, as happens in θ. Despite the inconvenience caused by the fact, the reading 'one like an ancient of days' must be allowed to stand in the LXX. Another textual problem concerns the final phrase of the Greek. The reading preferred by Rahlfs, following 88-Syh, is παρῆσαν αὐτῷ ('were by/with him'). 967, in contrast, witnesses to προσήγαγον αὐτῷ, but Lust this time considers the Cologne papyrus to be in error. His grounds are that it is

65. The MT tradition of the different fourth beast is also present in *Barn.* 4.5, where it is said to be 'wicked and powerful and fiercer than all the beasts of the sea' (translation by J. Reeves, 'An Enochic Citation in Barnabas 4:3 and the Oracles of Hystaspes' [IOUDAIOS Electronic Bulletin Board: November 1992], p. 2). Reeves (p. 4) sees in *Barnabas* several points of correspondence with the Oracle of Hystaspes.

66. Montgomery, *Daniel*, p. 304. He is supported by Collins, *Daniel*, p. 311.

67. J. Lust, 'Daniel 7.13 and the Septuagint', *ETL* 54 (1978), p. 65.

grammatically incorrect, and has come about as a corruption from θ/MT.<sup>68</sup> In fact, there does not need to be a grammatical problem with the 967 reading. The προσήγαγον form is the second aorist third person plural of προσάγω, used intransitively with αὐτῷ as its indirect object. Hence, 'they (the bystanders) drew close to him'. Other occurrences of this form in the LXX may be found in Num. 7.3 and 15.33 as well as Susanna 52. If there has been no cause to doubt the reliability of 967 for the rest of v. 13, there seem to be no grounds for rejecting it at this point. Indeed, the whole verse makes adequate grammatical sense as presented by 967.<sup>69</sup> The sense is as follows: 'on the clouds of heaven one like a son of man came and one like an ancient of days was nearby, and those standing by drew near to him'. That is the meaning presumed for the rest of this discussion.

The most obvious difference between the versions at v. 13 is the question of whether the son of man arrives 'with the clouds of heaven' (MT, עַם עֲנַי שְׁמַיָּא) or 'on the clouds of heaven' (LXX, ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). Are the prepositions עַם and ἐπὶ equivalent or not? The Greek rendering could represent עַם in its *Vorlage*, or it could be an interpretation of the preposition עַם on the part of the translator. Some say that there is no significance in the difference.<sup>70</sup> Prepositions are extremely fluid, and it is possible that ἐπὶ possessed a shade of meaning appropriate to עַם in the mind of the translator. The argument then continues that even if there is a distinction, whether in translation or in the *Vorlage*, there is no difference in the way the son of man is viewed by each version. The divinity or otherwise of the son of man cannot be decided on the choice of preposition.

The data available for a discussion on the usage of Semitic and Greek prepositions, and their equivalence between languages, are obviously extensive. By the very nature of their varied usage, firm conclusions are almost impossible to arrive at, as exceptions can generally be found to support a point of view. But the evidence of the prepositions in this particular instance should not be dismissed out of hand. A study of their use by individual authors and translators can be indicative of style and usage.

68. Lust, 'Daniel 7.13', p. 64.

69. Jeansonne, *Daniel 7-12*, pp. 11 and 98, sees προσήγαγον as an example of an original reading in 967, but agrees with Ziegler's emendation of ὡς to ἕως plus the genitive.

70. For example, Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 145, and Jeansonne, *Daniel 7-12*, p. 113.